Barbara DuVan-Clarke (State Bar No. 259268)
bdc@blackstonepc.com
Danielle Ling GruppChang (State Bar No. 313881)
dgruppchang@blackstonepc.com
P.J. Van Ert (State Bar No. 234858)
pjvanert@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
James S. Winn Jr (Sate 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 CAMILLE GUERIN and CAMILLE TORRES

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

CAMILLE GUERIN and CAMILLE TORRES, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, vs. O & A LINE MANAGEMENT, LLC; CITRIN HOSPITALITY, INC.; MCGA HOTELS LLC; MCGA HOTELS LA LLC; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 24STCV00784 [Consolidated with Case No. 24STCV00885] Honorable Elaine Lu Department 9 **DECLARATION OF JAMES S. WINN JR. IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** Date: January 12, 2026 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: 9 Complaint Filed: January 10, 2024 Trial Date: Not Set

DECLARATION OF JAMES S. WINN JR.

I, James S. Winn Jr., declare and state as follows:

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

Experience and Adequacy of Blackstone Law, APC

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

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

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

4. Barbara DuVan-Clarke is a 16-year litigator who joined Blackstone Law, APC in September 2022 as a Senior Trial Attorney and Team Lead, building on her entire career of litigating single-plaintiff employment, catastrophic injury, and class/PAGA matters with well-known plaintiff-side wage and hour law firms in Los Angeles. She earned her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of California at Los Angeles in 2003, and then obtained her Juris Doctorate from Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio in 2007. Ms. DuVan-Clarke also maintains leadership roles in the California Employment Lawyers' Association ("CELA") and other organizations.

5. Danielle L. GruppChang is a Senior Associate Attorney at Blackstone Law, APC. She graduated from California Polytechnic University San Luis Obispo in 2013, with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and a minor in Communication Studies. She then obtained her Juris Doctorate from University of California Law San Francisco (formerly known as University of California Hastings College of the Law), graduating in 2016, and was admitted to the California State Bar in January 2017. She has practiced exclusively plaintiff's side labor and employment class and representative action law from 2017 through the present.

6. P.J. Van Ert is an accomplished attorney who joined Blackstone Law, APC in 2023, after having worked at an employment litigation firm for 2 years, and prior to that, having served as a District Attorney for over 13 years. In that role, she was a prolific trial attorney, and it is my understanding that she tried over 50 jury trials to verdict. She graduated from University of California at Davis in 2000, with a Bachelor of Arts degree, and from University of California at Los Angeles School of Law with a Juris Doctorate in 2004. She was admitted to the State Bar of California in December 2004.

7. Alexandra Rose joined Blackstone Law, APC from a highly reputable employment law firm. She graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2016 and from New England Law | Boston with a Juris Doctor degree in 2019. She was admitted to the State Bar of California in December of 2019 and the State Bars of New York and New Jersey in 2023. She is additionally licensed in all federal district courts of California. She has worked on many wage and hour class action and PAGA representative matters, and her work has included, *inter alia*, researching and drafting pleadings, administrative notice exhaustion, drafting, negotiating, and finalizing stipulations and settlement agreements, engaging in motion practice, claims evaluation and analysis, and making court appearances. She manages the post-settlement department at Blackstone Law, APC. In that capacity, she oversees and handles over 100 wage-and-hour putative class actions and/or representative actions under PAGA that are in settlement.

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

9. 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**.

<u>Procedural History of the Actions</u>

10. On November 7, 2023, Plaintiffs provided written notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by online submission and to Defendant O&A Line Management, LLC ("Defendant"), Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC by U.S. Certified Mail, pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699.3, of the specified provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendant ("PAGA Notice").

A true and correct copy of the PAGA Notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

11. On January 10, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a Class Action Complaint for Damages ("Class Complaint") in the action entitled *Guerin and Torres v. O&A Line Management, LLC, et al.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 24STCV00784 ("Class Action"), thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendant, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC.

12. On January 12, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, *Et Seq.* ("PAGA Complaint") in the action entitled *Guerin and Torres v. O&A Line Management, LLC, et al.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 24STCV00885 ("PAGA Action"), which alleged one cause of action under PAGA against Defendant, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC.

13. On July 29, 2024, the Court consolidated the Class Action and PAGA Action (together, "Actions") and deemed the Class Action lead. Together, the Class Complaint and PAGA Complaint are referred to as the "Operative Complaint." The Operative Complaint alleges causes of action for violations of the California Labor Code for failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and premium payments in lieu thereof, failure to provide compliant rest periods and premiums payments in lieu thereof, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide earned gratuities, 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.

14. On April 22, 2025, Plaintiffs and Defendant (collectively, the "Parties") participated in a formal mediation conducted by Lynn Frank, 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.

15. The Parties have negotiated the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3.**

Summary of the Terms of the Settlement Agreement

16. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the Class shall be defined as "all current and former non-exempt or hourly paid employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time during the Class Period" ("Class" or "Class Member(s)"). The Class Period is defined as the period from January 10, 2020 through June 17, 2025. Based on information provided by Defendant, it is estimated that there are a total of three hundred fifty (350) 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 Four Hundred Forty-Three Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-Eight Dollars and Zero Cents ($443,748.00), 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) Eighty Thousand One Hundred Seventy-Three Dollars and Zero Cents ($80,173.00) in payments previously made by Defendant to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees ("GSA Credit"); (2) Class Counsel Fees Payment in the amount of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $115,311.80 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $443,748.00); (3) Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, not to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00); (4) Administration Expenses Payment, not to exceed Eight Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($8,000.00); (5) Class Representative Service Payments in the aggregate amount of Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($20,000.00); and (6) PAGA Penalties in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($50,000.00). 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 One Hundred Ten Thousand Two Hundred Sixty-Three Dollars and Twenty Cents ($110,263.20). Additionally, 25% of the PAGA Penalties, which is $12,500.00 out of $50,000.00, will be fully distributed to "all current and former non-exempt or hourly paid employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time during the PAGA Period" ("Aggrieved Employee (s)"). The "PAGA Period" is defined as the period

from January 12, 2023 through June 17, 2025.

