Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089)
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623)
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff GIL CABALU, individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated employees and aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

GIL CABALU, individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated employees, and aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HARVEST FARMS SOLUTIONS, INC.; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 26STCV07454

Honorable Theresa M. Traber
Department 1

DECLARATION OF ALEXANDRA ROSE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

Date:	February 18, 2027
Time:	10:30 a.m.
Dept.:	1
Complaint Filed:	March 6, 2026
FAC Filed:	September 10, 2026
Trial Date:	Not Set

DECLARATION OF ALEXANDRA ROSE

I, Alexandra Rose, declare and state as follows:

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

Experience and Adequacy of Blackstone Law, APC

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

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

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

4. Miriam L. Schimmel is a 29-year litigator who joined Blackstone Law, APC in June 2022, following ten years of working with two well-known plaintiff-side wage and hour law firms in Los Angeles. She obtained her Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1992. Thereafter, she received her law degree from Loyola Law School in 1996 and was admitted to the California State Bar in December 1996. Since her admission to the Bar, she has devoted her practice to a wide variety of litigation matters on both the plaintiff and defense side, including general business, toxic tort, medical device, and pharmaceutical matters. Since 2010, her practice has been devoted almost entirely to employment litigation consisting of wage and hour class actions and representative actions pursuant to PAGA, as well as individual actions based on violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"). Approximately 75% of her work in this regard has been on behalf of employees (plaintiffs), while the remaining 25% was on behalf of employers/businesses. On many of those cases, she was the senior lead attorney managing the litigation and overseeing other attorneys. In that capacity, she obtained extensive experience analyzing potential wage and hour and wrongful termination claims for viability; took and defended hundreds of depositions; propounded and responded to discovery; prepared and opposed a wide variety of motions and pleadings, including dispositive and certification motions, as well as settlement approval motions; strategized on all cases; participated in and directed communication with class members; attended hearings; led and participated in mediations; coordinated with class action administrators; prepared and worked with experts; and engaged in all other related aspects of litigation in state, federal, complex, and appellate courts.

///

5. Joana Fang is a highly skilled nine-year lawyer who is part of the team at Blackstone Law, APC that litigated this matter. She is a 2015 graduate of Loyola Law School, and a 2011 graduate of University of California, Berkeley where she was a double major in Legal Studies and Media Studies. Since passing the Bar, Ms. Fang has exclusively represented plaintiffs in wage and hour litigation, as well as catastrophic injury complex litigation. She is admitted to the State of California, all federal district courts of California, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit. She was most recently recognized as a 2025 Southern California Rising Star by Super Lawyers.

6. I joined Blackstone Law, APC from a highly reputable employment law firm. I graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2016 and from New England Law | Boston with a Juris Doctor degree in 2019. I was admitted to the State Bar of California in December of 2019 and the State Bars of New York and New Jersey in 2023. I am additionally licensed in all federal district courts of California. I manage the post-settlement department at Blackstone Law, APC. In that capacity, I oversee and handle over 200 wage-and-hour putative class actions and/or representative actions under PAGA that are in settlement.

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

Procedural History of the Action

8. On March 5, 2026, Plaintiff provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by online submission and to Defendant Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc. ("Defendant") by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specified provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("PAGA Notice"). A true and correct copy of the PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

9. On March 6, 2026, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint in the action entitled *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 26STCV07454 ("Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant.

///

///

10. On May 11, 2026, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq.* in the action entitled *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 26STCV15055 ("PAGA Action"), which alleged one cause of action under PAGA against Defendant.

11. On July 24, 2026, Plaintiff and Defendant (together, the "Parties") reached a settlement following arm's-length negotiations between counsel for the Parties. The Parties then worked diligently to negotiate and memorialize the terms in a long-form settlement agreement.

12. On September 10, 2026, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("Operative Complaint") in the Action, which added the PAGA claims alleged in the PAGA Action. The Operative Complaint alleges eleven (11) causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, reporting time pay violations, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premiums payments in lieu thereof, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, and failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, for violations of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq*. based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations, and for civil penalties under PAGA based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations.

13. On October 14, 2026, the Parties executed the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

Summary of the Terms of the Settlement Agreement

14. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the Class shall be defined as "all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the Class Period" ("Class" or "Class Member(s)"). The Class Period is defined as the period from July 1, 2024 through May 22, 2026. Based on information provided by Defendant, there are a total of nineteen (19) Class Members who worked one thousand two hundred and ninety-four (1,294) weeks for Defendant for at least one day during the Class Period ("Workweeks").

15. The Parties have agreed to settle the class and PAGA claims at issue in the Operative Complaint for a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of One Hundred Fifteen Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($115,000.00), exclusive of employer-side payroll taxes. The Gross Settlement Amount is a common fund and therefore includes all requested costs, fees, and other allocations. The Gross Settlement Amount includes: (1) Class Counsel's fees in the amount of one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $38,333.33 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $115,000.00); (2) Class Counsel's actual litigation costs and expenses, not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00); (3) Administration Expenses Payment, not to exceed Four Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($4,250.00); (4) Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,000.00); and (5) PAGA Penalties in the amount of Five Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,750.00). After the above-estimated amounts are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Amount that will be available for Class Members is currently estimated to be Fifty-One Thousand Six Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars and Sixty-Seven Cents ($51,666.67).

16. Additionally, thirty-five percent (35%) of the PAGA Penalties, which is $2,012.50 out of $5,750.00, will be fully distributed to "all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period" ("Aggrieved Employee(s)"). The "PAGA Period" is defined as the period from March 5, 2025 through May 22, 2026. Based on information provided by Defendant, there are a total of nineteen (19) Aggrieved Employees who worked five hundred and nine (509) pay periods for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period ("PAGA Pay Periods").

17. The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed and paid to all Class Members who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion ("Participating Class Member(s)") on a *pro rata* basis based on their number of Workweeks. The *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount that a Class Member may be eligible to receive under the Settlement ("Individual Class Payment") will be calculated by the Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

///

///

18. The thirty-five percent (35%) share of the PAGA Penalties will be distributed and paid to all Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on their number of PAGA Pay Periods. The *pro rata* share of the thirty-five percent (35%) share of the PAGA Penalties that an Aggrieved Employee may be eligible to receive under the Settlement ("Individual PAGA Payment") will be calculated by the Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

19. Each Individual Class Payment will be allocated twenty percent (20%) to the settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion") and eighty percent (80%) to the settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form and the Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. The Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, and issue checks to Participating Class Members for their net payment of their Individual Class Payment. The employer's share of taxes and contributions in connection with the Wage Portion of Individual Class Payments will be paid by Defendant separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Administrator.

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

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

///

///

///

The Settlement is Reasonable

Informed Arms-Length Negotiations

22. The Parties' settlement negotiations were at all times made at arm's-length and were adversarial. The Settlement was reached after the Parties exchanged sufficient information to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses, and Plaintiff engaged in additional negotiations in order to finalize the long-form agreement presently before the Court.

