

Ryan A. Quadrel (State Bar No. 308311)
rquadrel@blackstonepc.com
Shelby L. Miner (State Bar No. 318338)
sminer@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
James S. Winn Jr. (State Bar No. 349690)
jwinn@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JULIO ESTRADA and
RAUL NAVA, 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**

JULIO ESTRADA and RAUL NAVA,
individually, and on behalf of other similarly
situated employees and aggrieved employees
pursuant to the California Private Attorneys
General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MARUICHI AMERICAN CORPORATION;
and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV13131

Honorable Laura A. Seigle
Department 17

**DECLARATION OF JAMES S. WINN JR. IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Date: September 30, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: 17

Complaint Filed: May 2, 2025
FAC Filed: June 2, 2025
SAC Filed: June 11, 2026
Trial Date: Not Set

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

2

3
4
5
6

7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

8 4. Ryan A. Quadrel is a leading wage and hour litigator whose practice focuses on high-
9 exposure class and representative actions in state, federal, and complex courts throughout California.
10 Known for his strategic judgment and disciplined litigation management, Mr. Quadrel brings extensive
11 experience representing both employees and employers, allowing him to assess cases with the
12 sophistication and balance required in complex employment matters. Mr. Quadrel earned his Juris
13 Doctor degree from Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center in 2015, where he graduated in
14 the top of his class and earned several accolades by competing and coaching teams in moot court
15 competitions. Since his admission to the California State Bar, his practice has been dedicated almost
16 exclusively to employment law, with a concentration on wage and hour class actions and
17 representative actions under PAGA. Throughout his career, Mr. Quadrel has taken a leadership role in
18 all aspects of complex litigation including trial and arbitration hearings. He regularly oversees case
19 assessment and strategy, directs discovery, and manages the full spectrum of motion practice,
20 including dispositive and class certification briefing. His experience includes soliciting testimony from
21 trial witnesses, taking and defending depositions, coordinating with experts on liability and damages
22 analyses, supervising communications with large groups of class members and aggrieved employees,
23 and guiding cases through mediation, settlement approval, and administration. His strategic approach
24 and command of wage and hour law have resulted in the recovery of unpaid wages and penalties for
25 thousands of employees throughout the state. Recognized for both his results and his professional
26 leadership, Mr. Quadrel frequently lectures on wage and hour legal updates and litigation strategy. He
27 has been recognized as a Top Lawyer on several occasions by Palm Springs Life Magazine.

28 ///

1 5. Shelby L. Miner is an Associate Attorney at Blackstone Law, APC whose practice
2 focuses on wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA claims and consumer fraud. In 2014, Ms. Miner
3 obtained a Bachelor of Arts degrees from University of Minnesota – Twin Cities. In 2017, Ms. Miner
4 earned her Juris Doctor from University of California, Los Angeles School of Law where she was
5 awarded the Christopher E. Bergin Award for Excellent in Writing. Further, in 2016, Ms. Miner served
6 as a Judicial Extern for the Honorable Louis A. Lavin of the second district California Court of Appeal.
7 In 2017, Ms. Miner was admitted to the State Bar of California, and in 2020 was admitted to the State
8 Bar of Minnesota. Further, Ms. Miner is also admitted to the Central District of California and the DC
9 Court of Appeal.

10 6. Alexandra Rose joined Blackstone Law, APC from a highly reputable employment law
11 firm. Ms. Rose graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts
12 degree in 2016 and from New England Law | Boston with a Juris Doctor degree in 2019. She was
13 admitted to the State Bar of California in December of 2019 and the State Bars of New York and New
14 Jersey in 2023. Ms. Rose is additionally licensed in all federal district courts of California. Ms. Rose
15 manages the post-settlement department at Blackstone Law, APC. In that capacity, Ms. Rose oversees
16 and handles over 100 wage-and-hour putative class actions and/or representative actions under PAGA,
17 that are in settlement.

18 7. I joined Blackstone Law, APC after working at a respected employment and personal
19 injury plaintiff-side law firm where I handled cases from intake to post settlement. I graduated from
20 the University of California, Santa Barbara with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science with a
21 Minor in Professional Writing in 2018. I received my Juris Doctorate Degree in 2022 from University
22 of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law. I was admitted to the State Bar of California in May 2023. I
23 have worked on many wage and hour class action and PAGA representative matters, and my work has
24 included, *inter alia*, conducting legal research, drafting pleadings, stipulations, memorandums of
25 understanding, and settlement agreements, negotiating settlement terms, engaging in motion practice,
26 and making court appearances. Super Lawyers honored me as a Southern California Rising Star in
27 2026.

28 ///

8. 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

9. On May 2, 2025, former plaintiff Jessie Sanchez filed a Class Action Complaint in the action currently entitled *Julio Estrada, et al. v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 25STCV13131 (“Action”), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant Maruichi American Corporation (“Defendant”).

10. On June 2, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint in the Action, which substituted the former plaintiff with Plaintiffs.

11. On August 13, 2025, Plaintiffs propounded written formal discovery onto Defendant (specifically, Request for Production of Documents (Set One) and Special Interrogatories (Set One)).

12. On February 5, 2026, Plaintiffs and Defendant (collectively, the “Parties”) participated in a formal mediation conducted by Marc Feder, Esq. (“Mediator”), a neutral and respected mediator with extensive experience in complex wage and hour matters, and with the assistance of the Mediator’s evaluations, the Parties were able to reach an agreement to resolve this dispute on a class and representative basis. The Parties then worked diligently to negotiate and memorialize the terms in a long form settlement agreement.

13. On April 30, 2026, Plaintiffs provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) by online submission and to 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 Letter”). A true and correct copy of the PAGA Letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

14. On June 11, 2026, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint (“Operative Complaint”) in the Action, which added a cause of action under PAGA. The Operative Complaint alleges ten (10) causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and 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.

15. On June 29, 2026, the Parties executed the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“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

16. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the Class shall be defined as “all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period” (“Class” or “Class Member(s)”). The Class Period is defined as the period from May 2, 2021 through May 14, 2026. Based on information provided by Defendant, it is estimated that there are a total of sixty-seven (67) Class Members.

17. 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 Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$525,000.00), 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 up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$175,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is \$525,000.00); (2) Class Counsel’s actual litigation costs and expenses, not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00); (3) Settlement Administration Costs, not to exceed Six Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents (\$6,890.00); (4) Enhancement Payments in the aggregate amount of Fifteen Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$15,000.00); and (5) PAGA Amount in the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00). 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 Two Hundred Seventy-Three Thousand One Hundred Ten Dollars and Zero Cents (\$273,110.00). Additionally, 35% of the PAGA Amount (“PAGA Employee Amount”), which is \$8,750.00 out of \$25,000.00, will be fully distributed to “all current and former

hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period” (“PAGA Employee(s)”). The “PAGA Period” is defined as the period from May 2, 2024 through May 14, 2026.

18. The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed and paid to all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion (“Settlement Class Member(s)”) on a *pro rata* basis based on the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period (“Workweeks”). The *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount that a Class Member may be eligible to receive under the Class Settlement (“Individual Settlement Share”) will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

19. The PAGA Employee Amount will be distributed and paid to all PAGA Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on the number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period (“Pay Periods”). The *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount that a PAGA Employee may be eligible to receive under the PAGA Settlement (“Individual PAGA Payment”) will be calculated by the Settlement Administrator, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

20. Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as twenty percent (20%) wages and eighty percent (80%) penalties and interest. The portion allocated to wages will be reported on an IRS Form W-2 and the portions allocated to penalties and interest will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee’s share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares, and issue checks to Settlement Class Members for their net payment of their Individual Settlement Share (“Individual Settlement Payment”). The employer’s share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares 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 Settlement Administrator.

///

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

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

The Settlement is Reasonable

Informed Arms-Length Negotiations

23. The Parties' settlement negotiations were at all times made at arm's-length and were adversarial. The Settlement was reached following a full day of mediation with a highly respected mediator with substantial experience mediating wage and hour cases, and Plaintiffs engaged in additional negotiations in order to finalize the long-form agreement presently before the Court.

24. The Parties engaged in extensive informal discovery prior to reaching a settlement. Prior to mediation, Defendant produced a random twenty-five percent (25%) sampling of putative class members' time and pay records 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.

25. 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.

26. Based on the information exchanged, the Parties extensively briefed issues regarding class certification and liability and provided their analyses to the Mediator who helped the Parties debate the strengths and weakness of their respective positions. At all times, Plaintiffs were 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

27. Class Counsel analyzed all available data and estimated Defendant's maximum potential exposure for the class claims to be approximately \$1,598,323, 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, and based on the analysis of the data which was extrapolated out for all putative class members across the entire putative class period, which included: \$467,186 for meal period violations; \$467,280 for rest period violations at a 60% violation rate; \$232,708 for unpaid off-the-clock work for 1 hour and 30 minutes per workweek of off-the-clock work; \$36,540 for unpaid overtime wages at the required regular rate of pay; \$47,700 for unreimbursed business expenses; \$182,909 for waiting time penalties; and \$164,000 for wage statement penalties. Plaintiffs further estimated that Defendant faced an additional exposure of \$242,300 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 \$1,840,623 in damages.

Specific Risks Considered

28. Although the investigation and information discovered supports Plaintiffs' 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.

29. 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. Plaintiffs further recognize 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. Plaintiffs have also considered the Parties' settlement discussions, as well as the evaluations

1 of the Mediator, who is experienced and well-regarded in complex labor and employment matters.