18. The Net Settlement Amount will be distributed and paid to all Class Members who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement ("Participating Class Members") on a *pro rata* basis based on any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day during the Class Period ("Workweeks"). Each Participating Class Member's *pro rata* share of the Net Settlement Amount will be calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period ("Individual Class Payment"), in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

19. The twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Penalties will be distributed and paid to all Aggrieved Employees on a *pro rata* basis based on any pay period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period ("Pay Periods"). Each Aggrieved Employee's *pro rata* share of twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Penalties will be calculated according to the number of Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period ("Individual PAGA Payment"), in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

20. Each Individual Class Payment will be allocated as twenty percent (20%) wages (the "Wage Portion") and eighty percent (80%) interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Wage Portion will be reported on IRS Form W-2 and the Non-Wage Portion will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Administrator. The Administrator will withhold the employee's share of taxes and withholdings with respect to the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payment, and issue checks to Participating Class Members for their net payment of their Individual Class Payment. The employer's share of taxes and contributions in connection with the Wage Portion of Individual Class Payments will be paid by Defendant separately and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount. Each Individual PAGA Payment will be allocated as one hundred percent (100%) penalties and will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable) by the Administrator.

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

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

<u>The Settlement is Reasonable</u>

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 data of putative class members' time and pay 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.

Estimate of Potential Value of Claims

27. Class Counsel analyzed all available data and estimated Defendant's maximum potential exposure to be approximately $2,882,476, 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: $114,465 for meal period violations (less meal period premiums paid); $1,112,722 for rest period violations at a 100% violation rate; $284,957 for unpaid off-the-clock work for 1 hour per workweek of off-the-clock work; $1,354 for unpaid overtime wages at the required regular rate of pay; $5,712 for unpaid meal period premiums and sick pay at the required regular rate of pay; $113,730 for unreimbursed business expenses; $894,486 for waiting time penalties; and $355,050 for wage statement penalties. Plaintiffs further estimated that Defendant faced an additional exposure of $390,800 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 $3,273,276 in damages.

Specific Risks Considered

28. Although the investigation and information discovered supports Plaintiff's contentions, Defendant raised potential defenses and other circumstances that impacted the risk of proceeding on a class-wide basis. Consideration of these risks factored into the negotiations and the decision to enter the Settlement. First and foremost, it was found that Defendant had paid Eighty Thousand One Hundred Seventy-Three Dollars and Zero Cents ($80,173.00) in payments to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees (i.e., GSA Credit). According to Defendant, they learned that its timekeeping system was not properly flagging meal break issues in all instance which is used to determine whether a meal break premium is owed. In some instances, a meal break premium was paid but in others, it was not. Defendant also discovered that certain employees may not have received reporting time pay if they were asked to work less than half of their scheduled day's work. As a result, Defendant audited its records and issued payments to employees may have been owed for meal break premiums, reporting time pay, and related penalties. Accordingly, Class Counsel took this into consideration when settling and the Parties agreed, upon the Mediator's recommendation, that the GSA Credit shall be subtracted from the Gross Settlement Amount.

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

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

31. For example, Plaintiffs' meal period claims, which were based on Defendant's alleged failure to provide lawful meal periods, have been increasingly difficult to certify in recent years. Plaintiffs' theory of liability for meal period violations was based on allegations that Defendant had failed to implement its policies and that its practices failed to allow Class Members to take meal breaks in the manner required under California law. Defendant contended that its policies and practices at all times during the Class Period were lawful. Indeed, Plaintiffs' analysis revealed only a 10.7% violation rate for purported unique meal period violations after offsetting for meal period premiums paid. Defendant further argued that the rate of purported meal period violations reflected in the data would require individualized inquiry and that such inquiry would prohibit a class from being certified. We also had to consider the risk that the Court would find validity in the individualized proof defense to certification of Plaintiffs' meal period claim.

32. Additionally, a large portion of Defendant's overall liability lies in Plaintiffs' rest period allegations. As with the meal period allegations, Defendant contended that it had a lawful written rest period policy, provided compliant rest breaks, and relieved Class Members of all duties as required under California law. Additionally, this claim was even more uncertain given the difficulties

associated with proving the alleged rest period violations, as Defendant was not required to record these breaks. Given the lack of records demonstrating rest period violations, there were legitimate concerns Plaintiffs would not be able to certify these claims or prove substantial damages with requisite certainty, which made the estimated value of this claim subject to much challenge.

33. Plaintiffs also faced challenges certifying and proving liability for their unpaid wages claims. These claims were largely based on Defendant's unrecorded, off-the-clock work performed by the Class Members after their shifts and during purported meal periods. For example, Class Members reported that due to being subject to disciplinary action if they were to work past their shifts or unauthorized overtime, they were forced to clock out and then continue working. This off-the-clock work included continuing to care for customers, cleaning and resetting tables, putting away various items, cleaning workstations, polishing silverware, and setting up the spaces for the following day. However, the individualized nature of why this work was performed and the individualized nature of damages presented substantial concerns regarding the manageability of the case and the risk the Court could find these issues prevented certification, and the estimated damages for this claim were based on an assumption that all Class Members worked off the clock for at least one hour per week. Additionally, Plaintiffs' unpaid wages claim was based on unpaid overtime compensation, meal break premiums, and sick pay at the required regular rate of pay. However, Defendant alleged that the bonuses it pays its employees are all discretionary and that the bonuses were not required to be factored into the regular rate of pay.

34. Plaintiffs additionally contended that Defendant wrongfully exercised dominion over gratuities through its practices of withholding gratuities and putting an improperly large portion of them in tipping pools. California Code of Regulations, Title 22, § 927-1(d) states that if an "employee is required to pay more than 15 percent to a tip pool, or the employer pays less than 85 percent of the total amount of its tips to the employee, then the amount retained by the employee or paid over by the employer is wages under Section 926. As wages, tips would then need to be included in the employer's calculation of the employee's regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime, premium pay, and sick pay. Defendant contended that its policies regarding tipping complied with the California Labor Code. Defendant further contended that it properly included tips in its calculation of the employee's regular

rate of pay for purposes of overtime, premium pay, and sick pay. Essentially, it was determined that Plaintiffs faced challenges with these claims.