23. The Parties engaged in extensive informal discovery prior to reaching a settlement. Defendant produced all of the putative class members' time and pay data as well as Defendant's relevant wage and hour policies, and information regarding the total number of putative class members, the number of current versus former employees, the total workweeks worked by the putative class members, and the average rate of pay for the putative class members.

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

25. Based on the information exchanged, the Parties extensively briefed issues regarding class certification and liability. At all times, Plaintiff was willing and prepared to litigate this matter through class certification and trial if the Parties had been unable to reach a favorable resolution.

Estimate of Potential Value of Claims

26. Class Counsel analyzed all available data and estimated Defendant's maximum potential exposure for the class claims to be approximately $244,797, assuming the litigation was successful at trial on all claims at issue and every employee had a violation for each claim on every shift worked. This maximum potential analysis was then reduced based on the challenges facing the likelihood of obtaining class certification, prevailing at trial, and other attendant risks. This estimate is based off an estimated maximum liability for all claims at issue and the total aggregate workweeks during the relevant time period, less interest, which included: $33,030 for meal period violations (less meal period premiums paid); $33,618 for rest period violations; $42,023 for unpaid off-the-clock work; $67,236 for reporting time pay; $6,470 for unreimbursed business expenses; $12,470 for waiting time penalties; and $49,950 for wage statement penalties. Plaintiff further estimated that Defendant faced an additional exposure of $50,900 in potential, non-stacked (i.e., one penalty, per employee, per

pay period during the PAGA statutory period) PAGA penalties. Together with the PAGA penalties, Defendant's maximum potential exposure totaled $295,697 in damages.

Specific Risks Considered

27. Although the investigation and information discovered supports Plaintiff's contentions, Defendant raised potential defenses and other circumstances that impacted the risk of proceeding on a class-wide basis. Consideration of these risks factored into the negotiations and the decision to enter the Settlement.

28. Class Counsel is aware of Defendant's defenses and arguments and has also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation, including those involved in class and/or representative adjudication. Plaintiff further recognizes the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability for the claims asserted in the Action, Defendant's defenses, and the difficulties in establishing entitlement to monetary recovery.

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

30. For example, Plaintiff's meal period claims, which were based on Defendant's alleged failure to provide lawful meal periods, have been increasingly difficult to certify in recent years. Plaintiff's theory of liability for meal period violations was based on allegations that Defendant had failed to implement its policies and that its practices failed to allow Class Members to take meal breaks in the manner required under California law. Defendant contended that its policies and practices at all times during the Class Period were lawful. Defendant further argued that the rate of purported meal period violations reflected in the data would require individualized inquiry and that such inquiry would

prohibit a class from being certified. We also had to consider the risk that the Court would find validity in the individualized proof defense to certification of Plaintiff's meal period claim.

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

32. Plaintiff also faced challenges certifying and proving liability for his minimum wage and overtime claims. These claims were largely based on Defendant's unrecorded, off-the-clock work performed by the Class Members both before and after their shifts and during purported meal periods. For example, Plaintiff alleged that he and the other Class Members were required to arrive to work early and perform required security protocols prior to clocking in. However, the individualized nature of why this work was performed and the individualized nature of damages presented substantial concerns regarding the manageability of the case and the risk the Court could find these issues prevented certification.

33. Further, there were substantial risks associated with Plaintiff's reporting time pay claim. Plaintiff contended that during the relevant time period, Plaintiff and the other Class Members, who were required to report to work and did report to work, were not put to work or were furnished less than half of their usual or scheduled day's work. The claim also faced significant problems of proof. Because employees who were sent home were often never clocked in, or had their time adjusted, Defendant's time and pay records would not reliably show when a reporting time violation happened. As a result, the occurrence, frequency, and length of these incidents would have to be proven largely through Class Members' recollections rather than documents. The frequency of canceled or shortened shifts, how much notice was given, and the reasons employees were sent home also likely varied from person to person, from shift to shift, and over time. Defendant argued that

these individual questions, such as whether an employee was actually scheduled, whether notice was given, whether the employee left voluntarily, and whether the employee worked at least half the scheduled shift, would predominate over common questions and defeat certification. Even if a class were certified, proving class-wide liability and damages through testimony instead of records would have been costly, uncertain, and open to a strong defense challenge. Plaintiff's estimate of damages for this claim therefore rested on assumptions about how often violations occurred, and those assumptions might not have held up at certification or trial.

34. Plaintiff also contended that Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other Class Members for necessary business-related expenses, such as the usage of personal cell phones for work-related purposes. Defendant contended that it had a policy and practice of reimbursing employees for necessary business-related expenses in which it reimbursed Class Members $5 a pay period for cell phone reimbursement. Defendant further contended that, with respect to the alleged expenses for which Plaintiff and the other Class Members never requested reimbursement from Defendant, it did not know and had no reason to know that alleged business-related expenses had been incurred. Defendant further contended that the reason for why a Class Member undertook certain expenses, while not others, and failed to receive reimbursement for certain expenses while not others, would raise individual issues that could not be certified.

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

///

36. Class Counsel also recognized that, even if Plaintiff prevailed at class certification, proving the amount of wages due to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and extremely uncertain proposition. In order to prove liability and damages, Class Counsel will need to request and analyze hundreds of pages of documents, obtain the Class Members' contact information, contact them, and obtain declarations at great expense. Obtaining the cooperation of current employees would also be difficult, given the likely reluctance to aid prosecution of a lawsuit against a current employer. On the other hand, Defendant would likely be able to obtain the cooperation of its employees. Moreover, even if Plaintiff prevailed at class certification and trial, possible appeals would substantially delay any recovery by the Class.

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

38. Accordingly, after considering this multitude of factors, we concluded that it was in the best interest of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees to enter into the Settlement, and to allocate Five Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,750.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount towards the PAGA claims, which represents approximately 5% of the Gross Settlement Amount. This percentage of the settlement is well-within the range of wage and hour settlements regularly approved in both state and federal court for cases that include both a class and PAGA action. Typically, such hybrid cases allocate only 1% of the gross settlement value to resolve

PAGA claims, and, indeed, settlements allocations as little as 0.22% of the gross settlement amount have been approved as reasonable by courts. Moreover, the overall relief obtained by the Settlement is significant, not only from a monetary perspective, but also because it fulfills the public policy objectives of PAGA—to promote enforcement of California's labor laws, provide funds to the state, and deter future non-compliance by the employer.

39. Therefore, taking into account how each of the above risks potentially effected Plaintiff's ability to first obtain class certification, and then prove the underlying violations, the Court's broad discretion in civil penalties, plus the cost and delay in recovering the alleged potential damages, Class Counsel discounted Defendant's estimated liability based on the challenges facing his ability to succeed on class certification by 40% to $177,418. The merits-based risk factors further reduced Defendant's estimated liability by an additional 30%. This resulted in an adjusted estimated liability of $124,193. In light thereof, the settlement amount of $115,000 is a significant settlement.