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

10 31. For example, Plaintiffs' meal period claims, which were based on Defendant's alleged
11 failure to provide lawful meal periods, have been increasingly difficult to certify in recent years.
12 Plaintiffs' theory of liability for meal period violations was based on allegations that Defendant had
13 failed to implement its policies and that its practices failed to allow Class Members to take meal breaks
14 in the manner required under California law. Defendant contended that its policies and practices at all
15 times during the Class Period were lawful. Indeed, Plaintiffs' analysis revealed only a 1.8% violation
16 rate for purported unique meal period violations. Defendant further argued that the rate of purported
17 meal period violations reflected in the data would require individualized inquiry and that such inquiry
18 would prohibit a class from being certified. We also had to consider the risk that the Court would find
19 validity in the individualized proof defense to certification of Plaintiffs' meal period claim.

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

28 ///

1 33. Plaintiffs also faced challenges certifying and proving liability for their minimum wage
2 and overtime claims. These claims were largely based on Defendant's unrecorded, off-the-clock work
3 performed by the Class Members both before and after their shifts and during purported meal periods.
4 For example, it was reported that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were required to arrive 10-
5 15 minutes before their scheduled shifts to prepare tools and equipment, start machines, and don PPE
6 and uniforms, and they also were required to stay 5-10 minutes past their shifts end 1-2 times per week
7 to inspect metallic tubes and sign off on paperwork before trucks could leave with materials. However,
8 the individualized nature of why this work was performed and the individualized nature of damages
9 presented substantial concerns regarding the manageability of the case and the risk the Court could
10 find these issues prevented certification, and the estimated damages for this claim were based on an
11 assumption that all Class Members worked off the clock for at least 1 hour and 30 minutes per week.

12 34. Plaintiffs also contended that Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other
13 Class Members for necessary business-related expenses, such as usage of personal cell phones for
14 work-related purposes, usage of personal vehicles for travel to customer sites, and the purchase of
15 work-related supplies and PPE, including steel toed boots, safety masks, safety glasses, and tools.
16 Defendant contended that it had a policy and practice of reimbursing employees for necessary
17 business-related expenses. Defendant further contended that, with respect to the alleged expenses for
18 which Plaintiffs and the other Class Members never requested reimbursement from Defendant, it did
19 not know and had no reason to know that alleged business-related expenses had been incurred.
20 Defendant further contended that the reason for why a Class Member undertook certain expenses,
21 while not others, and failed to receive reimbursement for certain expenses while not others, would
22 raise individual issues that could not be certified.

23 35. There are also substantial risks associated with Plaintiffs' waiting time penalties and
24 wage statement claims. First, these claims were derivative of Plaintiffs' claims for unpaid meal period
25 premiums, unpaid rest period premiums, unpaid minimum wages, and unpaid overtime wages, and if
26 certification was denied on those underlying claims, these derivative claims for penalties would also
27 likely fail. Further, even if Plaintiffs prevailed on their underlying claims, they would still be required
28 to demonstrate that Defendant's violations of California Labor Code section 203 were *willful*

1 violations. Wage statement claims have also seen varying treatment at the appellate level because
2 such claims have an element of discretion attached to them rather than a pure calculation of damages
3 after liability is proven. Accordingly, these derivative claims, which comprised a substantial portion
4 of Defendant's estimated liability, were therefore uncertain.

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

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

26 38. Accordingly, after considering this multitude of factors, we concluded that it was in the
27 best interest of the State of California and the PAGA Employees to enter into the Settlement, and to
28 allocate Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount

1 towards the PAGA claims, which represents approximately 4.76% of the Gross Settlement Amount.
2 This percentage of the settlement is well-within the range of wage and hour settlements regularly
3 approved in both state and federal court for cases that include both a class and PAGA action. Typically,
4 such hybrid cases allocate only 1% of the gross settlement value to resolve PAGA claims, and, indeed,
5 settlements allocations as little as 0.22% of the gross settlement amount have been approved as
6 reasonable by courts. Moreover, the overall relief obtained by the Settlement is significant, not only
7 from a monetary perspective, but also because it fulfills the public policy objectives of PAGA-to
8 promote enforcement of California's labor laws, provide funds to the state, and deter future non-
9 compliance by the employer.

10 39. Therefore, taking into account how each of the above risks potentially effected
11 Plaintiffs' ability to first obtain class certification, and then prove the underlying violations, the
12 Court's broad discretion in civil penalties, plus the cost and delay in recovering the alleged potential
13 damages, Class Counsel discounted Defendant's estimated liability based on the challenges facing
14 their ability to succeed on class certification by 50% to \$920,312. The merits-based risk factors further
15 reduced Defendant's estimated liability by an additional 40%. This resulted in an adjusted estimated
16 liability of \$552,187. In light thereof, the settlement amount of \$525,000 is a significant settlement.

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

22 ***Enhancement Payments***

23 41. As part of the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs are requesting reasonable Enhancement
24 Payments of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) each to Plaintiffs
25 (total, \$15,000.00). These Enhancement Payments are eminently reasonable given the time and effort
26 Plaintiffs spent on this case, and the benefit to the Class Members as a result of Plaintiffs' actions.
27 Notice of the requested Enhancement Payments is disclosed to the Class Members in the Class Notice.

28 ///

1 *Attorneys' Fees and Costs*

2 42. The attorneys' fees incurred by Class Counsel are in line with the common fund
3 requested. The Settlement Agreement provides for Class Counsel to apply for attorneys' fees in an
4 amount of up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$175,000.00 if the Gross
5 Settlement Amount is \$525,000.00) and actual litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed
6 Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00), which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement
7 Amount, subject to approval by the Court. Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of
8 litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.

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

16 44. Class Counsel has litigated this matter for over a year and was actively preparing this
17 matter for class certification and trial. The Motion for Final Approval will elaborate on the nature of
18 the legal services provided, the time incurred in performing those services, and Class Counsel's hourly
19 rates. The Motion for Final Approval will also elaborate on the reimbursement costs sought by Class
20 Counsel. Notice of the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs is disclosed to the Class Members in the
21 Class Notice.

22 *Notice to the Class*

23 45. The Parties have agreed to retain Apex Class Action LLC ("Apex" or "Settlement
24 Administrator") to handle the notice and settlement administration process. The Parties respectfully
25 request that the Court appoint Apex to handle these procedures and to serve as the Settlement
26 Administrator. Defendant will provide Apex with the Class List and Apex will calculate each Class
27 Member's estimated Individual Settlement Share and each PAGA Employee's estimated Individual
28 PAGA Payment. Apex will also receive and process Requests for Exclusion, Notices of Objection,

1 and Disputes; will provide necessary reports and declarations; will calculate, subtract, and transmit
2 necessary taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement
3 Shares; will prepare and submit informational and other tax filings and documents; will issue and
4 transmit all payments provided for by the Settlement, including, but not limited to, mailing Individual
5 Settlement Payment checks to the Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payment checks
6 to the PAGA Employees; and perform any other usual and customary duties for administering a class
7 action settlement.

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

12 ***Notice of Settlement to the LWDA***

13 47. In accordance with California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2), on August 13, 2026, a
14 copy of the proposed Settlement was submitted to the LWDA via online submission through the
15 LWDA's website. A true and correct copy of the email from the LWDA confirming receipt is attached
16 hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

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

19 Executed on August 13, 2026, at Tustin, California.


20
21 
22 James S. Winn Jr.

EXHIBIT 1

- *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.
- *Basilisa 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 Lusk 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.*, Humboldt 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 I, 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.
- *Brittini 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 Nayabhil 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



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

James S. Winn Jr., Esq.
jwinn@blackstonepc.com

April 30, 2026

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Julio Estrada and Raul Nava v. Maruichi American Corporation*

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Juilo Estrada and Raul Nava (together, “Claimants”) with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Maruichi American Corporation (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 Julio Estrada from approximately March 2021 to June 2021 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Julio Estrada worked as a Quality Assurance Engineer for Employers and was based out of Employers’ facility located at their Santa Fe Springs, California location.

Employers employed Raul Nava from approximately January 2018 to January 2022 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Raul Nava worked as a Helper for Employers and was based out of Employers’ facility located at their Santa Fe Springs, California location.

Claimants intend 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”). Claimants are seeking penalties on behalf of themselves 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 Claimants’ 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

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

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

1. 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 Claimants 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of these off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

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

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimants 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 Claimants and other

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.

Claimants 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.

2. 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, Employers failed to provide Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimants 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, Claimants 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 Claimants 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 Claimants 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 practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants 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.

Claimants 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.

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

3. 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).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimants 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, Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a 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 a day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimants 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 Claimants 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants 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.

Claimants 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.

Claimants 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.

4. 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. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimants 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.

5. 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), 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).

Claimants 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.

6. 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 Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, 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).

Claimants 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.

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

8. 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 Claimants and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimants 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 Claimants 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.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. CONCLUSION

Claimants hereby provide 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 Claimants 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



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

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 Claimants' 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

James Winn
James S. Winn Jr., Esq.

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

Erick J. Becker (ebecker@cwlawyers.com)

Garret M. Fahy (gfahy@cwlawyers.com)

Joshua Park (jpark@cwlawyers.com)

CUMMINS & WHITE, LLP

2424 S.E. Bristol Street, Suite 300

Newport Beach, CA 92660

Attorneys for Defendant

MARUICHI AMERICAN CORPORATION

EXHIBIT 3

1 **JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

2 This Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Settlement,” “Agreement,” or
3 “Settlement Agreement”) is made and entered into by and between Plaintiffs Julio Estrada and Raul
4 Nava (together, “Plaintiffs” or “Class Representatives”), individually, and on behalf of all others
5 similarly situated and on behalf of the State of California with respect to aggrieved employees, and
6 Defendant Maruichi American Corporation (“Defendant”) (collectively, Plaintiffs and Defendant are
7 referred to as “Parties” and individually as “Party”).