35. Plaintiffs also contended that Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for necessary business-related expenses, such as the usage of personal cell phones for work-related purposes and the costs associated with purchasing clothing to comply with Defendant's dress code. Defendant contended that it had a policy and practice of reimbursing employees for necessary business-related expenses. Defendant further contended that, with respect to the alleged expenses for which Plaintiffs and the other Class Members never requested reimbursement from Defendant, it did not know and had no reason to know that alleged business-related expenses had been incurred. Defendant further contended that the reason for why a Class Member undertook certain expenses, while not others, and failed to receive reimbursement for certain expenses while not others, would raise individual issues that could not be certified.

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

37. Class Counsel also recognized that, even if Plaintiffs prevailed at class certification, proving the amount of wages due to each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and extremely uncertain proposition. In order to prove liability and damages, Class Counsel will need to request and analyze thousands of pages of documents, obtain the Class Members' contact information, contact them, and obtain declarations at great expense. Obtaining cooperation of current employees would also be difficult, given the likely reluctance to aid prosecution of a lawsuit against a current

employer. On the other hand, Defendant would likely be able to obtain the cooperation of its employees. Moreover, even if Plaintiffs prevailed at class certification and trial, possible appeals would substantially delay any recovery by the Class.

38. Therefore, taking into account how each of the above risks potentially effected Plaintiffs' ability to first obtain class certification, and then prove the underlying violations, plus the cost and delay in recovering the alleged potential damages, Class Counsel discounted Defendant's estimated liability based on the challenges facing their ability to succeed on class certification by 65% to $1,145,647. The merits-based risk factors further reduced Defendant's estimated liability by an additional 60%. This resulted in an adjusted estimated liability of $458,259. In light thereof, the settlement amount of $443,748 is a significant settlement.

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

40. Therefore, after considering this multitude of factors, we concluded that it was in the best interest of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees to enter into the Settlement, and to allocate Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($50,000.00) of the Gross Settlement Amount towards the PAGA claims, which represents approximately 11.27% of the Gross Settlement Amount. This percentage of the settlement is well-within the range of wage and hour settlements regularly approved in both state and federal court for cases that include both a class and PAGA action.

Typically, such hybrid cases allocate only 1% of the gross settlement value to resolve PAGA claims, and, indeed, settlements allocations as little as 0.22% of the gross settlement amount have been approved as reasonable by courts. Moreover, the overall relief obtained by the Settlement is significant, not only from a monetary perspective, but also because it fulfills the public policy objectives of PAGA—to promote enforcement of California's labor laws, provide funds to the state, and deter future non-compliance by the employer.

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

Class Representative Service Payments

42. As part of the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs are requesting reasonable Class Representative Service Payments of Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,000.00) each Plaintiffs (total, $10,000.00). These Class Representative Service Payments are eminently reasonable given the time and effort Plaintiffs spent on this matter, and the benefit to the Class Members as a result of Plaintiffs' actions. Notice of the requested Class Representative Service Payments are disclosed to the Class Members in the Class Notice. Additionally, Plaintiffs are in the process of negotiating individual settlement agreements with Defendant regarding Plaintiffs' individual claims of retaliation and wrongful termination. For the avoidance of doubt, the existence and settlement of those individual claims do not create a conflict of interest nor do they undermine Plaintiffs' ability to fairly and vigorously protect the interest of the Class Members since the claims are distinct from the wage-and-hour claims and do not overlap in subject matter or relief.

Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment

43. The attorneys' fees incurred by Class Counsel are in line with the common fund requested. The Settlement Agreement provides for Class Counsel to apply for attorneys' fees in an amount of up to thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $155,311.80 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $443,748.00) and actual litigation costs and expenses in an amount not

to exceed Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00), which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount, subject to approval by the Court. Class Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained.

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

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

Notice to the Class

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

PAGA Payment checks to the Aggrieved Employees; and perform any other usual and customary duties for administering a class action settlement.

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

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

Executed on January 5, 2026, at Tustin, California.

James Winn

James S. Winn Jr.