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

Class Representative Service Payment

41. As part of the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff is requesting a reasonable Class Representative Service Payment of Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,000.00) to Plaintiff Gil Cabalu. This Class Representative Service Payment is eminently reasonable given the time and effort Plaintiff spent on this matter, and the benefit to the Class Members as a result of Plaintiff's actions. Notice of the requested Class Representative Service Payment is disclosed to the Class Members in the Class Notice.

Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment

42. The attorneys' fees incurred by Class Counsel are in line with the common fund requested. The Settlement Agreement provides for Class Counsel to apply for attorneys' fees in an amount of up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $38,333.33 if the Gross

Settlement Amount is $115,000.00) and actual litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00), which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court. Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.

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

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

Notice to the Class

45. The Parties have agreed to retain Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix" or "Administrator") to handle the notice and settlement administration process. The Parties respectfully request that the Court appoint Phoenix to handle these procedures and to serve as the Administrator. Defendant will provide Phoenix with the Class Data and Phoenix will calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Class Payment and each Aggrieved Employee's estimated Individual PAGA Payment. Phoenix will also receive and process Requests for Exclusion, written objections, and challenges to Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods; will provide necessary reports and declarations; will calculate, subtract, and transmit necessary taxes and withholdings with respect to the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments; will prepare and submit informational and other tax filings and documents; will issue and transmit all payments provided for by the Settlement, including, but not

limited to, mailing Individual Class Payment checks to the Participating Class Members and Individual PAGA Payment checks to the Aggrieved Employees; and perform any other usual and customary duties for administering a class action settlement.

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

Notice of Settlement to the LWDA

47. In accordance with California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), on November 6, 2026, a copy of the proposed Settlement was submitted to the LWDA via online submission through the LWDA's website. A true and correct copy of the email from the LWDA confirming receipt is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

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

Executed on November 6, 2026, at Jersey City, New Jersey.

Alexandra Rose

Alexandra Rose

EXHIBIT 1

- *Ana Valenzuela v. Handlery Hotels, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 24CU006128C, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jorge Villalpando, et al. v. Best Deal Food Company*, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-23-005838, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ignacio Duenas v. Belcan Engineering Group, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV34198, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Edgar Corral v. Penn Elcom, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01363928-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Christopher Vandycke, et al. v. Pacific Coast Supply, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV027855, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ariana Crisafulli, et al. v. Sonoma Media Investments, LLC*, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV05458, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Luke Leon v. BigHorn Golf Club dba BigHorn ClubHouse, et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2400375, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Luis A. Romero v. Thyssenkrupp Materials, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV03007, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jose Luis Ramirez, et al. v. TMI Automotive Products Inc., et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2304340, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Yrene Diaz, et al. v. Macadi Cleaning Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33823, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ingrid Ruano v. Box Express Manufacturing*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV17209, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lakeysha Vaughn, et al. v. Den-Mat Holdings, LLC, et al.*, Santa Barbara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV01042, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Carla Recinos Castillo, et al. v. Radiant Services Corp., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV37683, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Eduardo Venegas v. Ionis Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case 24STCV12702, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Marissa Riemann v. Quantum Design, Inc., et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 24CU009870C, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jossue Morentin, et al. v. Andros Engineering Corporation*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-25-101034, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Urbano Zavala Lopez v. Food for Life*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2305901, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Demaris Masadas v. California Dinner Entertainment, LLC dba Pirate's Dinner Adventure*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01354556-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of

representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Laura Abarca v. Skirball Cultural Center*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07567, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Frank Breckenridge v. Pacific Material Handling Solutions, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070227, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Gina Harris v. Arhaus, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV24656, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Debra McDonald v. LFCU Financial Services, LLC dba Logix Federal Credit Union, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV16050, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Victoria Esquivel v. Hamlet Karapetian, DMD, Inc. dba Friendly Smiles Dental Group, et al.*, Santa Barbara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV03582, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Gabriela Guerrero, et al. v. SAR California Holdco Inc. dba Sarku Japan*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-104255, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Roman Ramirez Gallegos, et al. v. Dolex Dollar Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21872, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ismael Mercado, et al. v. Natural Alternatives International, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00052115-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marcella Holmes, et al. v. Pacifica Hotel Company*, San Luis Obispo County

Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0681, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Daniel Pereira, et al. v. L.N. Curtis and Sons,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV101859, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Dillan Burghart, et al. v. Watermark Services, IV, LLC,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV035212, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kasim Hakimi v. Catalent Pharma Solutions, LLC,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV087209, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cesar Ibarra v. Leuen, Inc. dba The Original Pantry Café,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV017182, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sharon Baker v. OPARC,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11229, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Basilia Villa Magaña v. CJKANTRG PA, LLC,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV25886, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexis Stuart-Drinnen v. DiCarlo's Italian Cafe, LLC, et al.,* San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2313579, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Monique Duong v. Boardwalk IG Management, LLC,* Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01334565-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Peter J. Gutierrez v. Univar Solutions USA Inc., et al.,* Los Angeles County Superior

Court, Case No. 23STCV26851, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Steve Robles v. Avery Products Corporation*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2024-01390483-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Dianna Flores v. Capitol Distribution Company LLC dba Capitol Food Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV20477, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mark Trahan v. Celebrity Casinos, Inc. dba Crystal Casino*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV30655, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jamie Ramires, et al. v. Bright Star Schools*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV15490, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alesia Williams v. Altamed Health Services Corp.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV15413, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Moreno v. Kern Regional Center*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-24-103353, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jonathan Cruz-Pulido v. Central Valley Meat Co., Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV13660, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Gregorio Pineda, et al. v. Orthopaedic Hospital dba Orthopaedic Institute for Children and Luskin Orthopaedic Institute for Children, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV01618, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *John Price v. Fort Point Beer Company,* San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-610592, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *David Jason Quiñones, et al. v. J-M Manufacturing Company Inc. dba JM Eagle,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV16439, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Laila Droubi, et al. v. GSF Properties, Inc.,* Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-24-100950, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rowena Ray v. Sierra Central Credit Union,* Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV02890, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Hamid Kondori, et al. v. Mission Imports, et al.,* Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2022-01295280-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Johnny Rivas v. Buckingham Property Management,* Kings County Superior Court, Case No. 23CU0355, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Manuel Hernandez v. DHC PS Holdings LLC, et al.,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV079333, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel He, et al. v. Bay Photo Lab Inc., et al.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV05682, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Leonard Moore v. Truepill, Inc.,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV047001, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and

PAGA action.