8 This Settlement Agreement shall be binding on Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members (as
9 defined herein), the State of California as to the employment of PAGA Employees (as defined herein),
10 and Defendant, subject to the terms and conditions hereof and the approval of the Court.

11 **RECITALS**

12 1. On May 2, 2025, former plaintiff Jessie Sanchez filed a Class Action Complaint in the
13 action currently entitled *Julio Estrada, et al. v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Los Angeles County
14 Superior Court Case No. 25STCV13131 (“Action”), thereby commencing a putative class action
15 against Defendant.

16 2. On June 2, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint in the Action,
17 which substituted the former plaintiff with Plaintiffs.

18 3. On April 30, 2026, Plaintiffs provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce
19 Development Agency (“LWDA”) by online submission and to Defendant by U.S. Certified Mail,
20 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor
21 Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant (“PAGA Letter”).

22 4. The Parties agree that Plaintiffs will file a Second Amended Class and Representative
23 Action Complaint (“Operative Complaint”) in the Action, which will add a cause of action under the
24 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2698 *et seq.*
25 (“PAGA”) against Defendant.

26 5. The Operative Complaint alleges ten (10) causes of action for violations of the
27 California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to
28 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.* based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations, and for civil penalties under PAGA based on the aforementioned California Labor Code violations.

6. Defendant denies all material allegations set forth in the Action and has asserted numerous affirmative defenses. Notwithstanding, in the interest of avoiding further litigation, Defendant desires to fully and finally settle the Action, Released Class Claims (as defined herein), and Released PAGA Claims (as defined herein).

7. Class Counsel diligently investigated the class and PAGA claims against Defendant, including any and all applicable defenses and the applicable law. The investigation included, *inter alia*, the exchange of information, data, and documents, and review of corporate policies and practices. The Parties have engaged in sufficient informal discovery and investigation to assess the relative merits of the claims and contentions of the Parties.

8. On February 5, 2026, the Parties participated in mediation with Marc Feder, Esq. (the “Mediator”), a respected mediator of complex wage and hour actions, and with the assistance of the Mediator’s evaluations, the Parties reached the settlement that is memorialized herein. The Parties’ settlement discussions were conducted at arms’ length, and the Settlement is the result of an informed and detailed analysis of Defendant’s potential liability and exposure in relation to the costs and risks associated with continued litigation. Based on Class Counsel’s investigation and evaluation, Class Counsel believes that the settlement with Defendant for the consideration and on the terms set forth in this Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Class Members, State of California, and PAGA Employees in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay and uncertainty associated with litigation and various defenses asserted by Defendant.

9. The Parties expressly acknowledge that this Settlement Agreement is entered into solely for the purpose of compromising significantly disputed claims and that nothing herein is an admission of liability or wrongdoing by Defendant. If for any reason this Settlement Agreement is

not approved, it will be of no force or effect, and the Parties shall be returned to their original respective positions.

DEFINITIONS

10. The following definitions are applicable to this Settlement Agreement. Definitions contained elsewhere in this Settlement Agreement will also be effective.

a. “Attorneys’ Fees and Costs” means attorneys’ fees approved by the Court for Class Counsel’s litigation and resolution of the Action and all actual costs and expenses incurred and to be incurred by Class Counsel in connection with the Action, as set forth in Paragraph 13.

b. “Class” or “Class Member(s)” means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period.

c. “Class Counsel” means Jonathan M. Genish, Ryan A. Quadrel, Shelby Miner, Alexandra Rose, and James S. Winn Jr. of Blackstone Law, APC, who will seek to be appointed counsel for the Class.

d. “Class List” means a complete list of all Class Members that Defendant will diligently and in good faith compile from its records and provide to the Settlement Administrator. The Class List will be formatted in a readable Microsoft Office Excel spreadsheet containing the following information for each Class Member: (1) full name; (2) last known mailing address; (3) Social Security number; (4) number of Workweeks worked for Defendant during the Class Period. and (5) number of Pay Periods worked for Defendant during the Class Period.

e. “Class Notice” means the Notice of Class Action Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as “**Exhibit A**.”

f. “Class Period” means the period from May 2, 2021 through May 14, 2026.

g. “Class Settlement” means the settlement and resolution of all Released Class Claims.

h. “Court” means the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles.

i. “Defendant’s Counsel” means Erick J. Becker, Garret M. Fahy, and Joshua Park

1 of Cummins & White, LLP.

2 j. “Dispute” means a letter submitted by a Class Member disputing the number of
3 Workweeks and/or Pay Periods which have been credited to them, which must: (a) contain the case
4 name and number of the Action; (b) contain the Class Member’s full name, signature, address,
5 telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of the Class Member’s Social Security number; (c)
6 clearly state that the Class Member disputes the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to
7 the Class Member and what the Class Member contends is the correct number; and (d) be returned by
8 mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response
9 Deadline.

10 k. “Effective Date” means the following: (i) if no Settlement Class Member
11 objects to the Class Settlement, then the Effective Date will be the date of Final Approval; or (ii) if
12 any Settlement Class Member objects to the Class Settlement, the Effective Date will be the sixty-first
13 (61st) calendar day after the date of Final Approval, provided no appeal is initiated by an objector; or
14 (iii) if a timely appeal is initiated by an objector, then the Effective Date will be the day after final
15 resolution of that appeal (including any requests for rehearing and/or petitions for certiorari), resulting
16 in final judicial approval of the Settlement.

17 l. “Employer Taxes” means the employer’s share of taxes and contributions in
18 connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares, which shall be paid by Defendant
19 in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.

20 m. “Enhancement Payment(s)” means the amounts to be paid to Plaintiffs, in
21 recognition of their effort and work in prosecuting the Action on behalf of Class Members and PAGA
22 Employees, and general release of claims, as set forth in Paragraph 14.

23 n. “Final Approval” means the determination by the Court that the Settlement is
24 fair, reasonable, and adequate, and entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment based thereon.

25 o. “Final Approval Hearing” means the hearing at which the Court will consider
26 and determine whether the Settlement should be granted Final Approval.

27 p. “Final Approval Order and Judgment” means the order granting final approval
28 of the Settlement and entering judgment thereon, in a form and content mutually agreed to by the

Parties, and subject to approval by the Court.

q. “Gross Settlement Amount” means the amount of Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$525,000.00) to be paid by Defendant in full satisfaction of the Action, Released Class Claims, and Released PAGA Claims, which includes all Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Amount, Settlement Administration Costs, and Net Settlement Amount to be paid to the Settlement Class Members. Defendant shall pay the Employer Taxes separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. The Gross Settlement Amount is non-reversionary; no portion of the Gross Settlement Payment will return to Defendant. The Gross Settlement Amount may be subject to increase, as provided in Paragraph 17.

r. “Individual PAGA Payment” means the *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount that a PAGA Employee may be eligible to receive under the PAGA Settlement, to be calculated in accordance with Paragraph 19.

s. “Individual Settlement Payment” means the net payment of each Settlement Class Member’s Individual Settlement Share, after reduction for the employee’s share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share, as provided in Paragraph 20.

t. “Individual Settlement Share” means the *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount that a Class Member may be eligible to receive under the Class Settlement, to be calculated in accordance with Paragraph 18.

u. “LWDA Payment” means the amount of Sixteen Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$16,250.00), i.e., 65% of the PAGA Amount, that the Parties have agreed to pay to the LWDA under the PAGA Settlement, as set forth in Paragraph 15.

v. “Net Settlement Amount” means the portion of the Gross Settlement Amount that is available for distribution to Settlement Class Members, which is the Gross Settlement Amount less the Court-approved Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, Enhancement Payments, PAGA Amount, and Settlement Administration Costs.

w. “Notice of Objection” means a Settlement Class Member’s written objection to the Class Settlement, which must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action; (b) contain the

objector's full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of the objector's Social Security number; (c) contain a written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for such objection; (d) contain copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (e) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.

x. "PAGA Amount" means the allocation of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00) from the Gross Settlement Amount for the PAGA Settlement. Sixty-Five percent (65%) of the PAGA Amount, or \$16,250.00, will be paid to the LWDA (i.e., the LWDA Payment) and the remaining thirty-five percent (35%), or \$8,750.00, will be distributed to the PAGA Employees (i.e., the PAGA Employee Amount).

y. "PAGA Employee(s)" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period.

z. "PAGA Employee Amount" means the amount of Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents (\$8,750.00), i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, to be distributed to PAGA Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on their Pay Periods.

aa. "PAGA Period" means the period from May 2, 2024 through May 14, 2026.

bb. "PAGA Settlement" means the settlement and resolution of all Released PAGA Claims.

cc. "Pay Periods" means the number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period.

dd. "Preliminary Approval" means the date on which the Court enters the Preliminary Approval Order.

ee. "Preliminary Approval Order" means the order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement, in a form and content mutually agreed to by the Parties, and subject to approval by the Court.

ff. "Released Class Claims" means any and all claims which were alleged or which could have been reasonably alleged based on the factual allegations in the Operative Complaint,

1 arising during the Class Period, which shall specifically include claims for Defendant’s alleged failure
2 to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium
3 payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage
4 statements, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code
5 Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and
6 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and California Business and
7 Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

8 gg. “Released PAGA Claims” means any and all claims arising from any of the
9 factual allegations in the PAGA Letter and the Operative Complaint, arising during the PAGA Period,
10 for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections
11 2698 *et seq.*, which shall specifically include claims for Defendant’s alleged failure to pay overtime
12 and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments,
13 timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide compliant wage statements,
14 maintain complete and accurate payroll records, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses
15 in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a),
16 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
17 Wage Order.

18 hh. “Released Parties” means Defendant and its current and former officers,
19 directors, members, insurers, shareholders, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, successors, and
20 assigns.