EXHIBIT 1

- *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.
- *Vanessa Vazquez v. Cliffs Resort LLC*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV-0025, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Javier Hernandez, Jr. v. DGDG 1, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV416770, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Juan Manuel Munoz v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV06386, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mayra Campos Molina, et al. v. Harbor Hotels, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV10683, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Sykes, IV, et al. v. Wente Bros.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV048758, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Padilla, et al. v. WEHO Hospitality Sunset, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV01072, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marvin Morales v. Skurka Aerospace, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12893, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Tyler Krug, et al. v. EKC Enterprises, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-103975, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joseph Amyot v. Silverthorn Resort, Inc.*, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0203487, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marissa Hartman v. Napa LP Hospitality Corporation*, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV00116, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lesly Arreguin, et al. v. Intercare Therapy, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27972, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alma Lopez, et al. v. Advanced Manufacturing and Development, Inc.*, Mendocino County Superior, Case No. 23CV000673, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Brittni Aghedo, et al. v. Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27362, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Robin Jennings v. Mizuho Orthopedic Systems, Inc. dba Mizuho OSI*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070891, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jonathan Martin v. Atlas Digital, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30498, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cynthia Molt v. Los Angeles Film School, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30757, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *William Ramirez v. Employer Solutions Staffing Group LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV24735, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Anu Verma v. SingerLewak LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11344, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Toby Lanzarin, et al. v. Building Material Distributors, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00330343-CU-OE-GDS, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kassandra Herndon, et al. v. Agreeya Solutions, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0002783, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Damon Siler, et al. v. Call-The-Car dba Call the Car*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07514, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Daniel Ochoa-Lopez v. CorTech West Staffing, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19480, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Juan Escobedo v. Block Tops, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01356309-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Antonio Quintero v. Weyerhaeuser NR Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV02624, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cristo Hernandez v. Eldorado National (California), Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2201056, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Rigoberto Tecaliz v. National Restaurant Inc. dba Black Bear Diner*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00046906-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cecilia Estrada v. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07184, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Davis v. JAJ Roofing dba Citadel Roofing and Solar*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV011004, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Aurelio Aguilar v. Supreme Car Wash, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV29696, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Aaron Coffey v. Catalina Channel Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV41396, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Djuana Shanella Hale, et al. v. Welbe Health, LLC, et al.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0006866, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Fosados v. Drew Chain Security Corp.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00519, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jose Manuel Amaro Bernal v. Joseph Holt Plastering, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15637, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Brandon Geston v. FRTO LLC, et al.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01292, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Alfonso Herrera v. W.L. Butler Construction, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01335445-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marcos Ojendiz, et al. v. Jonathan Louis International*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV35253, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emmanuel Caldera v. Zeb's World Famous Boathouse Inc. dba Goat Hill Tavern*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01310801-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alex Javier Nakamoto v. Skydio, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV062913, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jason McEntee v. Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV041360, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexzander Roberts, et al. v. Lemonade Restaurant Group*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV38302, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Halla Knotts v. Launch Technical Workforce Solutions, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332568, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Armando Gastelum v. Premier Trailer Manufacturing, Inc.*, Tulare County Superior Court, Case No. VCU300333, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Tiffany Patterson v. Black Mountain Healthcare, LLC., d/b/a Seaport Home Health & Hospice*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00037563-CU-

OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Angel Rodriguez v. American Textile Maintenance*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV17855, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rita Ray v. Families Together of Orange County*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01324555-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ly Hai v. Sunroad HS Auto, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00025788-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Anabel Perez v. Eureka Specialties, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV35940, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Galicia v. Virco, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV29425, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Rene Umana v. Columbus Technologies*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV16432, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Sitara Nayabkhil v. San Francisco SPCA (dba SFSPCA), a California 501(c)(3) non-profit organization*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-609950, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Fernando Solis v. Tuff Shed, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24VECV00368, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Tyler Emery v. Santa Cruz Bicycles, LLC*, Santa Cruz Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00244, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Odalys Montejo v. Team Nissan LLC*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 2023CUOE017853, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Vanessa Cortes v. Giti Tire (USA) LTD*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332578, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Travis Sanford v. Santa Cruz Seaside Company*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV01762, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jered Ortega v. YMCA of San Diego County*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00043645-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Corina Martinez v. Stagnaro Bros. Seafood, Inc.*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00082, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandra Jimenez v. ClearFreight, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV28938, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jazzmin Cortez v. Millard Mall Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2104010, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Christa Morton, et al. v. PSI Services, LLC*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG00039, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Michael Bravo v. Michels Pacific Energy, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV403427, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Rodriguez v. Republique, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV14521, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Theresa Bendorf, et al. v. Sea World LLC, et al.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2021-00034922-CU-OE-CTL, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Victor De La Cruz v. Northwest Pipe Company*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2211140, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Bobby Birdi v. Lucid USA, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 21CV003541, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Trujillo, et al. v. Producers Dairy Foods, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00313753, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *David Williams v. Rancho Nicasio, LLC*, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV2203067, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Jackson v. Lifecare Assurance Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26579, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexis Cardoza v. BHFC Operating LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34040, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and

hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Maria Ayala, et al. v. SDH Services West, LLC*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-21-101933, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Alfredo Sanchez v. Greenworld, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2105756, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Oscar Bryant v. Midwest Construction Services, Inc. dba Trillium*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2121529, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.
- *Matthew Savattieri v. AMI Expeditionary Healthcare, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33372, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lexy Barajas, et al. v. H. W. Hunter, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV01892, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandro Valdez v. C.H.I. Automart, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV40168, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sheizan Bawa v. Meathead Movers, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01211895-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tanisha Lopez, et al. v. Restorix Health, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33067, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Perla Soto, et al. v. Nippon Express U.S.A., Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV24902, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and

hour class and PAGA action.

- *Angel Garcia, et al. v. J&B Investments, Inc., et al.,* San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2208601, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sindy Aviles, et al. v. Freeway Insurance Services America, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV34864, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alexander Gnaedig, et al. v. Favorite Healthcare Staffing, Inc.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV20904, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Richard Evans v. My Paint Stop, LLC, et al.,* Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC21-01812, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Parada George v. Main Electric Supply Company, LLC, et al.,* Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2021-01220136-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Samia Salazar Yunis v. Sharif Jewelers,* Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2020-00290080, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Daniel Analco v. Felix Chevrolet, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV36654, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Sasha Aiono v. Benefit Cosmetics,* Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33719, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

EXHIBIT 2

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.
BDC@blackstonepc.com

November 7, 2023

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: ***Camille Torres v. O & A Line Management, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, MCGA Hotels LA LLC***

Camille Guerin v. O & A Line Management, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, MCGA Hotels LA LLC

Dear Representative:

This office represents Camille Torres and Camille Guerin ("Claimant Torres" and "Claimant Guerin" respectively; collectively, "Claimants") with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against O & A Line Management, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC and MCGA Hotels LA LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Claimants from approximately October 2021 through approximately June 2023 in the case of Claimant Torres, and from approximately December 2022 through approximately June 2023 in the case of Claimant Guerin, both as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees. During their employment with Employers, Claimants were employed as servers at Employers' location at 3515 Wilshire Blvd, Los Angeles, California 90010.