- *Colton Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al.*, Humbolt County Superior Court, Case No. CV2402126, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Elba Garcia v. South Central Los Angeles Regional Center for Developmentally Disabled Persons, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV04382, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Miguel Avila v. Weber Metals, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV04071, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Hector Cornejo v. Renovo Solutions, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27376, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Juan Campos-Ledezma, et al. v. Institute for Environmental Health, Inc.*, Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-23-006693, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jeanne Boudreau v. Intelliswift Software, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-611128, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Munguia v. Moog Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11688, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Francisco Javier Sanchez, Jr. v. Jim Crawford Construction Company, Inc.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01421, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Jose Ramirez v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court,

Case No. 24CU012580C, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Kirstie Deveaux, et al. v. Motorola Solutions, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV427798, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Geri Gates, et al. v. SD & A Teleservices, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV29390, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Bryan Zuniga v. Inova Diagnostics, Inc., et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00055201-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ivorya Geneve v. Mikuni Restaurant Group, Inc.*, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C23-02732, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Amira Fakira, et al. v. CSL Plasma, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV057131, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Vadim Savin, et al. v. Fleetlogix Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00051984-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Grace Weissmuller, et al. v. Astrix Technology, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV45436, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Gabriel Perez, et al. v. Kimberlite Corporation, et al.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV073959, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Armida Marquez v. The Nielsen Company (US), LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior

Court, Case No. 23STCV06394, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Sergio Valdez v. Ampere Computing, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV438808, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Mendoza v. Mingei International, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2024-00015385-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Vivian Huynh v. Technical Safety Services, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV053505, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Connor Brown v. Bi-Rite Management Services LLC, et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-24-611385, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joshua Gilmore v. Golden Bolt, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11281, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tony Jones v. Saddle Creek Corporation dba Saddle Creek Logistics Services*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2024-01379065-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Armida Burton v. Mercury Mission Systems, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV02628, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Triada Pallidou v. TJB Geary's, LLC dba Geary's Beverly Hills*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15627, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Joey Ruiz, et al. v. Southern Tire Mart, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court,

Case No. 24STCV12037, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Salomon Garcia, et al. v. Atlas Freight Forwarding, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00039724-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Chardriana Jean v. Woodruff-Sawyer & Co.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV102594, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Stephanie Leon v. Fulgent Therapeutics, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV14168, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emma Romero v. Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2322374, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Karen Hartstein v. Hyatt Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV15895, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Michael Casas, et al. v. Encorr Sheets, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2319925, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Quincy O'Neal v. Included Health, Inc., formerly known as Grand Rounds Health, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-608391, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Javario Datrail Luna v. A-Check America, Inc., et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306180, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Kevin Werner, et al. v. Greystar Management Services, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles

County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV08498, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Jully Mullings v. Antelope Ambulance Service,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30241, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Maria Martina Aleman v, Holding Hands OPCO LLC dba Holding Hands, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV25240, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jesus Herrera v. Reeve Store Equipment Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV04239, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Vanessa Vazquez v. Cliffs Resort LLC,* San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV-0025, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Javier Hernandez, Jr. v. DGDG 1, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV416770, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Juan Manuel Munoz v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV06386, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mayra Campos Molina, et al. v. Harbor Hotels, LLC,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV10683, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Sykes, IV, et al. v. Wente Bros.,* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV048758, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Jose Padilla, et al. v. WEHO Hospitality Sunset, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV01072, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marvin Morales v. Skurka Aerospace, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12893, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Krug, et al. v. EKC Enterprises, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-103975, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joseph Amyot v. Silverthorn Resort, Inc.*, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0203487, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marissa Hartman v. Napa LP Hospitality Corporation*, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV00116, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lesly Arreguin, et al. v. Intercare Therapy, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27972, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alma Lopez, et al. v. Advanced Manufacturing and Development, Inc.*, Mendocino County Superior, Case No. 23CV000673, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Brittni Aghedo, et al. v. Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27362, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Robin Jennings v. Mizuho Orthopedic Systems, Inc. dba Mizuho OSI*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070891, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Jonathan Martin v. Atlas Digital, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30498, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cynthia Molt v. Los Angeles Film School, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30757, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Ramirez v. Employer Solutions Staffing Group LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV24735, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Anu Verma v. SingerLewak LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11344, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Toby Lanzarin, et al. v. Building Material Distributors, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00330343-CU-OE-GDS, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kassandra Herndon, et al. v. Agreeya Solutions, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0002783, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Damon Siler, et al. v. Call-The-Car dba Call the Car*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07514, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Daniel Ochoa-Lopez v. CorTech West Staffing, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19480, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Juan Escobedo v. Block Tops, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01356309-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Antonio Quintero v. Weyerhaeuser NR Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV02624, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cristo Hernandez v. Eldorado National (California), Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2201056, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rigoberto Tecaliz v. National Restaurant Inc. dba Black Bear Diner*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00046906-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cecilia Estrada v. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07184, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Davis v. JAJ Roofing dba Citadel Roofing and Solar*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV011004, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Aurelio Aguilar v. Supreme Car Wash, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV29696, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Aaron Coffey v. Catalina Channel Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV41396, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Djuana Shanella Hale, et al. v. Welbe Health, LLC, et al.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0006866, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Fosados v. Drew Chain Security Corp.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00519, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Jose Manuel Amaro Bernal v. Joseph Holt Plastering, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15637, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Brandon Geston v. FRTO LLC, et al.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01292, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alfonso Herrera v. W.L. Butler Construction, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01335445-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marcos Ojendiz, et al. v. Jonathan Louis International*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV35253, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emmanuel Caldera v. Zeb's World Famous Boathouse Inc. dba Goat Hill Tavern*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01310801-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alex Javier Nakamoto v. Skydio, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV062913, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jason McEntee v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV041360, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexzander Roberts, et al. v. Lemonade Restaurant Group*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV38302, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Halla Knotts v. Launch Technical Workforce Solutions, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332568, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to

PAGA.

- *Armando Gastelum v. Premier Trailer Manufacturing, Inc.*, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. VCU300333, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Tiffany Patterson v. Black Mountain Healthcare, LLC., d/b/a Seaport Home Health & Hospice*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00037563-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Angel Rodriguez v. American Textile Maintenance*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV17855, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rita Ray v. Families Together of Orange County*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01324555-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ly Hai v. Sunroad HS Auto, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00025788-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Anabel Perez v. Eureka Specialties, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV35940, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Galicia v. Virco, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV29425, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Rene Umana v. Columbus Technologies*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV16432, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Sitara Nayabkhil v. San Francisco SPCA (dba SFSPCA), a California 501(c)(3) non-*

profit organization, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-609950, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Fernando Solis v. Tuff Shed, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24VECV00368, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Emery v. Santa Cruz Bicycles, LLC*, Santa Cruz Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00244, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Odalys Montejo v. Team Nissan LLC*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 2023CUOE017853, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Vanessa Cortes v. Giti Tire (USA) LTD*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332578, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Travis Sanford v. Santa Cruz Seaside Company*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV01762, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jered Ortega v. YMCA of San Diego County*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00043645-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Corina Martinez v. Stagnaro Bros. Seafood, Inc.*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00082, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandra Jimenez v. ClearFreight, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV28938, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Jazzmin Cortez v. Millard Mall Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2104010, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Christa Morton, et al. v. PSI Services, LLC,* Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG00039, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Michael Bravo v. Michels Pacific Energy, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV403427, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Rodriguez v. Republique, LLC,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV14521, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Theresa Bendorf, et al. v. Sea World LLC, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2021-00034922-CU-OE-CTL, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Victor De La Cruz v. Northwest Pipe Company*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2211140, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Bobby Birdi v. Lucid USA, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 21CV003541, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Trujillo, et al. v. Producers Dairy Foods, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00313753, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *David Williams v. Rancho Nicasio, LLC,* Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV2203067, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class

and PAGA action.