21 ii. “Request for Exclusion” means a letter submitted by a Class Member indicating
22 a request to be excluded from the Class Settlement, which must: (a) contain the case name and number
23 of the Action; (b) contain the Class Member’s full name, signature, address, telephone number, and
24 last four (4) digits of the Class Member’s Social Security number; (c) clearly state that the Class
25 Member does not wish to be included in the Class Settlement; and (d) be returned by mail to the
26 Settlement Administrator at the specified address, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline.

27 jj. “Response Deadline” means the deadline by which Class Members must submit
28 a Request for Exclusion, Notice of Objection, and/or Dispute, which shall be the date that is forty-five

(45) calendar days from the initial mailing of the Class Notice by the Settlement Administrator to Class Members, unless the 45th day falls on a Sunday or Federal holiday, in which case the Response Deadline will be extended to the next day on which the United States Postal service is open. The Response Deadline may also be extended by express agreement between Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel. In the event that a Class Notice is re-mailed to a Class Member, the Response Deadline for that Class Member shall be extended fifteen (15) calendar days from the original Response Deadline.

kk. "Settlement Administrator" means Apex Class Action LLC, or any other third-party class action settlement administrator agreed to by the Parties and approved by the Court for purposes of administering the Settlement. The Parties and their counsel each represent that they do not have any financial interest in the Settlement Administrator or otherwise have a relationship with the Settlement Administrator that could create a conflict of interest.

ll. "Settlement Administration Costs" means the costs payable from the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator for administering the Settlement, as set forth in Paragraph 16.

mm. "Settlement Class" or "Settlement Class Member(s)" means all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion.

nn. "Workweeks" means the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period.

CLASS CERTIFICATION

11. For the purposes of this Settlement only, the Parties stipulate to the certification of the Class.

12. The Parties agree that certification for the purpose of settlement is not an admission that certification is proper under Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Should, for whatever reason, the Court not grant Final Approval, the Parties' stipulation to class certification as part of the Settlement shall become null and void ab initio and shall have no bearing on, and shall not be admissible in connection with, the issue of whether or not certification would be inappropriate in a non-settlement context.

1 **TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT**

2 NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants, promises, and agreements set
3 forth herein, the Parties agree, subject to the Court's approval, as follows:

4 13. Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application
5 or motion by Class Counsel for attorneys' fees in the amount up to one-third (1/3) of the Gross
6 Settlement Amount (i.e., \$175,000.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is \$525,000.00) and
7 reimbursement of actual costs and expenses associated with Class Counsel's litigation and settlement
8 of the Action, in an amount not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00), both
9 of which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. These amounts will cover any and all work
10 performed and any and all costs incurred by Class Counsel in connection with the litigation of the
11 Action, including without limitation all work performed and costs incurred to date, and all work to be
12 performed and all costs to be incurred in connection with obtaining the Court's approval of this
13 Settlement Agreement, including any objections raised and any appeals necessitated by those
14 objections. Class Counsel shall be solely and legally responsible for correctly characterizing this
15 compensation for tax purposes and for paying any taxes on the amounts received. The Settlement
16 Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 to Class Counsel for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Any
17 portion of the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs that is not awarded by the Court to Class Counsel
18 shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement Amount for the benefit of the Settlement Class Members.

19 14. Enhancement Payments. Defendant agrees not to oppose or impede any application or
20 motion by Plaintiffs for Enhancement Payments in the amounts up to Seven Thousand Five Hundred
21 Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) each (total, \$15,000.00). The Enhancement Payments, which will
22 be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to Court approval, will be in addition to any other
23 payments they are entitled to under the Settlement. Plaintiffs shall be solely and legally responsible
24 for correctly characterizing this compensation for tax purposes and for paying any taxes on the
25 amounts received. The Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 to Plaintiffs for the
26 Enhancement Payments. Any portion of the requested Enhancement Payments that is not awarded by
27 the Court to Plaintiffs shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement Amount for the benefit of the
28 Settlement Class Members.

1 15. PAGA Amount. Subject to approval by the Court, the Parties agree that the amount of
2 Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00) shall be allocated from the Gross
3 Settlement Amount toward penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code
4 Section 2698, *et seq.* (i.e., the PAGA Amount), of which sixty-five percent (65%), or \$16,250.00, will
5 be paid to the LWDA (i.e., the LWDA Payment) and thirty-five percent (35%), or \$8,750.00, will be
6 distributed to PAGA Employees (i.e., the PAGA Employee Amount) on a *pro rata* basis, based on the
7 total number of Pay Periods worked by each PAGA Employee during the PAGA Period (i.e., the
8 Individual PAGA Payments).

9 16. Settlement Administration Costs. The Settlement Administrator will be paid for the
10 reasonable costs of administration of the Settlement and distribution of payments under the Settlement,
11 which is currently estimated not to exceed Six Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents
12 (\$6,890.00). These costs, which will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to Court
13 approval, will include, *inter alia*, translating the Class Notice to Spanish, printing, distributing, and
14 tracking Class Notices and other documents for the Settlement, calculating and distributing payments
15 due under the Settlement, issuing of 1099 and W-2 IRS Forms and all required tax reporting, filings,
16 withholdings, and remittances, providing necessary reports and declarations, and other duties and
17 responsibilities set forth herein to process the Settlement, and as requested by the Parties. To the
18 extent the actual Settlement Administrator's costs are greater than the estimated amount stated herein,
19 such excess amount will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the
20 Court. Any portion of the estimated, designated, and/or awarded Settlement Administration Costs
21 which are not in fact required to fulfill payment to the Settlement Administrator to undertake the
22 required settlement administration duties shall be reallocated to the Net Settlement Amount for the
23 benefit of the Settlement Class Members.

24 17. Escalator Clause. Defendant has represented that the Class Members worked a total of
25 6,547 Workweeks during the period May 2, 2021 through February 5, 2026. If there is a ten percent
26 (10%) increase in the number of 6,547 Workweeks, the Gross Settlement Amount shall increase on a
27 pro-rata basis equal to the percentage increase in the number of Workweeks worked by the Class
28 Members above 10% (for example, if the number of Workweeks increases by 11%, the Gross

Settlement Amount will increase by 1%).

18. Individual Settlement Share Calculations. Individual Settlement Shares will be calculated and apportioned from the Net Settlement Amount based on the Class Members' number of Workweeks, as follows:

a. After Preliminary Approval, the Settlement Administrator will divide the Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Class Members to yield the "Estimated Workweek Value," and multiply each Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Estimated Workweek Value to yield each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Share that the Class Member may be entitled to receive under the Class Settlement.

b. After Final Approval, the Settlement Administrator will divide the final Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Settlement Class Members to yield the "Final Workweek Value," and multiply each Settlement Class Member's individual Workweeks by the Final Workweek Value to yield each Settlement Class Member's final Individual Settlement Share.

19. Individual PAGA Payment Calculations. Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated and apportioned from the PAGA Employee Amount based on the PAGA Employees' number of Pay Periods, as follows: The Settlement Administrator will divide the PAGA Employee Amount, i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, by the Pay Periods of all PAGA Employees to yield the "Pay Period Value," and multiply each PAGA Employee's individual Pay Periods by the Pay Period Value to yield each PAGA Employee's Individual PAGA Payment.

20. Tax Treatment of Individual Settlement Shares and Individual PAGA Payments. Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as follows: twenty percent (20%) wages and eighty percent (80%) penalties, and interest. The portion allocated to wages will be reported on an IRS Form W-2 and the portions allocated to penalties, interest, and non-wage damages will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares, and issue checks to Settlement Class Members for their Individual Settlement Payments (i.e., payment of their Individual Settlement Share net of these taxes and withholdings). The Employer Taxes will be paid 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 Settlement Administrator.

21. Administration of Taxes by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing to Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, PAGA Employees, and Class Counsel any tax forms (i.e., IRS Forms W-2, IRS Forms 1099, etc.) as may be required by law for all amounts paid pursuant to this Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Administrator will also be responsible for calculating the Employer Taxes and forwarding all payroll taxes and other legally required withholdings to the appropriate government authorities.

22. Tax Liability. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant, and Defendant's Counsel do not intend anything contained in this Settlement Agreement to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement Agreement be relied on as such. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees are not relying on any statement, representation, or calculation by Defendant, the Settlement Administrator, or Class Counsel in this regard. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees understand and agree that Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees will be solely responsible for the payment of any taxes and penalties assessed on the payments described in this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, and PAGA Employees should consult with their tax advisors concerning the tax consequences of any payment they receive under the Settlement.