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 section 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

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

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 ("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, 350, 351 *et seq*., 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC Wage Orders"). 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 IWC Wage Orders require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and IWC Wage Orders further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay of the employee 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 the 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 period, Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform typical duties before clock in, during meal periods while clocked out, and just after clock out. Additionally, Claimants and Aggrieved Employees sometimes had to review and respond to work related communications between shifts from managers on shifts about issues such as planning for the next day's work. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

wages and overtime wages) to Claimants and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimants and Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, the uncompensated work described herein was often performed when Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees had already worked eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in week resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation. Finally, Employers 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 have 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 IWC Wage Orders 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 penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

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). A second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes must be provided before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a). When an employer fails to provide a meal or rest period, an hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

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 (5^{th}) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10^{th}) hour of work. Meal periods, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted or cut short.

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

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 its 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 the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders 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 penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS

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

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

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take legally 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 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 the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders 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 penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

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 have 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,* straight time/regular rate wages, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal and rest period premiums, and any other wages as they became due (e.g., gratuities, bonuses, or commissions). 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; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ALL GRATUITIES ACCURED BY CLAIMANT AND THE AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES

Claimant and the Aggrieved Parties are entitled to a portion of the gratuities left by patrons of Employers. The regulation of provision of said gratuities comes under Cal. Lab. Codes sections 350 *et seq*. Cal. Lab. Code section 351 states in part: "Every gratuity is hereby declared to be the sole property of the employee or employees to whom it was paid, given, or left for." Various courts and the California Labor Commissioner have considered the issue of distribution of tips in a tipping pool, and while they have found that a tipping pool must be "fair and reasonable" (*see generally, e.g., Leighton v. Old Heidelberg, Ltd*. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1062, no court has interpreted Cal. Lab Code section 351 to allow for a tipping pool with distribution above 15% of the direct recipient's gratuities into a tip pool. (*See, e.g.*, *Avidor v. Sutters Place, Inc.* (2013) 212 Cal.App.4th 1439, 1454-1454).

Employers wrongfully exercised dominion over gratuities through their practices of withholding gratuities and putting an improperly large portion of them in tipping pools. As a result of the practices described herein, Employers have converted gratuities that belonged to Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees.

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

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code; recovery of the gratuities converted by Employers, as well as any interest thereon and any and all profits, whether direct or indirect, which Employers acquired by unlawful conversion and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

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

As a result of the practices described herein, 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. The wage statements provided to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees also failed to include the name of the legal entity that employed Claimants and the Aggrieved Employees. 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; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two 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

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

worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders 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; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The IWC Wage Orders require 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. These costs include but are not limited to the purchase of dress-code compliant clothing and specified shoes required by Employers, minor tools for Employers' use (*e.g*., wine keys, lighters, etc), and the usage of personal cell phones and related internet usage for work-related purposes.

Accordingly, Employers violated the IWC Orders 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 penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

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), Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due to them within twenty-four (24) hours or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of

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

requiring Claimants and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, 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/regular rate 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 (e.g., gratuities, bonuses, or commissions). 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.

10. EMPLOYERS' OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc*. (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 ("*Huff*"), as an Aggrieved Employee, Claimants have standing, and intend, on behalf of LWDA, to pursue civil penalties against Employers for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employers. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against Employers for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Claimants, as "aggrieved" employees affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby do, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for unrelated Labor Code violations by Employers.

Employers are in direct violation of numerous California wage and hour laws including but not limited to said sections stated above. We hereby provide notice under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, et seq., and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, et seq., by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code §

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

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 time.

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

Barabara Du-Van Clarke
Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.

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

O & A Line Management
Attn: Rebecca Barone
Agent for Service of Process
1104 Wilshire Blvd
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Citrin Hospitality, Inc.
Attn: Lawrence Goodfriend
1299 Ocean Ave. Suite 333
Santa Monica, CA 90401

MCGA Hotels LLC
Attn: 1505 Corporation
Corporate Creations Network, Inc.
5901 W Century Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90045

MCGA Hotels LLC
515 W 20th St., Suite 5W
New York, NY10011

MCGA Hotels LA LLC
515 W 20th Street, Suite 5W,
New York, NY 10011

MCGA Hotels LA LLC
Attn: 1505 Corporation
Corporate Creations Network, Inc.
5901 W Century Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90045

EXHIBIT 3

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiffs Camille Torres and Camille Guerin (collectively, "Plaintiffs") individually and on behalf of the Putative Class, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees, and Defendant O&A Line Management, LLC ("Defendant") The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendant collectively as "Parties," or each individual Plaintiff or Defendant as a "Party."

1. **<u>DEFINITIONS</u>**.

1.1. "Action" means the Plaintiffs' lawsuits alleging wage and hour violations against defendants O&A Line Management, LLC, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC, which are captioned:

1.1.1 *Guerin and Torres v. O&A Line Management, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00784 (the "Class Action").

1.1.2 *Guerin and Torres v. O&A Line Management, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00885 (the "PAGA Action").

1.2. "Administrator" means Xpand Legal Consulting LLC, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

1.3. "Administration Expenses Payment" means the amount the Administrator will be paid from the Outstanding Settlement Amount to reimburse its reasonable fees and expenses in accordance with the Administrator's "not to exceed" bid submitted to the Court in connection with Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

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

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

1.6. "Class Counsel" means Jonathan M. Genish, Barbara DuVan Clarke, Danielle Ling GruppChang, P.J. Van Ert, Alexandra Rose, and James S. Winn Jr. of Blackstone Law, APC.

1.7. "Class Counsel Fees Payment" and "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Action.

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

1.9. “Class Member Address Search” means the Administrator’s investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members.

1.10. “Class Notice” means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be mailed to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees in English in the form, without material variation, attached as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.11. “Class Period” means the period from January 10, 2020 through June 17, 2025.

1.12. “Class Representatives” means the named Plaintiffs Camille Torres and Camille Guerin.

1.13. “Class Representative Service Payment(s)” means the payments to the Class Representatives for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action.

1.14. “Court” means the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.

1.15. “Defendant” means and refers to O&A Line Management, LLC.

1.16. “Defense Counsel” means Shareef S. Farag, Nicholas D. Poper, and Matthew Eaton of Baker & Hostetler LLP.

1.17. “Effective Date” means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Final Approval Order; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no Participating Class Member objects to the Class Settlement, the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members object to the Class Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

1.18. “Final Approval Order” means the Court’s order granting final approval of the Settlement.

1.19. “Final Approval Hearing” means the Court’s hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.20. “Gross Settlement Amount” means the sum of the GSA Credit and the Outstanding Settlement Amount, and which is inclusive of all Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members, Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration

Expenses Payment.

1.21. "GSA Credit" means a credit of Eighty Thousand One Hundred Seventy-Three Dollars and Zero Cents ($80,173.00) for payments previously made by Defendant to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees which shall be subtracted from the Gross Settlement Amount.

1.22. "Individual Class Payment" means the Participating Class Member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period.

1.23. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.

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

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

1.26. "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the payment to the LWDA of 75% of the PAGA Penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(i).

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

1.28. "Non-Participating Class Member" means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

1.29. "Outstanding Settlement Amount" means Three Hundred Sixty-Three Thousand Five Hundred Seventy-Five Dollars and Zero Cents ($363,575.00), which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay, can ever be required to pay, or can ever cause to be paid, under the Settlement except as provided in Paragraph 9 below and excluding employer payroll taxes owed on the wage portion of the Individual Class Payments.

1.30. "PAGA" means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code § 2698. *et seq*.).

1.31. "PAGA Period" means the period from January 12, 2023, to June 17, 2025.

1.32. "PAGA Notice" means Plaintiffs' November 7, 2023 letter (and any amendments thereto) to the LWDA and O&A Line Management, LLC, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC, providing notice pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

1.33. "PAGA Penalties" means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Outstanding Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees ($12,500.00) and 75% to the LWDA ($37,500.00) in settlement of PAGA claims.

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

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

1.36. "Plaintiffs" means Camille Torres and Camille Guerin.

1.37. "Preliminary Approval" and "Preliminary Approval Order" mean the Court's Order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement.

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

1.39. "Released PAGA Claims" means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.4 below.

1.40. "Released Parties" means Defendant O&A Line Management, LLC, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, MCGA Hotels LA LLC, and each of their past and present corporate affiliates, parents, subsidiaries, divisions, related entities, divested business and business units, and the board members, directors, officers, shareholders, owners, employees, agents, representatives, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, assigns, and/or any other persons acting on their behalf.

1.41. "Request for Exclusion" means a Class Member's submission of a written request to be excluded from the release of class action claims signed by the Class Member.

1.42. "Response Deadline" means 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may submit a Request for Exclusion, written objection, and/or challenge to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. Class Members to whom a Class Notice is resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 14 days beyond the expiration of the Response Deadline.

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

1.44. "Workweek(s)" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day during the Class Period.

2. RECITALS.

2.1. On November 7, 2023, Plaintiffs submitted the PAGA Notice to the LWDA. Through the PAGA Notice, Plaintiffs indicated their intent to seek civil penalties against

Defendant on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for alleged violations of the California Labor Code and California Wage Orders.

2.2. On January 10, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a purported Class Action Complaint for Damages ("Class Complaint") against Defendant, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC, alleging claims for: (1) unpaid minimum wages; (2) unpaid overtime; (3) meal break violations; (4) rest break violations; (5) failure to timely pay wages during employment; (6) conversion; (7) wage statement violations; (8) failure to timely pay wags at termination; (9) failure to reimburse business expenses; and (10) unfair competition in violation of California Business and Professions Code, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (the "UCL"). On January 12, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* ("PAGA Complaint") against Defendant, Citrin Hospitality, Inc., MCGA Hotels LLC, and MCGA Hotels LA LLC, seeking civil penalties based on substantially the same alleged Labor Code violations asserted in Plaintiffs' Class Complaint. The Court consolidated Plaintiffs' PAGA Complaint with the Class Complaint on July 29, 2024. Plaintiffs' Class Complaint and PAGA Complaint are collectively referred to as the "Operative Complaint."

2.3. On April 22, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by experienced mediator, Lynn Frank, which ultimately led to this Agreement to settle the Action. The Parties believe the Settlement is a fair, adequate and reasonable settlement of the Action and have arrived at the Settlement after extensive arms-length negotiations, considering all relevant factors, present and potential. The Parties to this Agreement are represented by competent counsel, and they have had an opportunity to consult with counsel prior to its execution.

2.4. Prior to mediation, Plaintiffs obtained, through informal discovery, information and documents regarding time and attendance, payment of wages and overtime, meal and rest periods, expense reimbursements, and the production of timekeeping and payroll data by Defendant in response to informal requests for purposes of mediation. Plaintiffs' investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.5. The Court has not granted class certification as no motion for class certification has been filed in the Action.

2.6. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or affected by the Settlement.

3. MONETARY TERMS.

3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. The Gross Settlement Amount is Four Hundred Forty-Three Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-Eight Dollars and Zero Cents ($443,748.00), which includes the GSA Credit ($80,173.00) for payments previously made by Defendant to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and the Outstanding Settlement Amount ($363,575.00). Defendant has no obligation to pay the

Outstanding Settlement Amount prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.2 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Outstanding Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.

3.2. Payments from the Outstanding Settlement Amount. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Outstanding Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval Order:

3.2.1. To Plaintiffs: Class Representative Service Payments to the Class Representatives of not more than Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($5,000.00) to each Class Representative for their effort in bringing and prosecuting the Action, in addition to their Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for Class Representative Service Payments that do not exceed these amounts. As part of the motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Plaintiffs will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing or as otherwise ordered by the Court. If the Court approves an amount of Class Representative Service Payments that is less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payments using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payments.

3.2.2. To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than thirty-five percent (35%)of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be $155,311.80 and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment representing Class Counsel's actual and reasonable litigation costs and expenses which is estimated to not exceed $30,000.00. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided they do not exceed these amounts. Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing or as otherwise ordered by the Court. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other plaintiff's counsel arising from any claim to any portion of the Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these payments.

3.2.3. <u>To the Administrator:</u> An Administration Expenses Payment not to exceed $8,000.00, except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administrator's expenses are less, or the Court approves payment less than $8,000.00, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.

3.2.4. <u>To Each Participating Class Member</u>: An Individual Class Payment calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by the total Workweeks worked by each Participating Class Member during the Class Period.

3.2.4.1. <u>Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments.</u> 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. The remaining 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payments.

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

3.2.5. <u>To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees:</u> PAGA Penalties in the amount of $50,000, with 75% ($37,500) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($12,500) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($12,500) by the total number of Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.2. If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net

Settlement Amount. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.

4.1. Class Data. Not later than 21 days after Defense Counsel's receipt of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of the Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendant has a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if they discover that the Class Data omitted Class Member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendant must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.2. Funding of Outstanding Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Outstanding Settlement Amount. including all amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes, by transmitting the funds to the Administrator within 60 days of entry of the Final Approval Order.

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

4.3.1. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of mailing) when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Class Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees (including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees and including those Aggrieved Employees for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members who are also Aggrieved Employees a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National

Change of Address Database.

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

4.3.3. For any Participating Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Aggrieved Employees whose Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 384 (b).

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

5. **RELEASES OF CLAIMS**. Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Outstanding Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs, Participating Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1. <u>Plaintiffs' Release</u>. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of their respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from any and all claims and/or theories of liability that have been or could have been alleged or asserted in any of the pleadings that have been filed in the Action, arising during the Class Period, including any claims and/or theories of liability raised during mediation, based on the facts alleged in any of the pleadings that have been filed in the Action and in any related notices sent to the LWDA, including, but not limited to, claims for failure to pay overtime wages, including failure to include additional renumeration when calculating overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods or pay meal period premiums in lieu thereof; failure to authorize and permit compliant rest periods or pay rest period premiums in lieu thereof, failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, failure to timely pay all earned wages and final paychecks due at time of separation of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to keep requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs, failure to pay all accrued and vested vacation and sick pay, all claims under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 for unfair business practices that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above, violations of the California Industrial Wage Orders that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above, as well as any potential penalties, interest or attorneys' fees associated with all of such causes of action under California law and all claims for civil penalties or other remedies recoverable under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (PAGA). The release shall include claims arising under California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 226, 226.7, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

5.2. Plaintiffs' Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of the Plaintiffs' Release only, each Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

> A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, and that if known by him or her would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party.

5.3. Release by Participating Class Members: All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release and discharge Released Parties from any and all claims and/or theories of liability that have been or could have been alleged or asserted in the Operative Complaint based on any of the facts alleged in the Operative Complaint, including, but not limited to, claims for failure to pay overtime wages, including failure to include additional renumeration when calculating overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods or pay meal period premiums in lieu thereof; failure to authorize and permit compliant rest periods or pay rest period premiums in lieu thereof, failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, failure to timely pay all earned wages and final paychecks due at time of separation of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to keep requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs, failure to pay all accrued and vested vacation and sick pay, all claims under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 for unfair business practices that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above, violations of the California Industrial Wage Orders that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above, as well as any potential penalties (excluding PAGA penalties), interest or attorneys' fees associated with all of such causes of action under California law. The Released Class Claims shall include claims arising under California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 226, 226.7, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

5.4. Release by Aggrieved Employees: All Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from any and all claims and/or theories of liability for civil penalties under PAGA that have been or could have been alleged or asserted in the Operative Complaint and/or PAGA Notice based on any of the facts alleged or asserted in the Operative Complaint and/or PAGA Notice, including, but not limited to, claims for failure to pay overtime wages, including failure to include additional renumeration when calculating overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods or pay meal period premiums in lieu thereof at the correct rate of pay; failure to authorize and permit compliant rest periods or pay rest period premiums in lieu thereof at the correct rate of pay, failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, failure to timely pay all earned wages and final paychecks due at time of separation of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements, failure to keep requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and costs, failure to pay all accrued and vested vacation and sick pay, violations of the California Industrial Wage Orders that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above. The PAGA Released Claims shall include PAGA claims arising under or predicated on California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 226, 226.7, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

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

6.1 Defendant's Declaration in Support of Preliminary Approval. Within 14 days of the full execution of this Agreement, Defendant will prepare and deliver to Class Counsel a signed Declaration from Defendant and Defense Counsel disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator. In their Declarations, Defense Counsel and Defendant shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.2 Plaintiffs' Responsibilities. Plaintiffs will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining preliminary approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699 (f)(2); (ii) a draft proposed Preliminary Approval Order; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve as the Administrator; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiffs, Class Counsel or Defense Counsel; (v) signed declarations from Plaintiffs confirming their willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members, and/or the Administrator; (vi) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents, including Plaintiffs' PAGA Notice, the PAGA Complaint, and this Agreement; and (vii) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, and/or the Administrator. In their respective Declarations, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.3 Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval Order to the Administrator and submitting copies of the Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Settlement to the LWDA before or on the same day that it is filed with the Court.

6.4 Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant preliminary approval or conditions preliminary approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

7. **CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE.** Defendant represents that the Class Members worked a total of approximately 15,997.30 Workweeks during the Class Period. In the event that the actual number of Workweeks worked by Class Members is greater than 15,997.30 Workweeks during the Class Period, then Defendant agrees to increase the Gross Settlement Amount on a proportional basis based on the workweek value of $30.01 per additional Workweek.

8. **SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.**

8.1 Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Xpand Legal Consulting LLC to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Xpand Legal Consulting LLC agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for the Administration Expenses Payment. The Parties and their counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

8.2 Employer Identification Number. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports state and federal tax authorities.

8.3 Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.

8.4 Notice to Class Members.

8.4.1 No later than 3 business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

8.4.2 Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service ("USPS") mail, the Class Notice substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as **Exhibit A**. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member and Aggrieved Employee, and the number of Workweeks and Pay Periods used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Members' addresses using the National Change of Address database. The Class Notice shall be provided in English and Spanish.

8.4.3 Not later than 3 business days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

8.4.4 The deadlines for Class Members' written objections, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional 14 days beyond the Response Deadline otherwise provided in the Class Notice for all Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed. The Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.

8.4.5 If the Administrator, Defendant, or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 14 days after their respective receipt of Class Notice, or the Response Deadline in the Class Notice, whichever is later.

8.5 Class Members' Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

8.5.1 Class Members who wish to exclude themselves from (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than the Response Deadline – *i.e.*, 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed). A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her/their representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Class Settlement and includes the Class Member's full name, address and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed, emailed, or postmarked by the Response Deadline.

8.5.2 The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

8.5.3 Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the release of the Released Class Claims, regardless of whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

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

8.6 Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. Each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee shall have until the Response Deadline (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods allocated to the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees in the Class Notice. The Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks and/or Pay Periods contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member or Aggrieved Employee's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination of the challenge(s).

8.7 Objections to Class Action Component of Settlement.

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

8.7.2 Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail. Participating Class Members may also choose to appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court at the Participating Class Member's own expense) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than 45 days after the Administrator's mailing of the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was re-mailed).

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

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

8.8.1 Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will establish, maintain, and use an internet website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Agreement, Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payments, the Final Approval Order and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes and emails.

8.8.2 Requests for Exclusion (Opt-outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; and (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion submitted (whether valid or invalid).

8.8.3 Weekly Reports. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received, objections received, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments ("Weekly Report"). The Weekly Reports must include the Administrator's assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

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

8.8.5 Administrator's Declaration. Not later than 14 days before the date by which Plaintiffs are required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

8.8.6 Final Report by Settlement Administrator. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds in the Outstanding Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 15 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court.

9. DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 7.5% of the Class, Defendant may, at its sole discretion, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that, if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void *ab initio*, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendant will remain responsible for paying all expenses of the Administrator incurred up to that time. Defendant must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw no later than 7 business days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel; late elections will have no effect.

10. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL. Not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Court, Plaintiffs will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699 (l), a proposed Final Approval Order, and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiffs shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel not later than 5 business days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

10.1 Response to Objections. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Participating Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than 5 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.

10.2 Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant final approval or conditions final approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Participating Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain final approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Administration Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

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

10.4 Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in the Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.

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

11. AMENDED JUDGMENT. If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit and a proposed amended judgment.

12. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

12.1 No Admission of Liability, Class Certification or Representative Manageability for Other Purposes. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or should be construed as an admission by Defendant that any of the allegations in the Action have merit or that Defendant has any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendant's defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of the Settlement only. If, for any reason the Court does not grant preliminary approval, final approval, or enter the Judgment, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reasons, and Defendant reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Action, and Plaintiffs reserve the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendant's defenses. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation, except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement.

12.2 Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (3) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (4) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. and Class Counsel agree to immediately notify Defense Counsel of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any with third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members. Furthermore, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will undertake any and all disclosures required to be made to the LWDA in conformity with PAGA.

12.3 No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

12.4 Integrated Agreement. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or by any Party.

12.5 Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiffs and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

12.6 Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Agreement, submitting supplemental evidence and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will seek the assistance of the mediator and/or the Court for resolution.

12.7 No Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in the Settlement.

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

12.9 Modification of Agreement. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court.

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

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

12.12 Cooperation in Drafting. The Parties have cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. This Agreement will not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting.

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

12.14 Mediator's Privilege. The Parties agree that any and all disclosures and/or exchanges of information in anticipation of mediation and the Settlement shall be covered by the mediation privilege.

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

12.16 Headings. The descriptive heading of any section or paragraph of this Agreement is inserted for convenience of reference only and does not constitute a part of this Agreement.

12.17 Calendar Days. Unless otherwise noted, all reference to "days" in this Agreement shall be to calendar days. In the event any date or deadline set forth in this Agreement falls on a weekend or federal legal holiday, such date or deadline shall be on the first business day thereafter.

12.18 Notice. All notices, demands or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiffs:

Jonathan M. Genish (*jgenish@blackstonepc.com*)
Barbara DuVan-Clarke (BDC@blackstonepc.com)
Danielle Ling GruppChang (dgruppchang@blackstonepc.com
P.J. Van Ert (pjvanert@blackstonepc.com)
Alexandra Rose (arose@blackstonepc.com)
James S. Winn Jr. (jwinn@blackstonepc.com)
Blackstone Law, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278
Facsimile: (855) 786-6356

To Defendant:

Shareef S. Farag (*sfarag@bakerlaw.com*)
Nicholas D. Poper (*npoper@bakerlaw.com*)
Matthew P. Eaton (*meaton@bakerlaw.com*)
BAKER & HOSTETLER, LLP
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: (310) 820-8800
Facsimile: (310) 820-8859

12.19 Execution in Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.

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

APPROVAL AND EXECUTION BY PARTIES:

Date: 01/02/2026 Camille Torres

Camille Torres, Plaintiff

Date:______________________ ________________________________

Camille Guerin, Plaintiff

O&A Line Management, LLC, Defendant

Date:______________________ ________________________________

By:
Its:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

Date:______________________ ________________________________

Jonathan M. Genish
Barbara DuVan-Clarke
Danielle Ling GruppChang P.J. Van Ert
Alexandra Rose
James S. Winn Jr.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

Date:______________________ ________________________________

Shareef S. Farag
Nicholas D. Poper
Matthew P. Eaton

Attorneys for Defendant

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

APPROVAL AND EXECUTION BY PARTIES:

Date:______________________

____
Camille Torres, Plaintiff

Date: 12/31/2025

Camille Guerin
____
Camille Guerin, Plaintiff

O&A Line Management, LLC, Defendant

Date:______________________

____
By:
Its:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

Date: 01/02/2026

____
Jonathan M. Genish
Barbara DuVan-Clarke
Danielle Ling GruppChang P.J. Van Ert
Alexandra Rose
James S. Winn Jr.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

Date:______________________

____
Shareef S. Farag
Nicholas D. Poper
Matthew P. Eaton
Attorneys for Defendant