- *Alexander Jackson v. Lifecare Assurance Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26579, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexis Cardoza v. BHFC Operating LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34040, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Maria Ayala, et al. v. SDH Services West, LLC*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-21-101933, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Alfredo Sanchez v. Greenworld, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2105756, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Oscar Bryant v. Midwest Construction Services, Inc. dba Trillium*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2121529, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Matthew Savattieri v. AMI Expeditionary Healthcare, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33372, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lexy Barajas, et al. v. H. W. Hunter, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV01892, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandro Valdez v. C.H.I. Automart, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV40168, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sheizan Bawa v. Meathead Movers, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01211895-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of

representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Tanisha Lopez, et al. v. Restorix Health, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33067, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Perla Soto, et al. v. Nippon Express U.S.A., Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV24902, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Angel Garcia, et al. v. J&B Investments, Inc., et al.,* San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2208601, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sindy Aviles, et al. v. Freeway Insurance Services America, LLC,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34864, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexander Gnaedig, et al. v. Favorite Healthcare Staffing, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV20904, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Richard Evans v. My Paint Stop, LLC, et al.*, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC21-01812, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Parada George v. Main Electric Supply Company, LLC, et al.,* Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01220136-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Samia Salazar Yunis v. Sharif Jewelers,* Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2020-00290080, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Analco v. Felix Chevrolet, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court,

Case No. 21STCV36654, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Sasha Aiono v. Benefit Cosmetics,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33719, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

EXHIBIT 2

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

Miriam Schimmel, Esq.
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com

March 5, 2026

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://dir.govfa.net/411

RE: ***Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.***

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Gil Cabalu ("Mr. Cabalu") with respect to his claims under the California Labor Code against Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc. (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Gil Cabalu from approximately 2020 to January 2026 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Gil Cabalu worked as a Maintenance Technician for Employers and was based out of Employers' facility located at 45000 Yucca Ave, Lancaster, CA 93534. Mr. Cabalu performed a number of duties for Employers, but most prevalently he performed duties related to inventory management, packing, shipping, and receiving.

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

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

1. FAILURE TO PAY REPORTING TIME WAGES

California Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order and requires that "…the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the ... standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful."

California Code of Regulations, Title 8, sections 11010-11160 establish a guarantee of at least partial compensation for employees who report to work expecting to work for a specified number of hours but are deprived of that amount due to inadequate scheduling and/or lack of proper notice by the employer. The applicable section and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that "[e]ach workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage."

Throughout the relevant time, there were a number of times Mr. Cabalu reported physically to work only to find out that his scheduled work shift was cancelled. Instead of being paid for the scheduled day's work, Employers adjusted his timesheet and sent him home.

Employers regularly failed to pay Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees for a number of reporting time pay issues (e.g., among other things, reporting and/or presenting for work shifts that were cancelled after said shifts started or without proper notice, and where Mr. Cabalu or Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid; staffing issues on Employers' part resulting in the preventing of Mr. Cabalu or Aggrieved Employees from continuing or starting work, and neither Mr. Cabalu nor Aggrieved Employees were properly paid for their time; technical issues on Employer's part preventing Mr. Cabalu or Aggrieved Employees from continuing work, and neither Mr. Cabalu nor Aggrieved Employees were paid for their time prior to technical issues preventing further work; client cancellation issues preventing Mr. Cabalu or Aggrieved Employees from continuing work, and neither Mr. Cabalu nor Aggrieved Employees were properly paid for their time).

Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Mr. Cabalu and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

any available penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

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

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

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

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock, including when Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees were required to arrive to work early and perform required security protocols. Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees also worked on-duty meal periods, and were required to carry and respond to live "walkie-talkie" devices during their purported meal breaks..

Employers failed to compensate Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

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

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

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Mr. Cabalu and other

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

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

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

3. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

During the relevant time period, Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees worked on-duty meal periods and were required to carry and respond to live "walkie-talkie" devices during their purported meal breaks. Mr. Cabalu was required to respond to questions on his "walkie-talkie" even during his meal breaks. Mr. Cabalu was required to work through his purported meal periods due to the large amount of tasks he was given by Employers' management. Employers automatically deducted time from Mr. Cabalu's and other Aggrieved Employees' timesheets for purported meal periods regardless of whether compliant meal periods were taken.

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

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

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

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

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

4. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

During the relevant time period, Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees worked on-duty rest periods and were required to carry and respond to live "walkie-talkie" devices during their purported rest periods. Mr. Cabalu was required to respond to questions on his "walkie-talkie" even during his rest periods. Mr. Cabalu was required to work through his purported rest periods due to the large amount of tasks he was given by Employers' management, missing most of his rest periods this way.

Employers failed to authorize and permit Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Cabalu and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

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

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

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

5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Cabalu and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, reporting time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a). Mr. Cabalu and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

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

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

7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

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

8. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

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

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

9. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

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

Mr. Cabalu and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. CONCLUSION

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

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Mr. Cabalu's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

Miriam Schimmel

Miriam Schimmel, Esq.

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

Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.
Agent for Service, Brendan K. Ozanne
5755 Oberlin Dr #301
San Diego, CA 92121

Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.
45000 Yucca Ave
Lancaster, CA 93534

EXHIBIT 3

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiff Gil Cabalu ("Plaintiff") and defendant Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc. ("Defendant"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. DEFINITIONS.

1.1 "Action" means the Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.* initiated on March 6, 2026 and pending in the Court.

1.2 "Address Search" means the Administrator's investigation and search for current Class Member or Aggrieved Employee 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 or Aggrieved Employees.

1.3 "Administrator" means Phoenix Settlement Administrators, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

1.4 "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.

1.5 "Aggrieved Employee" means a person employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period.

1.6 "Class" means all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the Class Period.

1.7 "Class Counsel" means Jonathan M. Genish, Miriam L. Schimmel, Joana Fang, and Alexandra Rose of Blackstone Law, APC.

1.8 "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 Action.

1.9 "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendant's possession including the Class Member's full name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, and number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.

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

1.11 "Class Notice" means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be

mailed to Class Members in English, with a Spanish translation, in the form, without material variation, attached as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.12 "Class Period" means the period from July 1, 2024 to May 22, 2026.

1.13 "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff in the operative complaint in the Action seeking Court approval to serve as a class representative.

1.14 "Class Representative Service Payment" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action.

1.15 "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.

1.16 "Defendant" means Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc., the named defendant in the Action.

1.17 "Defense Counsel" means Brian Dawson of Dawson & Ozarne.

1.18 "Effective Date" means the date on which the Judgment becomes 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 (c) 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 Order" 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 "Gross Settlement Amount" means $115,000.00, which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, and Administration Expenses Payment.

1.22 "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.

1.23 "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 35% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.

1.24 "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval Order.

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

1.26 "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 65% share of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (m).

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

1.28 "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.

1.29 "PAGA Pay Period" means any pay period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.30 "PAGA Period" means the period from March 5, 2025 to May 22, 2026.