23. Circular 230 Disclaimer. EACH PARTY TO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (FOR PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION, THE "ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY" AND EACH PARTY TO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OTHER THAN THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY, AN "OTHER PARTY") ACKNOWLEDGES AND AGREES THAT (1) NO PROVISION OF THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, AND NO WRITTEN COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE BETWEEN OR AMONG THE PARTIES OR THEIR ATTORNEYS AND OTHER ADVISORS, IS OR WAS INTENDED TO BE, NOR WILL ANY SUCH COMMUNICATION OR DISCLOSURE CONSTITUTE OR BE CONSTRUED OR BE RELIED UPON AS, TAX ADVICE WITHIN THE MEANING OF UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 230 (31 CFR PART 10, AS AMENDED); (2) THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY (A) HAS RELIED EXCLUSIVELY

1 UPON HIS, HER, OR ITS OWN, INDEPENDENT LEGAL AND TAX COUNSEL FOR ADVICE
2 (INCLUDING TAX ADVICE) IN CONNECTION WITH THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, (B)
3 HAS NOT ENTERED INTO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BASED UPON THE
4 RECOMMENDATION OF ANY OTHER PARTY OR ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY
5 OTHER PARTY, AND (C) IS NOT ENTITLED TO RELY UPON ANY COMMUNICATION OR
6 DISCLOSURE BY ANY ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY OTHER PARTY TO AVOID ANY
7 TAX PENALTY THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY; AND (3) NO
8 ATTORNEY OR ADVISOR TO ANY OTHER PARTY HAS IMPOSED ANY LIMITATION
9 THAT PROTECTS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANY SUCH ATTORNEY'S OR ADVISOR'S
10 TAX STRATEGIES (REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SUCH LIMITATION IS LEGALLY
11 BINDING) UPON DISCLOSURE BY THE ACKNOWLEDGING PARTY OF THE TAX
12 TREATMENT OR TAX STRUCTURE OF ANY TRANSACTION, INCLUDING ANY
13 TRANSACTION CONTEMPLATED BY THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

14 24. Settlement Awards Do Not Trigger Additional Benefits. All payments made under the
15 Settlement shall be deemed to be paid to the payee solely in the year in which such payments actually
16 are issued to the payee. It is expressly understood and agreed that payments made under this
17 Settlement shall not in any way entitle Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, or any PAGA Employee
18 to additional compensation or benefits under any new or additional compensation or benefits, or any
19 bonus, contest, or other compensation or benefit plan or agreement in place during the Class Period,
20 nor will it entitle Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members, or any PAGA Employee to any increased
21 retirement, 401K benefits or matching benefits, or deferred compensation benefits (notwithstanding
22 any contrary language or agreement in any benefit or compensation plan document that might have
23 been in effect during the Class Period).

24 25. Duties of the Parties with Respect to Obtaining Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.
25 Plaintiffs will obtain a hearing date from the Court for Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of
26 the Settlement, which Class Counsel will be responsible for drafting, and submit this Settlement
27 Agreement to the Court in support of said motion. Class Counsel will provide Defendant's Counsel a
28 draft of the preliminary approval motion before filing it with the Court. Defendant agrees not to

1 oppose the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement consistent with this Settlement
2 Agreement. By way of said motion, Plaintiffs will apply for the entry of the Preliminary Approval
3 Order seeking the following:

- 4 a. Conditionally certifying the Class for settlement purposes only;
- 5 b. Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement;
- 6 c. Preliminarily appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class;
- 7 d. Preliminarily appointing Class Counsel as counsel for the Class;
- 8 e. Approving as to form and content, the mutually-agreed upon and proposed
9 Class Notice and directing its mailing by First Class U.S. Mail;
- 10 f. Approving the manner and method for Class Members to request exclusion
11 from or object to the Class Settlement as contained herein and within the Class Notice; and
- 12 g. Scheduling a Final Approval Hearing at which the Court will determine whether
13 Final Approval of the Settlement should be granted.

14 26. Notice of Settlement to the LWDA. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(s)(2),
15 Class Counsel shall notify the LWDA of the Settlement.

16 27. Delivery of Class List. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of Preliminary Approval,
17 Defendant will provide the Class List to the Settlement Administrator.

18 28. Notice by First-Class U.S. Mail.

19 a. Within ten (10) business days after receiving the Class List from Defendant, the
20 Settlement Administrator will perform a search based on the National Change of Address Database or
21 any other similar services available, such as provided by Experian, for information to update and
22 correct for any known or identifiable address changes, and will mail a Class Notice in English and
23 Spanish (in the form attached as **Exhibit A** to this Settlement Agreement) to all Class Members via
24 First-Class U.S. Mail, using the most current, known mailing addresses identified by the Settlement
25 Administrator.

26 b. Any Class Notice returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable on
27 or before the Response Deadline will be sent promptly via First-Class U.S. Mail to the forwarding
28 address affixed thereto and the Settlement Administrator will indicate the date of such re-mailing on

1 the Class Notice. If no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator will promptly
2 attempt to determine the correct address using a skip-trace or other search, using the name, address,
3 and/or Social Security number of the Class Member, and perform a single re-mailing within five (5)
4 calendar days.

5 c. Compliance with the procedures described herein above shall constitute due and
6 sufficient notice to Class Members of the Settlement and shall satisfy the requirements of due process.
7 Nothing else shall be required of or done by the Parties, Class Counsel, or Defendant's Counsel to
8 provide notice of the Settlement.

9 29. Disputes Regarding Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. Class Members will have an
10 opportunity to dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods which have been credited to
11 them, as reflected in their respective Class Notices, by submitting a timely and valid Dispute to the
12 Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the
13 postmark on the return mailing envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Dispute
14 has been timely submitted. Absent evidence rebutting the accuracy of Defendant's records and data
15 as they pertain to the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to be credited to a disputing Class
16 Member, Defendant's records will be presumed to be correct and determinative of the dispute.
17 However, if a Class Member produces information and/or documents to the contrary, the Settlement
18 Administrator will evaluate the materials submitted by the Class Member and the Settlement
19 Administrator will resolve and determine the number of eligible Workweeks and/or Pay Periods that
20 the disputing Class Member should be credited with under the Settlement. The Settlement
21 Administrator's decision on such disputes will be final and non-appealable.

22 30. Requesting Exclusion from the Class Settlement. Any Class Member wishing to be
23 excluded from the Class Settlement must submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion to the
24 Settlement Administrator, by mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the
25 postmark on the return mailing envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Request
26 for Exclusion has been timely submitted. The Settlement Administrator will certify jointly to Class
27 Counsel and Defendant's Counsel the number of timely and valid Requests for Exclusion that are
28 submitted, and also identify the individuals who have submitted a timely and valid Request for

1 Exclusion in a declaration that is to be filed with the Court in advance of the Final Approval Hearing.
2 At no time will any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Class Members
3 to request exclusion from the Class Settlement. Any Class Member who submits a Request for
4 Exclusion is prohibited from making any objection to the Class Settlement. Any Class Member who
5 submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will not be bound by the Class Settlement and will
6 not be issued an Individual Settlement Payment. Any Class Member who does not affirmatively
7 request exclusion from the Class Settlement by submitting a timely and valid Request for Exclusion
8 will be bound by all of the terms of the Class Settlement, including and not limited to those pertaining
9 to the Released Class Claims, as well as any judgment that may be entered by the Court if it grants
10 Final Approval to the Settlement. Notwithstanding the above, all PAGA Employees will be bound to
11 the PAGA Settlement and will be issued their Individual PAGA Payment, irrespective of whether they
12 submit a Request for Exclusion.

13 31. Objecting to the Class Settlement. To object to the Class Settlement, Settlement Class
14 Members must submit a timely and complete Notice of Objection to the Settlement Administrator, by
15 mail, postmarked on or before the Response Deadline. The date of the postmark on the return mailing
16 envelope will be the exclusive means to determine whether a Notice of Objection has been timely
17 submitted. The Settlement Administrator will certify jointly to Class Counsel and Defendant's
18 Counsel the number of Notices of Objection that are submitted (specifying which ones were timely
19 and complete and which were not), and also attach them to a declaration that is to be filed with the
20 Court in advance of the Final Approval Hearing. At no time will any of the Parties or their counsel
21 seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Settlement Class Members to object to the Class Settlement or
22 appeal from the Final Approval Order and Judgment. Settlement Class Members, individually or
23 through counsel, may also present their objection orally at the Final Approval Hearing, regardless of
24 whether they have submitted a Notice of Objection.

25 32. Reports by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall provide
26 weekly reports to counsel for the Parties providing: (a) the number of undeliverable and re-mailed
27 Class Notices; (ii) the number of Class Members who have submitted Disputes; (iii) the number of
28 Class Members who have submitted Requests for Exclusion; and (iv) the number of Settlement Class

Members who have submitted Notices of Objection. Additionally, the Settlement Administrator will provide to counsel for the Parties any updated reports regarding the administration of the Settlement Agreement as needed or requested, and immediately notify the Parties when it receives a request from an individual or any other entity regarding inclusion in the Class and/or Settlement or regarding a Dispute.

33. Defendant's Right to Rescind. If more than ten percent (10%) of the Class Members submit timely and valid Requests for Exclusion, Defendant may elect to rescind the Settlement Agreement. Defendant must exercise this right of rescission in writing that is provided to Class Counsel within seven (7) calendar days of the Settlement Administrator notifying the Parties of the number of Class Members who have submitted timely and valid Requests for Exclusion following the Response Deadline. If Defendant exercises this option, Defendant shall pay any costs of settlement administration owed to the Settlement Administrator incurred up to that date.

34. Certification of Completion. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will provide a written declaration under oath to certify such completion to the Court and counsel for all Parties.

35. Duties of the Parties with Respect to Obtaining Final Approval of the Settlement. After the Response Deadline, a Final Approval Hearing will be conducted to determine whether Final Approval of the Settlement should be granted, along with the amounts properly payable for: (a) Individual Settlement Shares; (b) Individual PAGA Payments; (c) LWDA Payment; (d) Attorneys' Fees and Costs; (e) Enhancement Payments; and (f) Settlement Administration Costs. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will be responsible for drafting the motion seeking Final Approval of the Settlement. Class Counsel will provide Defendant's Counsel a draft of the final approval motion before filing it with the Court. By way of said motion, Plaintiffs will apply for the entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, which will provide for, in substantial part, the following:

- a. Approval of the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and directing consummation of its terms and provisions;
- b. Certification of the Settlement Class;
- c. Approval of the application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel;

- 1 d. Approval of the application for Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs;
- 2 e. Directing Defendant to fund all amounts due under the Settlement Agreement
- 3 and ordered by the Court; and
- 4 f. Entering judgment in the Action, while maintaining continuing jurisdiction, in
- 5 conformity with California Rules of Court 3.769 and the Settlement Agreement.

6 36. Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. No later than ten (10) business days after

7 the Effective Date, Defendant will deposit the Gross Settlement Amount and Employer Taxes into a

8 Qualified Settlement Fund (“QSF”) within the meaning of Treasury Regulation Section 1.468B-1, *et*

9 *seq.*, to be established by the Settlement Administrator. Defendant shall provide all information

10 necessary for the Settlement Administrator to calculate necessary payroll taxes including its official

11 name, 8-digit state unemployment insurance tax ID number, and other information requested by the

12 Settlement Administrator, no later than ten (10) business days after the Effective Date.

13 37. Distribution of the Gross Settlement Amount. Within five (5) business days of the

14 funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will issue the Individual

15 Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members, Individual PAGA Payments to PAGA Employees,

16 LWDA Payment to the LWDA, Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs to

17 Class Counsel, and Settlement Administration Costs to itself. The Settlement Administrator shall also

18 set aside the Employer Taxes and all employee-side payroll taxes, contributions, and withholding, and

timely forward these to the appropriate government authorities.

19 38. Settlement Checks. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for undertaking

20 appropriate deductions, required tax reporting, and issuing the Individual Settlement Payments by way

21 of check to the Settlement Class Members and the Individual PAGA Payments by way of check to the

22 PAGA Employees in accordance with this Settlement Agreement. When issuing payments, the

23 Settlement Administrator may combine the Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA

24 Payment into one check if the intended recipient for both payments is one individual. Settlement Class

25 Members and PAGA Employees are not required to submit a claim to be issued an Individual

26 Settlement Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment. Each Individual Settlement Payment and

27 Individual PAGA Payment check will be valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180)

28 calendar days from the date the checks are issued, and thereafter, shall be canceled. Any funds

1 associated with such canceled checks shall be distributed by the Settlement Administrator to the State
2 of California's Unclaimed Property Division in the name of the Settlement Class Member and/or
3 PAGA Employee. The Parties agree that this disposition results in no "unpaid residue" under
4 California Civil Procedure Code Section 384, as the entire Net Settlement Amount will be paid out to
5 Settlement Class Members, whether or not they cash their settlement checks. Therefore, Defendant
6 will not be required to pay any interest on such amounts. The Settlement Administrator shall undertake
7 amended and/or supplemental tax filings and reporting required under applicable local, state, and
8 federal tax laws that are necessitated due to the cancelation of any Individual Settlement Payment
9 and/or Individual PAGA Payment checks. Settlement Class Members whose Individual Settlement
10 Payment checks are canceled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the Class Settlement, and PAGA
11 Employees whose Individual PAGA Payment checks are canceled shall, nevertheless, be bound by the
12 PAGA Settlement.

13 39. Class Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross
14 Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members will be deemed to have fully, finally,
15 and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all
16 Released Class Claims.

17 40. PAGA Settlement Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross
18 Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs, the State of California with respect to all PAGA Employees, and all
19 PAGA Employees will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised,
20 relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released PAGA Claims.

21 41. Plaintiffs' General Release. Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross
22 Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs, individually and on their own behalf, will be deemed to have fully,
23 finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties
24 from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, guarantees, costs, expenses, attorneys'
25 fees, damages, or causes of action of any kind or nature whatsoever, known or unknown, suspected or
26 unsuspected, asserted or unasserted, arising out of, relating to, or resulting from their employment
27 and/or separation of employment with Defendant, which Plaintiffs, at any time up until the execution
28 of the Settlement Agreement, had or claimed to have or may have. It is agreed that this is a general

1 release and is to be broadly construed as a release of all claims, provided that, notwithstanding the
2 foregoing, this Paragraph expressly does not include a release of any claims that cannot be released
3 hereunder by law. Any and all rights granted under any state or federal law or regulation limiting the
4 effect of the Settlement Agreement, including the provisions of Section 1542 of the California Civil
5 Code, ARE HEREBY EXPRESSLY WAIVED. Section 1542 of the California Civil Code reads as
6 follows:

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

12 42. Final Approval Order and Judgment. The Parties shall provide the Settlement
13 Administrator with a copy of the Final Approval Order and Judgment once it is entered by the Court,
14 and the Settlement Administrator shall post the Final Approval Order and Judgment on its website for
15 sixty (60) calendar days. No individualized notice of the Final Approval Order and Judgment to the
16 Class will be required.

17 43. Continued Jurisdiction. After entry of the judgment pursuant to the Settlement, the
18 Court will have continuing jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court and
19 Section 664.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, for purposes of addressing: (a) the
20 interpretation and enforcement of the terms of the Settlement, (b) settlement administration matters,
21 and (c) such post-judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or as set forth in this
22 Settlement Agreement.

23 44. Effects of Termination or Rescission of Settlement. Termination or rescission of the
24 Settlement Agreement shall have the following effects:

25 a. The Settlement Agreement shall be void and shall have no force or effect, and
26 no Party shall be bound by any of its terms;

27 b. In the event the Settlement Agreement is terminated, Defendant shall have no
28 obligation to make any payments to any Party, Class Member, or attorney, except that the terminating

1 Party shall pay the Settlement Administrator for services rendered up to the date the Settlement
2 Administrator is notified that the Settlement has been terminated;

3 c. The Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order and Judgment,
4 including any order certifying the Class, shall be vacated;

5 d. The Settlement Agreement and all negotiations, statements, and proceedings
6 relating thereto shall be without prejudice to the rights of any of the Parties, all of whom shall be
7 restored to their respective positions in the Action prior to the execution of the Settlement Agreement;

8 e. Neither this Settlement Agreement, nor any ancillary documents, actions,
9 statements, or filings in furtherance of the Settlement (including all matters associated with the
10 mediation) shall be admissible or offered into evidence in the Action or any other action for any
11 purpose whatsoever; and

12 f. Any documents generated to bring the Settlement into effect, will be null and
13 void, and any order or judgment entered by the Court in furtherance of this Settlement Agreement will
14 likewise be treated as void from the beginning.

15 45. No Prior Assignments. The Parties and their counsel represent, covenant, and warrant
16 that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign,
17 transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause
18 of action or right herein released and discharged.

19 46. Exhibits Incorporated by Reference. The terms of this Settlement include the terms set
20 forth in any attached exhibits, which are incorporated by this reference as though fully set forth herein.
21 Any exhibits to this Settlement Agreement are an integral part of the Settlement.

22 47. Entire Agreement. This Settlement Agreement and any attached exhibits constitute the
23 entirety of the Parties' agreement relating to the settlement and transaction completed thereby, and all
24 prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, representations, and statements, whether oral
25 or written and whether by a Party or such Party's legal counsel, are merged herein. No other prior or
26 contemporaneous written or oral agreements may be deemed binding on the Parties. The Parties
27 expressly recognize California Civil Code Section 1625 and California Code of Civil Procedure
28 Section 1856(a), which provide that a written agreement is to be construed according to its terms and
may not be varied or contradicted by extrinsic evidence, and the Parties agree that no such extrinsic

1 oral or written representations or terms will modify, vary, or contradict the terms of this Settlement
2 Agreement.

3 48. Interim Stay of Proceedings. The Parties agree to hold in abeyance all proceedings in
4 the Action (including with respect to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 583.310), except
5 such proceedings necessary to implement and complete this Settlement Agreement, pending the Final
6 Approval Hearing to be conducted by the Court.

7 49. Amendment or Modification. Prior to the filing of the motion for preliminary approval
8 of the Settlement, the Parties may not amend or modify any provision of this Settlement Agreement
9 except by written agreement signed by counsel for all Parties. After the filing of the motion for
10 preliminary approval of the Settlement, the Parties may not amend or modify any provision of this
11 Settlement Agreement except by written agreement signed by counsel for all the Parties and subject
12 to Court approval. A waiver or amendment of any provision of this Settlement Agreement will not
13 constitute a waiver of any other provision.

14 50. Authorization to Enter into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and
15 represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Settlement
16 Agreement and to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant
17 to this Settlement Agreement to effectuate its terms and to execute any other documents required to
18 effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties warrant that they understand and have
19 full authority to enter into this Settlement Agreement, and further intend that this Settlement
20 Agreement will be fully enforceable and binding on all Parties, and agree that it will be admissible
21 and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to enforce its terms, notwithstanding any mediation
22 confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply under state or federal law.

23 51. Signatories. It is agreed that because the members of the Class are so numerous, it is
24 impossible or impractical to have each Settlement Class Member or PAGA Employee execute this
25 Settlement Agreement. The Class Notice will advise all Class Members of the binding nature of the
26 Class Settlement as to the Settlement Class Members and the binding nature of the PAGA Settlement
27 as to the PAGA Employees, and the releases provided for by this Settlement Agreement shall have
28 the same force and effect as if this Settlement Agreement were executed by each Settlement Class
Member and PAGA Employee.

52. Binding on Successors and Assigns. This Settlement Agreement will be binding upon,

1 and inure to the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties hereto, as previously defined.

2 53. California Law Governs. All terms of this Settlement Agreement and attached exhibits
3 hereto will be governed by and interpreted according to the laws of the State of California.

4 54. Execution and Counterparts. This Settlement Agreement is subject only to the
5 execution of all Parties. However, this Settlement Agreement may be executed in one or more
6 counterparts. All executed counterparts and each of them, including facsimile, electronic, and scanned
7 copies of the signature page, will be deemed to be one and the same instrument.

8 55. Acknowledgement that the Settlement is Fair and Reasonable. The Parties believe this
9 Settlement Agreement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of the Action and have arrived at
10 this Settlement after arm's length negotiations and in the context of adversarial litigation, taking into
11 account all relevant factors, present and potential. The Parties further acknowledge that they are each
12 represented by competent counsel and that they have had an opportunity to consult with their counsel
13 regarding the fairness and reasonableness of this Settlement Agreement. In addition, if necessary to
14 obtain approval of the Settlement, the Mediator may execute a declaration supporting the Settlement
15 and the reasonableness of the Settlement and the Court may, in its discretion, contact the Mediator to
16 discuss the Settlement and whether or not the Settlement is objectively fair and reasonable.