1.31 "PAGA" means the Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.).

1.32 "PAGA Notice" means Plaintiff's March 5, 2026 letter to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a).

1.33 "PAGA Penalties" means the total amount of $5,750.00 in PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 35% to the Aggrieved Employees ($2,012.50) and 65% to the LWDA ($3,737.50) in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.34 "Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.

1.35 "Plaintiff" means Gil Cabalu, the named plaintiff in the Action.

1.36 "Preliminary Approval Order" means the Court's order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement.

1.37 "Released Class Claims" means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.2 below.

1.38 "Released PAGA Claims" means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

1.39 "Released Parties" means Defendant and each of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, members, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, subsidiaries, and affiliates.

1.40 "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.

1.41 "Response Deadline" means 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) email or mail Requests for

Exclusion, (b) fax, email, or mail objections to the Settlement, or (c) email or mail a challenge to the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. Class Members to whom Class Notices are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have their deadline extended an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline.

1.42 "Settlement" means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.43 "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. RECITALS

2.1 On March 5, 2026, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a), Plaintiff gave timely written notice to Defendant and the LWDA by sending the PAGA Notice.

2.2 On March 6, 2026, Plaintiff commenced the Action by filing a Class Action Complaint, alleging causes of action against Defendant for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, reporting time pay violations, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination, and failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, for violations of California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq*.

2.3 On May 11, 2026, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. in the action entitled *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 26STCV15055 ("PAGA Action").

2.4 On July 24, 2026, the Parties settled the Action and PAGA Action, which led to this Agreement.

2.5 Before negotiating the settlement, Plaintiff obtained, through informal discovery, all of the putative class members' time and pay data. Plaintiff's investigation was 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*").

2.6 The Court has not granted class certification.

2.7 The Parties agree that Plaintiff shall file a First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("Operative Complaint") in the Action, which will add the PAGA claims alleged in the PAGA Action.

2.8 The Court has not granted class certification.

2.9 The Parties, Class Counsel, and Defense Counsel represent they are not aware of any other

pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.

3. MONETARY TERMS.

3.1 Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant promises to pay $115,000.00 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount and to separately pay any and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions (as defined below) of the Individual Class Payments. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) before the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.2. 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 Defendant.

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 Order:

3.2.1 To Plaintiff: A Class Representative Service Payment of not more than $5,000.00 (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member and Aggrieved Employee. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiff's request for a Class Representative Service Payment that does not exceed this amount. As part of the Motion for Final Approval, Plaintiff will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payment. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.

3.2.2 To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third (1/3), which is currently estimated to be $38,333.33, and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $10,000.00. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided they do not exceed these amounts. As part of the Motion for Final Approval, Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel may seek Court approval of a Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. In support of the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Counsel must submit a cost ledger listing each expense incurred during the Action. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's 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 and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these payments.

3.2.3 To the Administrator: An Administration Expenses Payment not to exceed $4,250.00 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the administration expenses are less than or the Court approves payment less than $4,250.00 the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.

3.2.4 To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment, which the Administrator shall calculate 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.

3.2.4.1 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 an IRS W-2 Form. 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. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

3.2.4.2 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.

3.2.5 To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of $5,750.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 65% ($3,737.50) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 35% ($2,012.50) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1 The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 35% share of PAGA Penalties ($2,012.50) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

3.2.5.2 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 Size Estimates and Escalator Clause. Based on a review of its records to date,

Defendant estimates there are 19 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 1,294 Workweeks, and 19 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 509 PAGA Pay Periods. If the total number of Workweeks worked by the Class Members during the Class Period actually exceeds 1,294 by more than 10% (i.e., if the Workweeks exceed 1,423), then the Gross Settlement Amount will be increased on a *pro rata* basis equal to the percentage increase in the number of Workweeks worked by the Class Members above 10%.

4.2 Funding of Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes, by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date.

4.3 Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within 14 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment. Disbursement of the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment shall not precede disbursement of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments.

4.3.1 The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees 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 Class Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom a 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 a Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members who are also Aggrieved Employees a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database.

4.3.2 The Administrator must conduct an Address Search for all Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees whose checks are returned undelivered without a United States Postal Service ("USPS") forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail the check to the USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Participating Class Member or Aggrieved Employee whose original check was lost or misplaced, as requested by the Participating Class Member or Aggrieved Employee before the void date.

4.3.3 For any Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employees whose

Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such a check to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee.

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

5. RELEASES OF CLAIMS. Effective on the Effective Date and date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff, Participating Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1 Plaintiff's Release. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and his respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, administrators, successors, and assigns, release and discharge the Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the Class Period, including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged based on the facts contained in the Operative Complaint and (b) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged based on facts contained in the Operative Complaint and PAGA Notice ("Plaintiff's Release"). The Plaintiff's 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. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that the Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them.

5.1.1 Plaintiff's Waiver of Rights Under Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of the Plaintiff's Release, Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the 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.

5.2 Release by Participating Class Members:

All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts and allegations in the Operative Complaint that are alleged to have occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims involving any alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to pay reporting time wages, failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failure to provide accurate

wage statements, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses. Except as set forth in Section 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, or workers' compensation, or claims based on events occurring outside the Class Period.

5.3 Release by Aggrieved Employees:

All Aggrieved Employees, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA Penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts and allegations in the Operative Complaint that are alleged to have occurred during the PAGA Period and the PAGA Notice including any and all claims involving any alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to pay reporting time wages, failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failure to provide accurate wage statements, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses.

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

6.1 Defendant's Declaration in Support of Preliminary Approval. Within 5 days of the full execution of this Agreement, Defendant will prepare and deliver to Class Counsel a signed declaration from Defendant and Defense Counsel disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator. In their declarations, Defense Counsel and Defendant shall aver whether they are aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.2 Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff 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, subdivision (s)(2); (ii) a draft proposed Preliminary Approval Order; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiff, Class Counsel, or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiff confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members and the Administrator; (vi) a signed declaration from Class Counsel attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; and its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (PAGA Notice (Lab. Code, § 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Lab. Code, § 2699, subd. (s)(1)), and the Agreement (Lab. Code, § 2699, subd. (s)(2)); and (vii) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members and the

Administrator. In their declarations, Plaintiff and Class Counsel shall aver whether they are aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.3 Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and 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.

6.4 Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together 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 by meeting in person or by telephone and in good faith to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

7.1 Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Phoenix Settlement Administrators to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for the Administration Expenses Payment. 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 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 under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1

7.4 Notice to Class Members

7.4.1 Not later than 14 days after the Court grants preliminary approval, Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of the Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendant has 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 Defendant 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. No later than 3 business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, Workweeks, and PAGA 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 USPS mail, the Class Notice with Spanish translation 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 Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) 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 3 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 an 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 a Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

7.4.4 The deadline for Class Members' written objections, challenges to Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended for Class Members whose Class Notices are re-mailed. Class Members to whom Class Notices are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have their deadline extended an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline. The Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.

7.4.5 If the Administrator, Defendant, 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 a 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 the Class Notice, or the Response Deadline, whichever is later.