17 56. Invalidity of Any Provision. Before declaring any provision of this Settlement
18 Agreement invalid, the Court will first attempt to construe the provision as valid to the fullest extent
19 possible consistent with applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of this Settlement
20 Agreement valid and enforceable.

21 57. Enforcement Action. In the event that one or more of the Parties institutes any legal
22 action or other proceeding against any other Party or Parties to enforce the provisions of this
23 Settlement Agreement or to declare rights and/or obligations under this Settlement, the successful
24 Party or Parties will be entitled to recover from the unsuccessful Party or Parties reasonable attorneys'
25 fees and costs, including expert witness fees, in connection with any enforcement actions.

26 58. Plaintiffs' Cooperation. Plaintiffs agree to sign this Settlement Agreement and, by
27 signing this Settlement Agreement, are hereby bound by the terms herein and agree to fully cooperate
28 to implement the Settlement.

1 59. Non-Admission of Liability. The Parties enter into this Settlement Agreement to
2 resolve the dispute that has arisen between them and to avoid the burden, expense, and risk of
3 continued litigation. In entering into this Settlement Agreement, Defendant does not admit, and
4 specifically denies, it has violated any federal, state, or local law; violated any regulations or guidelines
5 promulgated pursuant to any statute or any other applicable laws, regulations, or legal requirements;
6 breached any contract; violated or breached any duty; engaged in any misrepresentation or deception;
7 or engaged in any other unlawful conduct with respect to its employees. Neither this Settlement
8 Agreement, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor any of the negotiations connected with it, shall be
9 construed as an admission or concession by Defendant of any such violations or failures to comply
10 with any applicable law. Except as necessary in a proceeding to enforce the terms of this Settlement
11 Agreement, this Settlement Agreement and its terms and provisions shall not be offered or received
12 as evidence in any action or proceeding to establish any liability or admission on the part of Defendant
13 or to establish the existence of any condition constituting a violation of, or a non-compliance with,
14 federal, state, local, or other applicable law.

15 60. Captions. The captions and paragraph numbers in this Settlement Agreement are
16 inserted for the reader's convenience, and in no way define, limit, construe, or describe the scope or
17 intent of the provisions of this Settlement Agreement.

18 61. Mutual Preparation. The Parties have had a full opportunity to negotiate the terms and
19 conditions of this Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, this Settlement Agreement will not be
20 construed more strictly against one Party than another merely by virtue of the fact that it may have
21 been prepared by counsel for one of the Parties, it being recognized that, because of the arms-length
22 negotiations between the Parties, all Parties have contributed equally to the preparation of this
23 Settlement Agreement.

24 62. Representation By Counsel. The Parties acknowledge that they have been represented
25 by counsel throughout all negotiations that preceded the execution of this Settlement Agreement, and
26 that this Settlement Agreement has been executed with the consent and advice of counsel, and
27 reviewed in full.

28 63. All Terms Subject to Final Court Approval. All amounts and procedures described in

1 this Settlement Agreement herein will be subject to final Court approval.

2 64. Notices. All notices, demands, and other communications to be provided concerning
3 the Settlement Agreement shall be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third
4 business day after mailing by First Class U.S. Mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed
5 as follows:

6 To Plaintiffs and Class Counsel:

7 Jonathan M. Genish

8 jgenish@blackstonepc.com

9 Ryan A. Quadrel

10 rquadrel@blackstonepc.com

11 Shelby Miner

12 sminer@blackstonepc.com

13 Alexandra Rose

14 arose@blackstonepc.com

15 James S. Winn Jr.

16 jwinn@blackstonepc.com

17 **BLACKSTONE LAW, APC**

18 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745

19 Beverly Hills, California 90211

20 Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

21 To Defendant:

22 Erick J. Becker

23 ebecker@cwlawyers.com

24 Garret M. Fahy

25 gfahy@cwlawyers.com

26 Joshua Park

27 jpark@cwlawyers.com

28 **CUMMINS & WHITE, LLP**

29 2424 S.E. Bristol Street, Suite 300

30 Newport Beach, California 92660

31 Tel: (949) 852-1800 / Fax: (949) 852-8510

32 65. Cooperation and Execution of Necessary Documents. All Parties and their counsel will
33 cooperate with each other in good faith and use their best efforts to implement the Settlement,
34 including and not limited to, executing all documents to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate
35 the terms of this Settlement Agreement. If the Parties are unable to reach agreement on the form or
36 content of any document needed to implement the Settlement Agreement, or on any supplemental
37 provisions that may become necessary to effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement, the Parties
38 may seek the assistance of the Mediator and then the Court to resolve such disagreement.

IT IS SO AGREED.

Julio Estrada

Raul Nava

Maari Ardy

Title: GEN. MOR

26

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Julio Estrada and Raul Nava v. Maruichi American Corporation **Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 25STCV13131**

PLEASE READ THIS CLASS NOTICE CAREFULLY.

You have received this Class Notice because Defendant's records indicate that you may be eligible to take part in the class action settlement reached in the above-referenced case.

You do not need to take any action to receive a settlement payment.

This Class Notice is designed to advise you of your rights and options with respect to the settlement, and how you can request to be excluded from the Class Settlement, object to the Class Settlement, and/or dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods that you are credited with, if you so choose.

YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT: A class and representative action settlement has been reached between Plaintiffs Julio Estrada and Raul Nava (together, "Plaintiffs") and Defendant Maruichi American Corporation ("Defendant") (Plaintiffs and Defendant are collectively referred to as the "Parties") in the case entitled *Julio Estrada and Raul Nava v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 25STCV13131 ("Action"), which may affect your legal rights. On [date of Preliminary Approval], the Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement and scheduled a hearing on [hearing date] at [hearing time] ("Final Approval Hearing") to determine whether or not the Court should grant final approval of the settlement.

I. IMPORTANT DEFINITIONS

"Class" or "Class Member(s)" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the Class Period.

"Class Period" means the period from May 2, 2021 through May 14, 2026.

"Class Settlement" means the settlement and resolution of all Released Class Claims.

"PAGA Employee(s)" means all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period.

"PAGA Period" means the period from May 2, 2024 through May 14, 2026.

"PAGA Settlement" means the settlement and resolution of all Released PAGA Claims.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE ACTION

On May 2, 2025, a former plaintiff commenced a putative class action lawsuit by filing a Class Action Complaint in the Action. On June 2, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Class Action Complaint, which substituted the former plaintiffs with the Plaintiffs. On April 30, 2026, Plaintiffs provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that Plaintiffs contend were violated ("PAGA Letter"). On [redacted], Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint ("Operative Complaint") in the Action, which added a cause of under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA").

Plaintiffs contend that Defendant failed to properly pay minimum and overtime wages, provide compliant meal and rest breaks and associated premiums, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment and associated waiting-time penalties, provide accurate wage statements, and reimburse business expenses, and thereby engaged in unfair business practices in violation of the California Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*, and conduct that gives rise to penalties under PAGA. Plaintiffs seek, among other things, recovery of unpaid wages and meal and rest period premiums, unreimbursed business expenses, restitution, penalties, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

Defendant denies all of the allegations in the Action or that it violated any law.

The Parties participated in mediation with a respected class action mediator, and as a result, the Parties reached a settlement. The Parties have since entered into a Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”).

On [Date of Preliminary Approval], the Court entered an order preliminarily approving the Settlement. The Court has appointed Apex Class Action LLC as the administrator of the Settlement (“Settlement Administrator”), Plaintiffs Julio Estrada and Raul Nava as representatives of the Class (“Class Representatives”), and the following Plaintiffs’ attorneys as counsel for the Class (“Class Counsel”):

Jonathan M. Genish
Ryan A. Quadrel
Shelby Miner
Alexandra Rose
James S. Winn Jr.
Blackstone Law, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

If you are a Class Member, you need not take any action to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, but you have the opportunity to request exclusion from the Class Settlement (in which case you will not receive an Individual Settlement Payment), object to the Class Settlement, and/or dispute the Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you, if you so choose, as explained more fully in Sections III and IV below. If you are a PAGA Employee, you do not need to take any action to receive an Individual PAGA Payment; you will not have the opportunity to object or seek exclusion from the PAGA Settlement and all PAGA Employees will be bound to the PAGA Settlement if the Court grants final approval of the Settlement.

The Settlement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in the Settlement is intended or will be construed as an admission by Defendant that the claims in the Action have merit or that Defendant has any liability to Plaintiffs, Class Members, or PAGA Employees. Plaintiffs and Defendant, and their respective counsel, have concluded and agree that, in light of the risks and uncertainties to each side of continued litigation, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interests of the Class Members, the State of California, and PAGA Employees.

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

A. Settlement Formula

The total gross settlement amount is Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$525,000.00) (the “Gross Settlement Amount”). The portion of the Gross Settlement Amount that is available for payment to Class Members is referred to as the “Net Settlement Amount.” The Net Settlement Amount will be the Gross Settlement Amount less the following payments which are subject to approval by the Court: (1) attorneys’ fees, in an amount not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$175,000.00), and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, in an amount not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00) to Class Counsel; (2) Enhancement Payments in amounts not to exceed Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) each (total, \$15,000.00) for their services in the Action; (3) the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00) allocated toward civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA Amount”), of which the LWDA will be paid 65% (\$16,250.00) (“LWDA Payment”) and the remaining 35% (\$8,750.00) will be distributed to PAGA Employees (“PAGA Employee Amount”); and (4) Settlement Administration Costs in an amount not to exceed Six Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents (\$6,890.00) to the Settlement Administrator.