7.5 Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

7.5.1 Class Members who wish to exclude themselves from (opt-out of) the Class

Settlement must send the Administrator, by email or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than the Response Deadline. A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or the Class Member's representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's full name, mailing address, and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely emailed 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, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' release under Paragraph 5.2 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 5.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6 Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods. Each Class Member shall have until the Response Deadline to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. The Administrator has the authority to address and make final decisions consistent with the terms of this Agreement on all Class Member challenges to the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods contained in the Class Notice are correct if they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of allocations of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods is final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel copies of all challenges to the calculation of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods and the Administrator's determination of the challenges.

7.7 Objections to Settlement.

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

7.7.2 Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by email or mail no later than the Response Deadline. Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present oral objections at the Final Approval Hearing.

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 all tasks to be performed by the Administrator set forth in this Agreement or otherwise.

7.8.1 Website, Email Address, and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will establish, maintain, and use a website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time, and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Agreement, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Final Approval Order, and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls 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 Response Deadline, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; and (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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, objections received, challenges to Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments ("Weekly Report"). The Weekly Reports must include the Administrator's assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

7.8.4 Administrator's Declaration. Not later than 14 days before the date by

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

7.8.5 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. **DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW.** If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 10% of the total of all Class Members, Defendant may, but is not obligated, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void ab initio and have no force or effect whatsoever, and neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendant will remain responsible for paying all of the Administrator's expenses incurred to that point. Defendant must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw not later than 7 days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel; late elections will have no effect.

9. **MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL.** Not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff will file in Court, a motion for final approval that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (s)(2), a proposed Final Approval Order, and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel before 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.

9.1 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 5 court days before the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.

9.2 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 Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, or Administration Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

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

9.4 Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement, 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 Net Settlement Amount.

9.5 Appellate Court Orders to Vacate, Reverse, or Materially Modify Judgment. If the appellate court vacates, reverses, or modifies the Judgment in a manner that requires a material modification of this Agreement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), this Agreement shall be null and void. The Parties shall nevertheless expeditiously work together in good faith to address the appellate court's concerns and to obtain final approval and entry of Judgment, sharing, on a 50-50 basis, any additional administration expenses reasonably incurred after remittitur. An appellate decision to vacate, reverse, or modify the Court's award of the Class Representative Service Payment or any payments to Class Counsel shall not constitute a material modification of the Judgment within the meaning of this paragraph, as long as the Gross Settlement Amount remains unchanged.

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. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

11.1 No Admission of Liability. 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 Defendant that any of the allegations in the Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendant has any liability for any claims asserted; nor is it intended or should be construed as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of the Settlement only. If for any reason the Court does not grant

preliminary approval, grant final approval, or enter the Judgment, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reason, Defendant reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Action, and Plaintiff reserves the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendant's defenses. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation (except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement).

11.2 Confidentiality Before Preliminary Approval. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant, and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate, 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) to counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant, 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.

11.3 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.

11.4 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.

11.5 Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiff and Defendant, 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.

11.6 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 Agreement and 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 the mediator or the Court for resolution.

11.7 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 the Settlement.

11.8 No Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant, nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Agreement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.

11.9 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.

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

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

11.12 Cooperation in Drafting. The Parties have cooperated in drafting and preparing 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.

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

11.14 Use and Return of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Evidence Code section 1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or the Settlement, may be used only with respect to the Settlement and for no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or the California Rules of Court. Not later than 90 days after the date when the Court discharges the Administrator's obligation to provide a declaration confirming the final pay out of all Settlement funds, Plaintiff shall destroy all paper and electronic versions of Class Data received from Defendant unless, before the Court's discharge of the Administrator's obligation, Defendant makes a written request to Class Counsel for the return, rather than the destruction, of Class Data.

11.15 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.

11.16 Calendar Days. Unless otherwise noted, all references 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.

11.17 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 Plaintiff:

Miriam L. Schimmel
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

To Defendant:

Brian Dawson
brian@dawson-ozanne.com
DAWSON & OZANNE
5755 Oberlin Drive, Suite 301
San Diego, California 92121
Tel: (619) 988-2135

11.18 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.

11.19 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 Code of Civil Procedure section 583.330, the date to bring a case to trial under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310 is extended for the entire period of this settlement process.

IT IS SO AGREED.

PLAINTIFF GIL CABALU

Dated: 10/13/2026

Gil Cabalu

Plaintiff Gil Cabalu

DEFENDANT HARVEST FARMS SOLUTIONS, INC.

Dated: 10/13/2026

Full Name: Brandon Marvin

Title: President

On behalf of Defendant Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.

APPROVED AS TO FORM ONLY:

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

Dated: October 14, 2026

Alexandra Rose

Alexandra Rose
Attorneys for Plaintiff Gil Cabalu
and Proposed Class Counsel

DAWSON & OZANNE

Dated: _____

Brian Dawson
Attorneys for Defendant Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

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

Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 26STCV07454

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 an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc. ("Defendant") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by a former employee of Defendant Gil Cabalu ("Plaintiff") and seeks payment of (1) back wages and other relief for a class of all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the Class Period ("Class Members"); and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all persons employed by Defendant in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period ("Aggrieved Employees"). The "Class Period" means the period from July 1, 2024 to May 22, 2026 and the "PAGA Period" means the period from March 5, 2025 to May 22, 2026.

The proposed settlement has two main parts: (1) a class settlement requiring Defendant to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA settlement requiring Defendant to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA").

Based on Defendant's 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 Defendant's 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 Defendant's records showing that **you worked _____ Workweeks** during the Class Period and **you worked _____ PAGA Pay Periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more Workweeks during the Class Period and/or more PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section IV 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 Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendant to make payments under the settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendant.

If you worked for Defendant 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 against Defendant.

(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 Defendant, 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.

Defendant 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 Defendant that are covered by this settlement.
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 VI of this Notice. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed settlement. Defendant must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees, and the Aggrieved Employees must give up their rights to pursue Released PAGA 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 Plaintiff who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiff, but every dollar paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiff reduces the overall amount paid to Participating Class Members. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff if you think they are unreasonable. See Section VII 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 VIII of this Notice.
You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks/PAGA Pay Periods **Written Challenges Must be Submitted by _____.**	The amount of your Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period ("Workweeks") and how many pay periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period ("PAGA Pay Periods"), respectively. The number of Workweeks and number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked according to Defendant's records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, you must challenge it by _____. See Section IV of this Notice.

I. WHAT IS THE ACTION ABOUT?

Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant. The Action accuses Defendant of violating California labor laws by failing to pay overtime and minimum wages, failing to pay reporting time wages, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failing to provide accurate wage statements, and failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses|. Based on the same claims, Plaintiff has also asserted a claim for civil penalties under PAGA.

Plaintiff is represented by attorneys in the Action: Jonathan M. Genish, Miriam L. Schimmel, Joana Fang, and Alexandra Rose of Blackstone Law, APC.

Defendant strongly denies violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contends it complied with all applicable laws.

II. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE ACTION HAS SETTLED?

So far the Court has made no determination whether Defendant or Plaintiff is correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiff and Defendant reached a settlement following arm's-length negotiations between counsel for the Parties, in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating an agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a settlement agreement and agreeing to ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action, Plaintiff and Defendant 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, Defendant does not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims. Plaintiff and Class Counsel strongly believe the settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendant has 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) the settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine final approval.

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

1. Defendant Will Pay $115,000.00 as the Gross Settlement Amount ("Gross Settlement Amount").

Defendant has agreed to deposit the Gross Settlement Amount into an account controlled by the Administrator of the settlement. The Administrator will use the Gross Settlement Amount to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, a Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and expenses, the Administrator's expenses, and penalties to be paid to the LWDA. Assuming the Court grants final approval, Defendant will fund the Gross Settlement Amount not more than 14 days after the judgment entered by the Court becomes final. The judgment will be final on the date the Court enters the judgment, or a later date if Participating Class Members object to the proposed settlement or the judgment is appealed.

2. Court Approved Deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount. At the final approval hearing, Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court:

A. Up to $38,333.33 (1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount) to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and up to $10,000.00 for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.

B. Up to $5,000.00 to Plaintiff as a class representative award for filing the Action, working with Class Counsel, and representing the Class. A class representative award will be the only monies Plaintiff will receive other than Plaintiff's Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment.

C. Up to $4,250.00 to the Administrator for services administering the settlement.

D. Up to $5,750.00 for PAGA penalties, allocated 65% to the LWDA and 35% to Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees based on their PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period.

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

3. Net Settlement Amount 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 Amount (the "Net Settlement Amount") by making Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members based on their Workweeks.

4. Taxes Owed on Payments to Class Members. Plaintiff and Defendant 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. Defendant will separately pay employer payroll taxes it owes 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 Plaintiff and Defendant 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 deposited with the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in your name. If the monies represented by your check is sent to the Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund, you should consult the rules of the fund for instructions on how to retrieve

your money.

6. The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will not grant final approval of the settlement or not enter a judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed that, in either case, the settlement will be void. Defendant will not pay any money, and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendant.

7. Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, Phoenix Settlement Administrators (the "Administrator") to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members' Requests for Exclusion and written objections. The Administrator will also decide Class Member challenges over Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods, 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 IX of this Notice.

8. Participating Class Members' Release. After the Judgment is final and Defendant has fully funded the Gross Settlement Amount and separately paid all employer payroll taxes, Participating Class Members will be legally barred from asserting any of the class 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 Defendant or related entities for wages based on the Class Period facts as alleged in the Action 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, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts and allegations in the Operative Complaint that are alleged to have occurred during the Class Period including failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to pay reporting time wages, failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failure to provide accurate wage statements, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses. Except as set forth in Section 5.3 of the Settlement 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 events occurring outside the Class Period.

9. Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Release. After the Judgment is final and Defendant has fully funded the Gross Settlement Amount and separately paid all employer payroll taxes, Aggrieved Employees will be legally barred from asserting PAGA claims against Defendant, 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 be part of any other PAGA claim against Defendant or related entities based on the PAGA Period facts as alleged in the Action and resolved by this settlement.

The Aggrieved Employees' Release is as follows:

All Aggrieved Employees, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, administrators, successors, and assigns, release the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts and allegations in the Operative Complaint that are alleged to have occurred during the PAGA Period and the PAGA Notice including any and all claims involving any alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to pay reporting time wages, failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, failure to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failure to

provide accurate wage statements, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses.

IV. 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, and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Workweeks worked by each individual Participating Class Member.

2. Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing $2,012.50 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by each individual Aggrieved Employee.

3. Workweek/PAGA Pay Period Challenges. The number of Workweeks you worked during the Class Period and number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, as recorded in Defendant's records, is stated in the first page of this Notice. You have until _____ to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods credited to you. You can submit your challenge by signing and sending a letter to the Administrator via mail or email. Section IX 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 Defendant's calculation of Workweeks and/or PAGA Pay Periods based on Defendant's 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/PAGA Pay Period challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendant's Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

V. 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 (if any).

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.

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 IX of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

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

To opt out of the class action settlement, submit a written and signed letter with your full name, mailing address, and email address or 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 identify the Action as *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 26STCV07454. You must make the request yourself. If someone else makes the request for you, it will not be valid. **You must send your request to be excluded to the Administrator by _____, or it will be invalid.** Section IX of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

VII. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiff and Defendant are asking the Court to approve. At least 16 days before the [redacted] final approval hearing, Class Counsel and/or Plaintiff will file in Court a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed settlement is fair and states (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiff is requesting as a class representative service award. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is in Section IX of this Notice) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on the Administrator's website [redacted] or the Court's website https://www.lacourt.ca.gov.

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the settlement or the Motion for Final Approval may wish to object, for example, that the proposed settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff are too high or too low. **The deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is** [redacted]. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action as *Gil Cabalu v. Harvest Farms Solutions, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 26STCV07454 and include your full name, mailing address, and email address or telephone number and sign the objection. Section IX of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

A Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the final approval hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. See Section VIII of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the final approval hearing.

VIII. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the final approval hearing on [redacted] at [redacted] in Department 1 of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. At the hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant final approval of the settlement and how much of the Gross Settlement Amount will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiff, and the Administrator. The Court will invite comment from objectors, Class Counsel, and defense counsel before making a decision. You can attend (or hire a lawyer to attend) either personally or virtually via LACourtConnect (https://www.lacourt.org/lacc/). Check the Court's website for the most current information.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the final approval hearing. You should check the Administrator's website beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the final approval hearing.

IX. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The settlement agreement sets forth everything Defendant and Plaintiff have promised to do under the proposed settlement. The easiest way to read the settlement agreement, the judgment, or any other settlement documents is to go to the Administrator's website at [redacted]. You can also 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 https://www.lacourt.ca.gov/pages/lp/access-a-case/tp/find-case-information/cp/os-civil-case-access and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. 26STCV07454. You can also make an appointment to personally review court documents in the Clerk's Office at the Spring Street Courthouse by calling (213) 310-7000.

DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT

Class Counsel:
Name of Attorneys: Jonathan M. Genish, Miriam L. Schimmel, Joana Fang, and Alexandra Rose
Email Addresses: mschimmel@blackstonepc.com, jfang@blackstonepc.com, arose@blackstonepc.com

Name of Firm: Blackstone Law, APC
Mailing Address: 8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745, Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278

Administrator:
Name of Company: Phoenix Settlement Administrators
Email Address: [redacted]
Mailing Address: [redacted]
Telephone: [redacted]

X. 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 should consult the Unclaimed Property Fund for instructions on how to retrieve the funds.

XI. 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 4

Outlook

Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

Desde no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>
Fecha Vie 6 Nov 2026 11:15
Para Karina Hernandez <khernandez@blackstonepc.com>

[External Email].

11/06/2026 11:15:04 AM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 11/06/2026 11:15:04 AM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1161951-26

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

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