Class Members are eligible to receive payment under the Class Settlement of their *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount (“Individual Settlement Share”) based on the number of weeks each Class Member worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the Class Period (“Workweeks”). The Settlement Administrator has divided the Net Settlement Amount by the Workweeks of all Class Members to yield the “Estimated Workweek Value,” and multiplied each Class Member’s individual Workweeks by the Estimated Workweek Value to yield an estimated Individual Settlement Share that each Class Member may be entitled to receive under the Class Settlement

(which is listed in Section III.C below). Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion (“Settlement Class Members”) will be issued their final Individual Settlement Payment.

Each Individual Settlement Share will be allocated as twenty percent (20%) as wages, which will be reported on an IRS Form W-2, and eighty percent (80%) as penalties, and interest, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable). Each Individual Settlement Share will be subject to reduction for the employee’s share of payroll taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Shares resulting in a net payment to the Settlement Class Member (“Individual Settlement Payment”). The employer’s share of taxes and contributions in connection with the wages portion of Individual Settlement Shares (“Employer Taxes”) will be paid by Defendant separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.

PAGA Employees are eligible to receive payment under the PAGA Settlement of their *pro rata* share of the PAGA Employee Amount (“Individual PAGA Payment”) based on the number of pay periods each PAGA Employee worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employee in California during the PAGA Period (“Pay Periods”). The Settlement Administrator had divided the PAGA Employee Amount, i.e., 35% of the PAGA Amount, by the Pay Periods of all PAGA Employees to yield the “PAGA Pay Period Value,” and multiplied each PAGA Employee’s individual Pay Periods by the Pay Period Value to yield each PAGA Employee’s Individual PAGA Payment.

Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties, will not be subject to taxes or withholdings, and will be reported on IRS Form 1099 (if applicable).

If the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, Individual Settlement Payments will be mailed to Settlement Class Members and Individual PAGA Payments will be mailed to PAGA Employees at the address that is on file with the Settlement Administrator. **If the address to which this Class Notice was mailed is not correct, or if you move after you receive this Class Notice, you must provide your correct mailing address to the Settlement Administrator as soon as possible to ensure you receive any payment that you may be entitled to under the Settlement.**

B. Your Workweeks and Pay Periods (if applicable) Based on Defendant’s Records

According to Defendant’s records:

- **From May 2, 2021 through May 14, 2026 (i.e., the Class Period), you are credited as having worked [REDACTED] Workweeks.**
- **From May 2, 2024 through May 14, 2026 (i.e., the PAGA Period), you are credited as having worked [REDACTED] Pay Periods.**

If you wish to dispute the Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you, you must submit your dispute in writing to the Settlement Administrator (“Dispute”). The Dispute must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Estrada, et al. v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Case No. 25STCV13131); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) clearly state that you dispute the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you and what you contend is the correct number; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address listed in Section IV.B below, postmarked **on or before [Response Deadline]**.

C. Your Estimated Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable)

As explained above, your estimated Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) is based on the number of Workweeks and Pay Periods (if applicable) credited to you.

Under the terms of the Settlement, your Individual Settlement Share is estimated to be \$ [REDACTED]. The Individual Settlement Share is subject to reduction for the employee’s share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the wages portion of the Individual Settlement Share and will only be distributed if the Court approves the Settlement and after the Settlement goes into effect.

Under the terms of the Settlement, your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be \$ [REDACTED] and will only be distributed if the Court approves the Settlement and after the Settlement goes into effect.

The settlement approval process may take multiple months. Your Individual Settlement Share and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) reflected in this Class Notice is only an estimate. Your actual Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA Payment (if applicable) may be higher or lower.

D. Release of Claims

Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released Class Claims.

Upon the Effective Date and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs, the State of California with respect to all PAGA Employees, and all PAGA Employees will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties of all Released PAGA Claims.

“Released Class Claims” means any and all claims which were alleged or which could have been reasonably alleged based on the factual allegations in the Operative Complaint, arising during the Class Period, which shall specifically include claims for Defendant’s alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide accurate wage statements, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

“Released PAGA Claims” means any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the PAGA Letter and the Operative Complaint, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698 *et seq.*, which shall specifically include claims for Defendant’s alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide compliant wage statements, maintain complete and accurate payroll records, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

“Released Parties” means Defendant and its current and former officers, directors, members, insurers, shareholders, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, successors, and assigns.

E. Attorneys’ Fees and Costs to Class Counsel

Class Counsel will seek attorneys’ fees in an amount not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., \$175,000.00) and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in an amount not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$30,000.00) (collectively, “Attorneys’ Fees and Costs”), subject to approval by the Court. The Attorneys’ Fees and Costs granted by the Court will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Class Counsel has been prosecuting the Action on behalf of Plaintiffs, Class Members, and PAGA Employees on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and has been paying all litigation costs and expenses.

F. Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs

Plaintiffs will seek the amounts of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$7,500.00) (“Enhancement Payments”) each (total, \$15,000.00), in recognition of their services in connection with the Action. The Enhancement Payments will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court, and if awarded, will be paid to Plaintiffs in addition to any other payments that they are entitled to under the Settlement.

G. Settlement Administration Costs to Settlement Administrator

Payment to the Settlement Administrator is estimated not to exceed Six Thousand Eight Hundred Ninety Dollars and Zero Cents (\$6,890.00) (“Settlement Administration Costs”) for the costs of the notice and settlement administration process, including and not limited to, the expense of notifying the Class Members of the Settlement, processing Requests for

Exclusion, Notices of Objection, and Disputes, calculating Individual Settlement Shares, Individual Settlement Payments, and Individual PAGA Payments, and distributing payments and tax forms under the Settlement, and shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court.

IV. WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS AS A CLASS MEMBER?

A. Participate in the Settlement

If you want to participate in the Class Settlement and receive money from the Class Settlement, you do not have to do anything. You will automatically be included in the Class Settlement and issued your Individual Settlement Payment unless you decide to exclude yourself from the Class Settlement.

Unless you elect to exclude yourself from the Class Settlement and if the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Class Settlement and any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon, and you will release the Released Class Claims against the Released Parties as described in Section III.D above.

If you are a PAGA Employee and the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, you will automatically be included in the PAGA Settlement and issued your Individual PAGA Payment. This means you will be bound by the terms of the PAGA Settlement and any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon, and you will release the Released PAGA Claims against the Released Parties as described in Section III.D above.

As a Class Member and PAGA Employee (if applicable), you will not be separately responsible for the payment of attorney's fees or litigation costs and expenses, unless you retain your own counsel, in which event you will be responsible for your own attorney's fees and expenses.

B. Request Exclusion from the Class Settlement

Class Members may request to be excluded from the Class Settlement by submitting a letter ("Request for Exclusion") to the Settlement Administrator, at the following address:

[Settlement Administrator]
[Mailing Address]

A Request for Exclusion must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Estrada, et al. v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Case No. 25STCV13131); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) clearly state that you do not wish to be included in the Class Settlement; and (d) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address above, postmarked **on or before [Response Deadline]**.

If the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, any Class Member who submits a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will not be issued an Individual Settlement Payment, will not be bound by the Class Settlement (and the release of Released Class Claims described in Section III.D above), and will not have any right to object to, appeal, or comment on the Class Settlement. Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion will be deemed Settlement Class Members and will be bound by all terms of the Class Settlement, including those pertaining to the release of claims described in Section III.D above, as well as any judgment that may be entered by the Court based thereon. PAGA Employees will be bound to the PAGA Settlement (and the release of Released PAGA Claims described in Section III.D above) and will still be issued an Individual PAGA Payment, irrespective of whether they submit a Request for Exclusion.

C. Object to the Class Settlement

You can object to the Class Settlement as long as you have not submitted a Request for Exclusion by submitting a written objection ("Notice of Objection") to the Settlement Administrator.

The Notice of Objection must: (a) contain the case name and number of the Action (*Estrada, et al. v. Maruichi American Corporation*, Case No. 25STCV13131); (b) contain your full name, signature, address, telephone number, and the last four (4) digits of your Social Security number; (c) contain a written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for such objection; (d) contain copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (e) be returned by mail to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address listed in Section IV.B above,

postmarked on or before [Response Deadline].

You may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing and present your objection orally, regardless of whether you have submitted a Notice of Objection.

V. FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing in Department 17 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, located at Spring Street Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 on [date], at [time], to determine whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court also will be asked to approve and grant the Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel, Enhancement Payments to Plaintiffs, and Settlement Administration Costs to the Settlement Administrator.

The Final Approval Hearing may be continued without further notice to the Class Members and PAGA Employees. It is not necessary for you to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, although you may appear if you wish to.

You can find more information regarding appearing remotely through LA Court Connect online at: <https://www.lacourt.org/lacceligibility/ui/civil.aspx?casetype=ci>

VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The above is a summary of the basic terms of the Settlement. For the precise terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement, you should review the detailed Settlement Agreement and other papers, which are on file with the Court.

You may view the Settlement Agreement and other documents filed in the Action by visiting Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 111 North Hill Street, California 90012, during normal business hours, or by online by visiting the following website: <https://www.lacourt.ca.gov/pages/lp/access-a-case/tp/find-case-information/cp/os-civil-case-access>

You may also visit the Settlement Administrator's website at [redacted] for key documents in the Action.

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THIS SETTLEMENT.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, YOU MAY CALL THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR AT THE FOLLOWING TOLL-FREE NUMBER: [INSERT], OR YOU MAY ALSO CONTACT CLASS COUNSEL.

EXHIBIT 4



Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

From no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>

Date Thu 8/13/2026 12:14 PM

To Ana Turcios <aturcios@blackstonepc.com>

[External Email].

08/13/2026 12:14:42 PM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 08/13/2026 12:14:42 PM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1174382-26

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](http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm)