

Benjamin H. Haber (SBN 315664)
benjamin.haber@wilshirelawfirm.com
Daniel J. Kramer (SBN 314625)
daniel.kramer@wilshirelawfirm.com
Angela Leong (SBN 300813)
angela.leong@wilshirelawfirm.com
Giancarlo A. Recinos (SBN 282836)
giancarlo.recinos@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

TERRILL POINTER, individually, and on behalf
of all others similarly sit,

Plaintiff,

v.

CROTHALL HEALTHCARE, INC., a
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 23STCV26517

*[Assigned for All Purposes to the Honorable
Theresa M. Traber, Dept. 1]*

**DECLARATION OF BENJAMIN H.
HABER IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Settlement Approval Hearing:

Date: January 13, 2027

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Dept: 1

Complaint filed: October 30, 2023

FAC filed: February 20, 2024

Trial date: None Set

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

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of California. I am a Partner at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC (“WLF” or “PAGA Counsel”), counsel for Plaintiff Terrill Pointer (“Plaintiff”) in this matter. I am thoroughly familiar with and have personal knowledge of all of the facts set forth herein.
2. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement.

3. On October 30, 2023, Plaintiff filed this action as a putative class action against Defendant Crothall Healthcare, Inc. (“Defendant”) alleging: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (8) unfair business practices (“Class Action”).

4. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a), Plaintiff gave timely written notice on December 12, 2023, to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendant of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support (LWDA-CM-999402-23). Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is true and correct copy of the December 12, 2023, PAGA Notice Letter. On February 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint adding an allegation for civil penalties pursuant to California Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code § 2699, et seq (“PAGA”). On August 27, 2024, the Court granted the Plaintiff’s request for dismissal of the Class claims.

5. Thereafter, the Parties met and conferred and agreed to mediate the PAGA Action with Phillip Cha, Esq., a well-respected and experienced mediator in wage-and-hour class and representative actions. In advance of mediation, PAGA Counsel conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of, and applicable law to, the PAGA Action. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained through informal discovery a representative sampling of time and payroll data for

1 Aggrieved Employees and the necessary policy documents to properly evaluate the strengths and
2 weaknesses of the claims and engage in meaningful settlement discussions.

3 6. On October 28, 2025, the Parties engaged in an all-day mediation session before
4 Phillip Cha, Esq. With the help of Mr. Cha, the Parties were able to reach an agreement on general
5 settlement terms at mediation. The settlement was negotiated in light of all known facts and
6 circumstances and the uncertainty associated with litigation – including the risk of Plaintiff not
7 being able to maintain representative claims, the difficulty of proving Plaintiff’s claims in a
8 manageable trial, the merits of Defendant’s potential defenses, and the significant delay and
9 potential appellate issues inherent to litigation – and was reached after extensive arm’s length
10 negotiations, with the assistance of Mr. Cha.

11 PAGA Settlement

12 7. The Settlement Agreement negotiated by the Parties provides for a Gross Settlement
13 Amount (“GSA”) payment in the amount of \$1,197,000.00 to resolve the PAGA Action.
14 Settlement Agreement §§ 1.10, 3.1. The GSA will be used to pay PAGA Representative Service
15 Award, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, PAGA Counsel Fees
16 Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administrator’s Expenses
17 Payment. Settlement Agreement § 1.10. After deducting PAGA Representative Service
18 Payments, PAGA Counsel Fees, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses, and Administrator
19 Expenses Payment from the GSA, the amount remaining is the Net Settlement Amount (“NSA”).
20 Settlement Agreement § 1.15. The NSA, which is estimated to be \$757,327.17, shall be
21 distributed as PAGA Penalties with 75% of the NSA allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment
22 and 25% of the NSA allocated to Individual PAGA Payments. Settlement Agreement § 3.2.4.
23 Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the PAGA Settlement Agreement
24 (“Settlement Agreement”).

25 8. This PAGA Settlement amount compares favorably to the estimated amount of
26 PAGA penalties. Plaintiff calculated that the maximum amount of statutory PAGA civil penalties
27 was potentially \$5,673,100.00, which is based on a maximum \$100 penalty for each of the 56,731
28 pay statements provided to the estimated 1,913 employees. Despite applying the maximum \$100

1 penalty for each pay statement, Plaintiff's analysis showed that approximately 43% of the PAGA
2 pay statements contained no facially violative meal periods. The valuation of \$1,197,000.00 is the
3 civil penalty amount calculated at approximately 21.1% of the maximum statutory rate. If stacking
4 is permitted, then the valuation increases with each additional penalty added to each pay period.
5 Plaintiff, however, is not aware of any PAGA award that permitted stacking since California's
6 2024 reforms to PAGA awards and, in the cases cited herein, only one penalty per pay period was
7 assessed.

8 9. Defendant maintains that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were properly
9 compensated, and that they did not violate the Labor Code as to any of them. Accordingly,
10 Defendant disputes and denies Plaintiff's allegations and claims asserted in the operative complaint
11 which are resolved by the Settlement Agreement. For example, Defendant claims that many of the
12 presumed meal period violations can be explained by valid meal period waivers or the voluntary
13 nature in which those employees took their late and/or shortened meal periods. Defendant asserted
14 additional defenses to the PAGA claim, not only as to liability but also as to the amount of the
15 penalties. Defendant could argue that no penalties prior to the PAGA notification should be
16 awarded because the violations were not intentional, and at least one Court has so ruled. These
17 defenses present a risk to the PAGA claim and the potential that some or all the PAGA penalties
18 sought may not be awarded.

19 10. While Plaintiff is confident in the merits of the case, a legitimate controversy exists
20 as to each cause of action for penalties, the factual allegations, the evidentiary basis, and the
21 underlying claims. Plaintiff also took into account the fact that continued litigation would be
22 expensive, involving a trial and possible appeals, and would substantially delay and potentially
23 reduce any recovery to the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees. Assuming Plaintiff
24 could prove at least one violation per pay period and the Court awarded \$100.00 in PAGA penalties
25 for each of the 56,731 pay periods during the PAGA Period, the total penalties would be
26 approximately \$5,673,100.00. As such, the Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,197,000.00 is
27 approximately 21.1% of the maximum realistic liability in this case.

28 11. Thus, when the risks of litigation, the burdens of proof necessary to establish

1 liability, and the probability of appeal of a favorable judgment are considered, it is clear the
2 settlement amount of \$1,197,000.00 is reasonable and in the best interest of the State of California
3 and the public. Plaintiff objectively and knowledgably balanced the strengths and weaknesses of
4 his claims against the risk of continued litigation and were able to determine a realistic range of
5 settlement recovery for PAGA penalties.

6 Attorneys' Fees and Costs

7 12. Plaintiff is represented by WLF. The attorneys at WLF performed significant work
8 and expended litigation costs in prosecuting this matter with no guarantee of payment.

9 13. WLF has been selected by Best Lawyers and U.S. News & World Report as one of
10 the nation's Best Law Firms since 2020 and is comprised of more than 100 attorneys and over 600
11 employees. WLF is actively and continuously practicing in employment litigation, representing
12 employees in both individual and class actions in both state and federal courts throughout
13 California.

14 14. WLF is qualified to handle this litigation because its attorneys are experienced in
15 litigating Labor Code violations in individual, class action, and representative action cases. WLF
16 has handled, and is currently handling, numerous wage and hour class action lawsuits, as well as
17 class actions involving consumer rights and data privacy litigation.

18 15. I am a Partner at WLF. I graduated from the University of California, Los
19 Angeles, in 2012 and received my Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings
20 College of the Law (now the University of California College of Law, San Francisco) in 2016.
21 During law school, I was a member of the executive board for the *Hastings Law Journal*; a
22 student mediator at the San Francisco Superior Court, Small Claims Division; and a managing
23 editor for *SCOCAblog*, which continues to be a leading online publication for analysis regarding
24 trends and cases before the California Supreme Court. Since graduating from law school, I have
25 focused my legal work primarily on wage-and-hour class and representative action litigation
26 and have helped obtain more than one hundred class and representative action settlements on
27 behalf of tens of thousands of workers in California. I was also selected as a "Southern
28 California Rising Star" in 2024, 2025, and 2026. My current billing rate is \$950.00.

1 16. I have been appointed as class counsel in numerous wage-and-hour class and
2 representative action cases throughout California. Below is a non-exhaustive list of cases where I
3 was appointed as class counsel or I and other members of WLF were appointed as class counsel:

- 4 a. *Colter v. Propulsion Controls Engineering*, San Diego County, Case No. 37-
5 2020-00030682-CU-OE-CTL; Motion for Final Approval granted on October
6 28, 2022.
- 7 b. *Rodriguez v. Modesto Restaurant Group, LLC*, Stanislaus County, Case No. CV-
8 21-000269; Motion for Final Approval granted on January 10, 2023.
- 9 c. *Kingsbury v. Caravan Foods II, Inc.*, Alameda County, Case No. RG21096357;
10 Motion for Final Approval granted on January 31, 2023.
- 11 d. *Frias-Estrada v. Trek Retail Corporation*, Contra Costa County, Case No.
12 MSC20-01916; Motion for Final Approval granted on March 3, 2023.
- 13 e. *Varez v. Valley Connection, LLC dba Carl's Jr.*, Merced County, Case No.
14 22CV-00985; Motion for Final Approval granted on April 27, 2023.
- 15 f. *Reyes v. Everytable, PBC, et al.*, Los Angeles County, Case No. 21STCV35987;
16 Motion for Final Approval granted on May 3, 2023.
- 17 g. *Ortiz v. Tara Materials, Inc.*, San Diego County, Case No. 37-2021-0001473-
18 CU-OE-CTL; Motion for Final Approval granted on May 30, 2023.
- 19 h. *Cruz-Sanchez v. Eagle Lath & Plaster, Inc.*, Sacramento County, Case No. 34-
20 2021-00293739-CU-OE-GDS; Motion for Final Approval granted on May 30,
21 2023.
- 22 i. *Garduno v. New Generation Framing, Inc., et al.*, Stanislaus County, Case No.
23 CV-21-000544; Motion for Final Approval granted on August 11, 2023.
- 24 j. *Hernandez, et al. v. Burford Farming Company, Inc.*, Fresno County, Case No.
25 21CECG03817; Motion for Final Approval granted on August 21, 2023.
- 26 k. *Barajas v. Final Phase Construction, Inc.*, San Bernardino County, Case No.
27 CIVSB2118622; Motion for Final Approval granted on September 13, 2023.
- 28 l. *Jaimes, et al. v. Infiniti Health LLC*, Los Angeles County, Case No.

- 22STCV07261; Motion for Final Approval granted on October 17, 2023.
- m. *Nunez v. Gabriel Container*, Los Angeles County, Case No. 21STCV09787; Motion for Final Approval granted on November 2, 2023.
- n. *Gutierrez v. Next Level Door & Millwork, Inc.*, Riverside County, Case No. CVRI2105455; Motion for Final Approval granted on January 11, 2024.
- o. *Lupercio v. Western CNC, Inc.*, San Diego County, Case No. 37-2021-00010314-CU-OE-CTL; Motion for Final Approval granted on January 26, 2024.
- p. *Jackson, et al. v. Apple Valley Communications, Inc., et al.*, San Bernardino County, Case No. CIVSB2124721; Motion for Final Approval granted on February 1, 2024.
- q. *Cuadras, et al. v. Guinn Corporation*, Kern County, Case No. BCV-21-101520; Motion for Final Approval granted on February 22, 2024.
- r. *Canton, et al v. John B. Sanfilippo & Sons, Inc.*, Merced County, Case No. 22-CV-01145; Motion for Final Approval granted on March 15, 2024.
- s. *Williams v. Total Longterm Care, Inc., et al.*, San Bernardino County, Case No. CIVSB2213347; Motion for Final Approval granted on April 2, 2024.
- t. *Espinoza v. Delallo's Italian Foods, Inc.*, Butte County, Case No. 21CV02640; Motion for Final Approval granted on April 24, 2024.
- u. *Meza v. Argus Management Company, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County, Case No. 21STCV31612; Motion for Final Approval granted on May 20, 2024.
- v. *Wade v. Mallory Safety and Supply LLC*, Siskiyou County, Case No. 23CV00951; Motion for Final Approval granted on July 11, 2024.
- w. *Abarca-Rueda, et al. v. Foley Family Wines, Inc., et al.*, Sonoma County, Case No. S-CV-268148; Motion for Final Approval granted on August 21, 2024.
- x. *Aguilar v. American Pasteurization Company, Inc., et al.*, Sacramento County, Case No. 34-2021-00312027-CU-OE-GDS; Motion for Final Approval granted on September 3, 2024.

y. *Hayes, et al. v. Gonzales Park, LLC, et al.*, Butte County, Case No. 21CV02456; Motion for Final Approval granted on May 1, 2024.

z. *Hernandez v. KW California, et al.*, Kern County, Case No. BCV-23-100346; Motion for Final Approval Granted on December 4, 2024.

aa. *Arias v. The Shyft Group GTB, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County, Case No. 22STCV37390; Motion for Final Approval granted on December 3, 2024.

bb. *Barajas Maya v. United Facilities Group, Inc., et al.*, Santa Clara County, Case No. 22CV397353; Motion for Final Approval granted on November 22, 2024.

17. Daniel J. Kramer is a tenth-year Senior Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. He was admitted to practice law in the State of California and the Central, Eastern, Southern, and Northern Districts of California. He graduated from Stanford University with a Bachelor of Arts in History and Political Science, and received his Juris Doctor from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2016. During law school, he was a research editor for the *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review*. Before joining Wilshire Law Firm, he practiced briefly at a firm that focused on municipal law and code enforcement and then moved to a respected plaintiff-side firm to practice wage and hour class and representative action litigation. Mr. Kramer currently bills at an hourly rate of \$850.00.

18. Mr. Kramer has more than seven years of work experience litigating wage and hour class and representative actions, and has been appointed as class counsel in numerous cases, including inter alia:

a. *Hayes, et al. v. Gonzales Park, LLC, et al.*, Butte County, Case No. 21CV02456; Motion for Final Approval granted on May 1, 2024.

b. *Hernandez v. KW California, et al.*, Kern County, Case No. BCV-23-100346; Motion for Final Approval granted on December 4, 2024.

c. *Petrossian v. The Testing Company LLC*, Los Angeles County, Case No. 22STCV34526; Motion for Final Approval granted on December 23, 2024.

d. *Conchas Jimenez v. The Castine Group*, Santa Clara County, Case No. 21CV375173; Motion for Final Approval granted on February 6, 2025.

1 e. *Svay v. Certainteed, LLC*, Madera County, Case No. MCV093066; Motion for
2 Final Approval granted on May 20, 2025.

3 f. *Chavira, et al. v. Mark III Construction, Inc.*, Sacramento County, Case No.
4 34-2021-00308972-CU-OE-GDS; Motion for Final Approval granted on
5 January 30, 2026.

6 g. *Mendoza, et al. v. OSI Industries, LLC*, Riverside County, Case No.
7 CVRI2203101; Motion for Final Approval granted on February 27, 2026.

8 19. Angela Leong is a twelfth-year Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. She
9 is admitted to practice law in the State of California and the Central Districts of California. She
10 graduated from the University of Macau with a Bachelor's Degree in English Communications,
11 received a Master of Science from the Southern Illinois University Carbondale, and received her
12 Juris Doctor from Whittier Law School in 2014. In the early years of her legal career, Ms. Leong
13 advocated for low-income individuals, which eventually led her to pursue employment law.
14 Angela's practice now focuses on litigating wage and hour class actions. Ms. Leong currently bills
15 at an hourly rate of \$750.00.

16 20. Giancarlo A. Recinos is a Senior Attorney at WLF. He was admitted to practice law
17 in the State of California in 2012 and is an active member in good standing with the State Bar of
18 California. Mr. Recinos graduated from San Francisco State University with a Bachelor of Arts in
19 Communications and received his Juris Doctor from Southwestern Law School. For over a decade,
20 his practice has focused on employment law and wage-and-hour compliance. Mr. Recinos currently
21 bills at an hourly rate of \$950.00.

22 21. Justin F. Marquez is a former Senior Partner at WLF who was actively involved in
23 the litigation and resolution of this Action from its inception through December 2024. He
24 graduated from University of California, Los Angeles's College Honors Program in 2004 with
25 Bachelor of Arts degrees in History and Japanese, magna cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa. He
26 graduated from Notre Dame Law School with a Juris Doctorate. He was admitted to the State Bar
27 of California in February 2009. His practice focused primarily on advocating for the rights of
28 consumers and employees in class action litigation and appellate litigation. He received numerous

1 awards for his legal work: from 2017 to 2020, Super Lawyers selected him as a “Southern
2 California Rising Star,” and from 2022 to 2025, he was selected as a “Southern California Super
3 Lawyer”; he was selected as one of the “Best Lawyers in America” from 2023 to 2025; and in
4 2024, he, along with his colleagues at WLF, received a CLAY (California Lawyer Attorneys of
5 the Year) award for their work on a false advertising case against Apple which ultimately led to a
6 \$25 million settlement. He also was selected to speak at multiple CELA conferences throughout
7 his career – in 2019, he spoke on the topic of manageability of class actions at CELA’s 2019
8 Advanced Wage & Hour Seminar, and in 2024, he spoke on the topic of dealings with multiple
9 cases against the same defendant at CELA’s 2024 Advanced Wage & Hour Seminar. He served
10 as lead or co-lead in negotiating class action settlements worth over \$10 million in gross recovery
11 to class members for each year since 2020, including over \$37.5 million in 2022 and over \$75
12 million in 2023. Mr. Marquez billed at an hourly rate of \$1,500.00 before his departure from WLF.

13 22. WLF’s hourly rates are comparable to those charged by other class action plaintiffs’
14 counsel and the firms defending class actions. WLF’s rates are well within the range of hourly
15 rates that the Los Angeles legal marketplace would compensate counsel for similar services
16 accomplishing similar results. For example, in *Bronshteyn v. State of California*, Los Angeles
17 County Superior Ct. No. 19SMCV00057, Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Statutory
18 Attorneys’ Fees and Costs filed March 30, 2023, an employment action brought by two plaintiffs
19 law firms (Levy, Vinick, Burrell & Hyams LLP and Law Offices of Wendy Musell), the court
20 found that counsel’s 2022 hourly rates of \$1,100 and \$1,000 per hour were reasonable for the
21 plaintiff’s five senior attorneys, including \$1,000 per hour for the plaintiff’s 23-year lead counsel
22 and \$850 per hour for a senior associate. These rates were then augmented by a 1.75 lodestar
23 multiplier and affirmed by the California Court of Appeals. The rates (and multiplier) requested
24 here are well in line with those found reasonable in *Bronshteyn*. In *Tran v. Golden State FC LLC*,
25 *et al.* (LASC Case No. BC699931), Fee Order filed 4/8/2022, the court found hourly rates of \$1,300
26 per hour reasonable for plaintiff’s 32-year attorney and \$1,000 per hour reasonable for a 14-year
27 attorney.

28 23. In support of the reasonableness of WLF’s hourly rates, attached as **Exhibit 3** is a

1 true and correct excerpt from the *2025 Real Rate Report* published by Wolters Kluwer. The Real
2 Rate Report is widely relied upon in the legal industry because it is derived from anonymized
3 billing data taken from actual law firm invoices that were submitted to clients and approved for
4 payment, rather than from voluntary surveys or self-reported rates. Although the report refers to
5 “2025” rates, the data reflects rates charged by law firms during the first half of 2024 and therefore
6 represents the most recent available objective evidence of prevailing market rates.

7 a. The Real Rate Report further shows that in the San Diego market, partners
8 with 21 or more years of experience command third-quartile billing rates of approximately \$1,334
9 per hour, confirming that highly experienced litigators in major Southern California markets
10 routinely bill at the upper end of the rate spectrum

11 b. The 2025 Real Rate Report’s practice-area-specific data further supports this
12 conclusion. Page 81 provides third-quartile rates for the detailed practice category “Employment
13 and Labor: Other Litigation,” which is directly analogous to the type of work performed in this
14 case. That dataset includes 24 partners and 14 associates and shows a third-quartile rate of \$1,252
15 per hour for partners and \$564 per hour for associates. These figures demonstrate that even within
16 the specialized employment litigation market, partners regularly bill well above \$1,200 per hour
17 based on rates actually charged to clients. When this practice-specific benchmark is considered
18 together with the broader regional market data, it confirms that WLF’s hourly rate for highly
19 experienced counsel in a representative employment action falls within the upper range of
20 prevailing market rates rather than outside it.

21 c. The Real Rate Report does not provide 1st quartile or 4th quartile rates,
22 presumably to provide a sense of the average attorney billing rates. Importantly, the third quartile
23 represents the point below which 75% of rates fall; it is not a cap on reasonable rates. By definition,
24 a substantial portion of partners in the relevant benchmark market routinely bill above that level,
25 particularly those with extensive experience, specialized expertise, or leadership roles in complex
26 litigation. Courts evaluating fee requests recognize that leading counsel in complex or
27 representative actions may reasonably bill above median or third-quartile benchmarks where their
28 experience, results obtained, and responsibilities justify higher rates. We firmly believe WLF

1 belongs in the 4th quartile of attorney billing rates in Southern California. As previously discussed,
2 WLF is a nationally recognized employment litigation firm that has been named one of the nation's
3 *Best Law Firms* by U.S. News & World Report and Best Lawyers since 2020, and its attorneys
4 regularly litigate complex wage-and-hour class and representative actions throughout California.

5 24. In an article entitled "Big Law Rates Topping \$2,000 Leave Value 'In Eye of
6 Beholder,'" written by Roy Strom and published by Bloomberg Law on June 9, 2022, the author
7 describes how Big Law firms have crossed the \$2,000-per hour rate. The article also notes that
8 law firm rates have been increasing by just under 3% per year. A true and correct copy of this
9 article is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

10 25. WLF has performed significant work and incurred litigation costs in prosecuting
11 this matter with no guarantee of any payment. The efforts expended by PAGA Counsel to achieve
12 this result include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 13 a. The investigation of the matter, including meeting with Plaintiff, reviewing
14 Defendant's policies, and requesting and reviewing Plaintiff's time and pay
15 records, personnel files, and exploring the corporate structure of Defendant;
- 16 b. filing the Actions;
- 17 c. attending status conferences and meeting and conferring with Defendant
18 regarding the case;
- 19 d. meeting and conferring with Defendant regarding the enforceability of the
20 arbitration agreement;
- 21 e. meeting and conferring with Defendant regarding mediation, exchange of
22 informal discovery beforehand, and negotiating with opposing counsel regarding
23 the parameters thereof;
- 24 f. selecting a mediator and mediation date;
- 25 g. working with opposing counsel and expert consultant for the receipt of a
26 representative sampling and analyzing the same with the aid of expert consultants
27 and Plaintiff to perform analyses of liability and exposure prior to attendance of
28 the mediation in this matter;

- h. reviewing policy documents from Defendant and researching applicable defenses;
- i. preparation of the mediation brief and damages model for use at mediation;
- j. attendance at the mediations by all Parties and Counsel;
- k. communicating with Plaintiff;
- l. negotiating, finalizing and fully executing the settlement agreement; and
- m. preparing and filing the instant Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement and supporting documents.

26. WLF's current lodestar reflects the efficiencies achieved by attorneys experienced in this field with 241.2 hours of work resulting in \$202,155.00 in fees. The chart below shows the calculation of hours spent by each of WLF's attorneys on this case:

Attorney	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Benjamin H. Haber	69.5	\$950.00	\$66,025.00
Daniel J. Kramer	87.6	\$850.00	\$74,460.00
Angela Leong	37.5	\$750.00	\$28,125.00
Giancarlo A. Recinos	6.3	\$950.00	\$5,985.00
Justin F. Marquez ¹	15.0	\$1,500.00	\$22,500.00
Coley Hayes	7.8	\$200.00	\$1,560.00
Rebecca Padilla	17.5	\$200.00	\$3,500.00
TOTAL	241.2		\$202,155.00

27. This amount does not include the time PAGA Counsel will spend at the PAGA approval hearing and assisting the Administrator following final approval. PAGA Counsel dedicated significant resources to this case by dividing the tasks required according to skill

¹ As described above, Justin F. Marquez is no longer with Wilshire Law Firm, PLC as of December 2024. I have conservatively estimated at least 15 hours of work by Mr. Marquez on this matter, which includes, but is not limited to, assisting with the intake process, investigation of the company, and filing of the complaint; participating in numerous meetings with Mr. Kramer and myself regarding the case and case strategy. His hourly rate was \$1,500 before he left Wilshire Law Firm.

1 level. The hours expended by each attorney were not duplicative and reflect the extensive
2 investigation and analysis that was required to achieve this Settlement. This time could have
3 been spent on other potentially lucrative cases. PAGA Counsel's lodestar reflects the
4 efficiencies achieved by attorneys experienced in this field. Moreover, PAGA Counsel has
5 singularly assumed the risk and costs of litigation purely on a contingency basis. And, while
6 Plaintiff is confident in the merits of his claims, a legitimate controversy exists as to each cause
7 of action, posing an actual risk that Plaintiff may not succeed at class certification and/or trial.
8 Any of these obstacles could have prevented recovery completely, meaning PAGA Counsel
9 would have been left with no compensation for all the time and money invested in litigating this
10 case. Despite these risks, PAGA Counsel took this case on a contingency basis so that
11 Aggrieved Employees (a particularly vulnerable group of hourly paid workers) could be
12 compensated for their unpaid wages. Consequently, PAGA Counsel was precluded from
13 focusing on, or taking on, other cases which could have resulted in a larger, and less risky,
14 monetary gain.

15 28. The Court should also consider that PAGA Counsel's efforts have resulted in
16 substantial benefits to the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees, in the form of a
17 significant, non-reversionary settlement fund established to compensate the State of California and
18 the Aggrieved Employees and to punish Defendant for the alleged PAGA violations. Without the
19 efforts of PAGA Counsel, the claims alleged in the complaint would likely have gone without
20 remedy.

21 29. In litigation costs, WLF has incurred \$18,382.83 in expenses on items such as
22 filing fees, service fees, mediation fees, and expert fees. All the costs incurred were reasonable and
23 necessary for the prosecution of this case. Additionally, we anticipate incurring \$300.00 in future
24 costs for filing fees and service fees for a total of \$18,682.83 in costs. PAGA Counsel's costs did
25 not reach the maximum of \$30,000.00, the remaining \$11,317.17 will revert to the NSA to be
26 distributed as PAGA Penalties to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees. A true and correct copy
27 of WLF's cost reports in this matter is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

28 30. PAGA Counsel has negotiated a settlement here that they believe is fair,

1 reasonable, and adequate based on their prior experience litigating these types of cases.

2 31. Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699(s)(1), Plaintiff submitted a copy
3 of the PAGA Complaint to the LWDA on February 20, 2024. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 6** is a
4 true and correct copy of the submission confirmation for the PAGA Complaint. Pursuant to
5 California Labor Code Section 2699(s)(2), Plaintiff submitted the proposed Settlement Agreement
6 to the LWDA on September 29, 2026. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 7** is a true and correct copy of
7 the submission confirmation for the proposed Settlement Agreement. To date, the LWDA has not
8 responded to or objected to the Settlement in this matter. Plaintiff will submit a copy of the Court's
9 judgment and order approving the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA within ten (10) days after
10 entry of judgment or order.

11 32. WLF has no actual or potential conflict of interest with the Aggrieved Employees
12 in this PAGA Action or with the Administrator that the Parties agreed to appoint, Apex Class
13 Action Administration.

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

16 Executed on September 29, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

17
18 
19 Benjamin H. Haber

EXHIBIT 1

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

3055 Wilshire Blvd, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Tel: (213) 381-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9989
www.wilshirelawfirm.com



Bobby Saadian, Esq. JD/MBA

Colin M. Jones, Esq.
Justin F. Marquez, Esq.
John G. Yslas, Esq.
Jon Teller, Esq.
Johnny Ogata, Esq.
Tae Kim, Esq.

Benjamin H. Haber, Esq.
Christina M. Le, Esq.
Daniel Kramer, Esq.
Arsiné Grigoryan, Esq.
Arrash T. Fattahi, Esq.
Zachary D. Greenberg, Esq.
Aram Boyadjian, Esq.

December 12, 2023

LWDA
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
(Via Online Submission)

Crothall Healthcare, Inc.
1500 Liberty Ridge Drive, Suite 210
Wayne, PA 19087
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6577 3117 74

Cothall Healthcare, Inc.
Tax Department
2400 Yorkmont Road
Charlotte, NC 28217
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6577 3117 98

CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent for Service of Process for: Crothall Healthcare, Inc.
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6577 3117 81

Re: ***Terrill Pointer v. Crothall Healthcare, Inc.***
Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Terrill Pointer (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Crothall Healthcare, Inc. (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s Aggrieved Employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue this action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of

the State of California, as well as on behalf of all other persons who worked for Defendant in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Plaintiff’s Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns/owned and operates/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendant’s business in California, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Plaintiff Terrill Pointer is a California resident who worked for Defendant in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately October 2022 to approximately July 2023. During Plaintiff’s employment for Defendant, Defendant paid Plaintiff an hourly wage and classified him as non-exempt from overtime. Defendant typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

Throughout Plaintiff’s employment, Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendant terminated his employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to indemnify Plaintiff for expenditures. As discussed below, Plaintiff’s experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Defendant Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and Overtime Wages

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “Hours worked” is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work “off-the-clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work-related duties during unpaid meal periods and after clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully failed to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the calculation of Plaintiff’s and the other Aggrieved Employees’ regular rate of pay used to calculate their overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages. Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the same pay periods where they worked overtime hours. Accordingly, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime compensation they were owed.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding and/or synthetic timekeeping for a portion of the statutory period that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant’s operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the

Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendant continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendant continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages

for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 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 that if an employee voluntarily leaves 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 previous 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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an

accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Defendant violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, the use of personal cell phones. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred

substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, but Defendant failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:


1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures;

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM



Justin F. Marquez, Esq.

EXHIBIT 2

PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between Plaintiff Terrill Pointer (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Crothall Healthcare, Inc. (“Defendant”). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as “Parties,” or individually as “Party.”

1. DEFINITIONS.

- 1.1. “Action” means the Plaintiff’s representative lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) against Defendant captioned *Terrill Pointer v. Crothall Healthcare, Inc.*, case number 23STCV26517 initiated on October 30, 2023 and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles.
- 1.2. “Administrator” means Apex Class Action Administration, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.
- 1.3. “Administration Expenses Payment” means the amount the Administrator will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to reimburse its reasonable fees and expenses in accordance with the Administrator’s “not to exceed” bid submitted to the Court in connection with approval of this Settlement.
- 1.4. “Aggrieved Employee” means a person employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt or hourly paid employee who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period.
- 1.5. “Aggrieved Employee Data” means Aggrieved Employee identifying information in Defendant’s possession including the Aggrieved Employee’s name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, and number of PAGA Pay Periods the Aggrieved Employee worked.
- 1.6. “Aggrieved Employee Address Search” means the Administrator’s investigation and search for current Aggrieved Employee mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Aggrieved Employees.
- 1.7. “Court” means the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.
- 1.8. “Defense Counsel” means Lonnie Giamela, Shaun J. Voigt, Rassa Ahmadi, and Lilit Vardanian of Fisher & Phillips LLP
- 1.9. “Effective Date” means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Approving the PAGA Settlement and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if there is no appeal, the date that is 61 days after the Judgment; (b)

if there is an appeal of the Court's Judgment, the date the Order Approving the PAGA Settlement and Judgment are affirmed on appeal, the date of dismissal of such appeal, or the expiration of the time to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the California Supreme Court; or (iii) if a petition for writ of certiorari is filed, the date of denial of the petition for writ of certiorari, or the date the Order Approving the PAGA Settlement and Judgment are affirmed pursuant to such petition.

- 1.10. "Gross Settlement Amount" means the total sum of One Million One Hundred and Ninety-Seven Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$1,197,000.00), which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement except as provided in Paragraph 8 below. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay the PAGA Representative Service Award, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administrator's Expenses Payment.
- 1.11. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods (defined below) the Aggrieved Employee worked.
- 1.12. "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon an order granting approval of the Settlement.
- 1.13. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the agency entitled, under California Labor Code, section 2699, subd. (i).
- 1.14. "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under California Labor Code, section 2699, subd. (i).
- 1.15. "Net Settlement Amount" means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: PAGA Representative Service Award, PAGA Counsel Fees Payment, PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment.
- 1.16. "PAGA Counsel" means Benjamin H. Haber, Daniel J. Kramer, Angela Leong, and Alan Wilcox of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, the attorneys representing the Plaintiff in the Action.
- 1.17. "PAGA Counsel Fees Payment" and "PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts allocated to PAGA Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Action.
- 1.18. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.
- 1.19. "PAGA Period" means the period from December 12, 2022, to December 28, 2025.

- 1.20. “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (California Labor Code, sections 2698, et seq.).
- 1.21. “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiff’s December 12, 2023 letter to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to California Labor Code, section 2699.3, subd.(a).
- 1.22. “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Net Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees and the 75% to LWDA in settlement of PAGA claims.
- 1.23. “Plaintiff” means Terrill Pointer, the named plaintiff in the Action.
- 1.24. “Approval Order” means the proposed Court Order Granting Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.25. “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released by the Plaintiff and PAGA Counsel and as described in Paragraph 5 below.
- 1.26. “Released Parties” means: Defendant and any of its past, present, and future direct or indirect parents, subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, affiliates, sectors, divisions, assigns, joint venturers, third parties, and other related entities, as well as each of their present and/or future officers, directors, administrators, trustees, staff, members, managers, employees, agents, representatives, insurers, re-insurers, partners, investors, and shareholders, including but not limited to Compass Group USA, Inc., as well as any individual or entity which could be jointly liable with Defendant.
- 1.27. “Settlement” means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.
- 1.28. Defendant means Crothall Healthcare, Inc., the named defendant in the Action.

2. RECITALS.

- 2.1. On October 30, 2023, Plaintiff commenced this Action by filing a Complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant for: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (7) failure to indemnify necessary business expenses; and (8) violation of California’s Unfair Competition Law, California Business and Professions Code, sections 17200, et seq. (“Class Action”). On February 20, 2024, after exhausting the requisite 65-day notice period under PAGA, Plaintiff amended the Class Action Complaint adding a single PAGA cause of action against Defendant. On August

27, 2024, the Court in the Class Action granted the Parties' joint stipulation to dismiss class claims and submit individual claims to arbitration. The amended Class Action Complaint is the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint"). Defendant denies the allegations in the Operative Complaint, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Operative Complaint, and denies any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.

- 2.2. Pursuant to California Labor Code, section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff gave timely written notice to Defendant and the LWDA by sending the PAGA Notice.
- 2.3. On October 28, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Phillip Cha, Esq. which led to this Agreement to settle the Action.
- 2.4. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained, through informal discovery, a sampling of time and pay records for the Aggrieved Employees, as well as documents that described Defendant's policies and procedures during the PAGA Period.
- 2.5. The Parties, PAGA 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. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 8 below, Defendant promises to pay One Million One Hundred and Ninety-Seven Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$1,197,000.00), and no more, as the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount, or any portion thereof, prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount pursuant to Paragraph 4.4 of this Agreement without asking or requiring Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.
- 3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in its order granting approval of the Settlement:
 - 3.2.1. To PAGA Representative Plaintiff: Plaintiff shall apply for the PAGA Representative Service Award of not more than \$10,000.00 (in addition to any Individual PAGA Payment the Plaintiff is entitled to receive as an Aggrieved Employee). Defendant will not oppose Plaintiff's request for a PAGA Representative Service Award that does not exceed this amount. If the Court approves a PAGA Representative Service Award less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Gross Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the PAGA Representative

Service Award using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the PAGA Representative Service Award.

- 3.2.2. To PAGA Counsel: Plaintiff and/or PAGA Counsel will file an application or motion for the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Litigation Expenses Payment. The PAGA Counsel Fees Payment shall not exceed 33 1/3% of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be \$399,000.00 and PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than \$30,000. Defendant will not oppose requests for Court approval of the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Litigation Expenses Payment provided they do not exceed the amounts stated herein. If the Court approves a PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and/or a PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Gross Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to PAGA Counsel or any other Plaintiff's Counsel arising from any claim to any portion any PAGA Counsel Fee Payment and/or PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. PAGA Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for any and all taxes that may be owed on the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and the PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant and the Released Parties, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these Payments.
- 3.2.3. To the Administrator: An Administrator Expenses Payment, not to exceed \$12,000.00, except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses incurred are less than this amount, or the Court approves the Administration Expenses Payment in an amount less than \$12,000.00, the Administrator will allocate the remainder of the funds to the Gross Settlement Amount.
- 3.2.4. To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount to be paid from the Net Settlement Amount, with 75% allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.
- 3.2.4.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by: (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' collective 25% share of PAGA Penalties by the total number of Pay Periods worked by the Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period, and (b) multiplying the resulting sum by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes that may be owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

3.2.4.2.If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Gross Settlement Amount. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.

- 4.1. Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on a review of its records to date, Defendant estimates there are 1,913 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total 56,731 of PAGA Pay Periods.
- 4.2. Aggrieved Employee Data. Within twenty (20) calendar days after the Court's preliminary approval of the Settlement, Defendant will deliver the Aggrieved Employee Data to the Administrator in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect the Aggrieved Employees' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Aggrieved Employee Data in confidence, use the Aggrieved Employee Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Aggrieved Employee Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Aggrieved Employee Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendant has a continuing duty to immediately notify PAGA Counsel if it discovers that the Aggrieved Employee Data omitted employee identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Aggrieved Employee Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendant must send the Aggrieved Employee 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 Aggrieved Employee Data.
- 4.3. Funding of Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date.
- 4.4. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within 14 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks to the respective addressees for all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the PAGA Counsel Fee and Expenses Payment. Disbursement of the PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment shall not precede disbursement of Individual PAGA Payments.
 - 4.4.1. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the 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. Before mailing any checks, the Settlement Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database.

- 4.4.2. The Administrator must conduct an Aggrieved Employee Address Search for all 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 Aggrieved Employee Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Aggrieved Employees whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Aggrieved Employee whose original check was lost or misplaced, provided the Aggrieved Employee requests the replacement check prior to the void date.
- 4.4.3. For any Aggrieved Employee 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 Aggrieved Employee.
- 4.4.4. The payment of Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate Defendant to confer any additional benefits or make any additional payments to the Aggrieved Employees (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 Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and PAGA Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

- 5.1 Plaintiff's General Release of All Claims. Plaintiff and his respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys (including PAGA Counsel), heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge the Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the PAGA Period, including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that arise from or are related to Plaintiff's employment with Defendant and the cessation thereof; and (b) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice ("Plaintiff's Release"). Plaintiff's Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the PAGA Period. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them.

- 5.1.1 Plaintiff's Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code, Section 1542. For purposes of Plaintiff's Release, Plaintiff expressly waives and

relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of California Civil Code, section 1542, which reads:

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

- 5.2 Release by Aggrieved Employees: Plaintiff, acting in his representative capacity as the authorized proxy of the LWDA pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, releases on behalf of the State of California, 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 all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice, which occurred during the PAGA Period, including but not limited to, any claims for civil penalties based on Defendant's alleged failure to pay minimum, straight time, and overtime wages and/or failure to pay minimum, straight time, and overtime wages at the correct rate(s) of pay, failure to provide legally compliant meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to timely pay final wages at termination, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, failure to maintain accurate records, and unfair business practices.
- 5.3 Release by PAGA Counsel: PAGA Counsel release on behalf of their present and former attorneys, employees, agents, successors and assigns, the Released Parties from all claims for attorneys' fees and expenses incurred in connection with the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice.

6. MOTION OR APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT. The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file an application or motion for approval of this Settlement.

- 6.1 Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining approval of this Settlement under California Labor Code, section 2699, subd. (f)(2)), including: (i) draft proposed Order Granting Approval of the Settlement; (ii) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve, competency, operative procedures for protecting the security of Aggrieved Employee 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 Aggrieved Employees or the LWDA, and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiff, PAGA Counsel, or Defense Counsel; (iii) a signed declaration from PAGA Counsel attesting to its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (California Labor Code, section 2699.3, subd. (a)),

Operative Complaint (California Labor Code, section 2699, subd. (1)(1)), this Agreement (California Labor Code, section 2699, subd. (1)(2)); and all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with the Aggrieved Employees and/or the Administrator. In their Declarations, Plaintiff and PAGA 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.

- 6.2 Responsibilities of PAGA Counsel. PAGA Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the application or motion for approval of this Settlement no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement and, if necessary, obtaining a prompt hearing date for the motion and appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the motion. PAGA Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.
- 6.3 Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed application or motion for approval of this Settlement and/or the supporting declarations and documents, PAGA 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 the motion for approval of this Settlement or conditions its approval on any material change to this Agreement, PAGA 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. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

- 7.1 Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Apex Class Action Administration to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Apex Class Action Administration agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Parties and their counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.
- 7.2 Employer Identification Number. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports state and federal tax authorities.
- 7.3 Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under United States Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.
- 7.4 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. **AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE SIZE ESTIMATES and ESCALATOR CLAUSE.**

Based on its records, Defendant estimates that, as of the date of mediation, there were 1,913 Aggrieved Employees who worked 56,731 PAGA Pay Periods. In the event the actual number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees increases by more than 10% (or 5,673 PAGA Pay Periods), then Defendant shall increase the Gross Settlement Amount on a proportional basis in excess of ten percent (i.e., if there were an eleven percent (11%) increase in the number of PAGA Pay Periods, then Defendant will increase the Gross Settlement Amount by 1%). However, should the number of PAGA Pay Periods increase by more than 10% (i.e., more than 62,404 PAGA Pay Periods), Defendant may elect, in its sole discretion, to limit the PAGA Period to the time at which the number of PAGA Pay Periods reaches 62,404, which may not be earlier than November 7, 2025.

9. **CONTINUING JURISDICTION OF THE COURT.** The Parties agree that, after entry of 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.

9.1 **Waiver of Right to Appeal.** Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the PAGA Counsel Fees Payment and PAGA Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, the Parties, their respective counsel 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 another party 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. **ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.**

10.1 **No Admission of Liability 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 Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendant has any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement, only. If, for any reason the Court does not approve this Settlement, Defendant reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Action, and Plaintiff reserves the right 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).

- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 Attorney Authorization. PAGA Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiff and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.
- 10.4 Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Settlement Agreement, submitting supplemental evidence, and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will seek the assistance of a mediator and/or the Court for resolution.
- 10.5 No Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.
- 10.6 No Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiff, PAGA Counsel, Defendant, nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 C.F.R., Part 10, as amended), or otherwise.
- 10.7 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.
- 10.8 Agreement Binding on Successors. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.
- 10.9 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.
- 10.10 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 of the Agreement.

- 10.11 Confidentiality. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during Action and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.
- 10.12 Use and Return of Aggrieved Employee Data. Information provided to PAGA Counsel pursuant to California Evidence Code, section 1152, and all copies and summaries of the Aggrieved Employee Data provided to PAGA Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement, and no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court. Not later than 90 days after the Administrator discharges its obligation to pay out of all settlement funds, Plaintiff shall destroy all paper and electronic versions of Aggrieved Employee Data received from Defendant unless, prior to the Administrator's payment of all settlement funds, Defendant makes a written request to PAGA Counsel for the return, rather than the destructions, of Aggrieved Employee Data.
- 10.13 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.
- 10.14 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.
- 10.15 Notice. All notices, demands, or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States Mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiff:

Benjamin H. Haber (benjamin.haber@wilshirelawfirm.com)
Daniel J. Kramer (daniel.kramer@wilshirelawfirm.com)
Angela Leong (angela.leong@wilshirelawfirm.com)
Alan Wilcox (alan.wilcox@wilshirelawfirm.com)
Wilshire Law Firm, PLC
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 784-3830
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

To Defendant:

Lonnie Giamela (lgiamela@fisherphillips.com)
Shaun J. Voigt (svoigt@fisherphillips.com)
Rassa L. Ahmadi (rahmadi@fisherphillips.com)
Lilit Vardanian (lvardanian@fisherphillips.com)
Fisher & Phillips LLP
444 South Flower Street, Suite 1500
Los Angeles, California 90071-2957
Telephone: (213) 330-4454
Facsimile: (213) 330-4501

10.16 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.

10.17 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 Court shall retain jurisdiction for purposes of enforcing this Agreement pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, section 664.6. The Parties further agree that, upon the signing of this Agreement, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, section 583.330, the date to bring a case to trial under California Code of Civil Procedure, section 583.310, shall be extended for the entire period of this settlement process as set forth in this Agreement.

Dated: 05/22/2026


Terrill Pointer (May 22, 2026 10:27:14 PDT)

Terrill Pointer
Plaintiff

Dated: May 22, 2026


WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC

Benjamin Haber
Daniel Kramer
Angela Leong
Alan Wilcox
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: 5/20/2026

DocuSigned by:

BHAVIN PATEL

419068794C2C4FA...

By: Bhavin Patel
Title: Assistant General Counsel
Crothall Healthcare, Inc.

Dated: May 26, 2026



FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP
Lonnie Giamela
Shaun J. Voigt
Rassa L. Ahmadi
Lilit Vardanian
Attorneys for Defendant

EXHIBIT 3



ELM Solutions

2025 Real Rate Report[®] powered by LegalVIEW[®] DynamicInsights

The industry's leading
analysis of law firm rates,
trends, and practices

Report Editor**Jennifer McIver**

Director, Legal Operations and Industry Insights
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Lead Data Analysts**Anand Kumar Pathinettam Padian**

Software and Data Engineer
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Farhan Shaikh

Data Scientist
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

ELM Solutions Creative**David Andrews**

Senior Graphic Designer
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Contributing Analysts and Authors**Haemi Jung**

Strategic Business Intelligence Manager
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Manish Sharma

Director, Business Analysis
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Karen Sekley-Dandrea

Director, Marketing
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Mat Greener

Project & Program Management Director
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Executive Sponsor**Brian Jorgenson**

Vice President, Product Management
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

©2004 - 2025 Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions. All rights reserved. This material may not be reproduced, displayed, modified, or distributed in any form without the express prior written permission of the copyright holders. To request permission, please contact:

Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions
2929 Allen Pkwy Ste 3300
Houston, TX 77019 United States
ATTN: Marketing
ELMSolutionsSales@wolterskluwer.com

LEGAL CAVEAT

Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions has worked to ensure the accuracy of the information in this report powered by LegalVIEW DynamicInsights; however, we cannot guarantee accuracy in all cases. Neither this report nor LegalVIEW DynamicInsights constitute legal, accounting, or professional advice and should not be used as such. This material should not be construed as a substitute for professional advice based on specific facts or circumstances. ELM Solutions is not responsible for any claims or losses arising from reliance on the information or recommendations included in this solution. [View terms of use.](#)

Table of Contents - 2025 Real Rate Report

A Letter to Our Readers • 4

Real Rate Report Overview • 5

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts • 9

- Partners, Associates, and Paralegals
- Partners, Associates, and Paralegals by Practice Area and Matter Type
- Partners and Associates by City
- Partners and Associates by City and Matter Type
- Partners by City and Years of Experience
- Associates by City and Years of Experience
- Partners and Associates by Firm Size and Matter Type

Section II: Industry Analysis • 71

- Partners, Associates, and Paralegals by Industry Group
- Partners and Associates by Industry Group and Matter Type
- Basic Materials and Utilities
- Consumer Goods
- Consumer Services
- Financials (Excluding Insurance)
- Health Care
- Industrials
- Insurance
- Technology and Telecommunications

Section III: Practice Area Analysis • 98

- Bankruptcy and Collections
- Commercial
- Corporate: Mergers, Acquisitions, and Divestitures
- Corporate: Other
- Corporate: Regulatory and Compliance
- Employment and Labor
- Environmental
- Finance and Securities
- General Liability (Litigation Only)
- Insurance Defense (Litigation Only)
- Intellectual Property: Other
- Intellectual Property: Patents
- Intellectual Property: Trademarks
- Real Estate

Section IV: In-Depth Analysis for Select US Cities • 201

- Boston, MA
- Chicago, IL
- Los Angeles, CA
- New York, NY
- Philadelphia, PA
- San Francisco, CA
- Washington, DC

Section V: International Analysis • 226

Section VI: Matter Staffing Analysis • 255

Appendix: Data Methodology • 259

NOTE:

You may experience an issue that can sometimes occur in PDF viewer. Thin lines (like table borders) may appear to “disappear” or look broken when zoomed out in a PDF viewer. This is usually a display/rendering issue rather than a problem with the actual content of the PDF.

Solution:

- Open the PDF in Acrobat and go to Edit > Preferences > Page Display.
- Uncheck Enhance thin lines (if it's checked).
- Restart Acrobat and reopen the PDF.

A Letter to Our Readers

Welcome to the latest edition of the Real Rate Report®, the legal industry's most trusted benchmark for legal billing rates.

Since 2010, the Real Rate Report has helped legal departments and law firms make smarter decisions about pricing, resourcing, and vendor management. That hasn't changed. What has changed is how we deliver those insights.

This year, the Real Rate Report is powered by LegalVIEW® DynamicInsights—our new digital-first platform that brings the same trusted LegalVIEW data to life in a more interactive, flexible, and timely way. Leveraging Wolters Kluwer's LegalVIEW database, with over \$200B in anonymized, approved, invoice data, LegalVIEW DynamicInsights offers dynamic filters, quarterly updates, and calendar-year alignment to help users tailor benchmarks to their unique needs, on demand.

The Real Rate Report remains a vital snapshot of the market, and we know many of you rely on it as a reference tool. But DynamicInsights goes further. It enables deeper exploration of rate trends by role, experience, geography, practice area, industry, and more. Whether you're negotiating rates, evaluating law firm performance, or planning budgets, DynamicInsights gives you the agility and precision today's legal environment demands.

As always, we welcome your feedback and thank our data contributors for making this work possible. We're proud to be your partner in legal analytics and look forward to continuing to deliver insights that drive better business outcomes.

Sincerely,



Brian Jorgenson

Vice President, Product Management
Wolters Kluwer ELM Solutions

Real Rate Report Overview

The Real Rate Report is powered by LegalVIEW DynamicInsights, a web-based solution that delivers dynamic, invoice-backed insights through approved legal billing rates. It enables legal professionals to analyze rate trends by role, experience, industry, geography, practice area, and more using the world's largest repository of legal spend data.

DynamicInsights leverages the same trusted LegalVIEW database that has powered the Real Rate Report for years, now encompassing over \$200B+ in anonymized, approved legal invoice data. As with previous Real Rate Reports, our data is sourced from corporations' and law firms' e-billing and time management solutions. We have included lawyer and paralegal rate data filtered by specific practice and sub-practice areas, metropolitan areas, and types of matters. This level of granularity gives legal departments and law firms the precision they need to identify areas of opportunity.

What's different with DynamicInsights?

Same source, same methodology: DynamicInsights uses the same rigorous data validation and methodology as the Real Rate Report.

- **Enhanced flexibility:** With dynamic filters, DynamicInsights enables users to tailor benchmarks to their unique needs and on demand.
- **Full year data:** DynamicInsights now aligns to a calendar year view—January through December—replacing the previous July-to-June format used in the Real Rate Report, reducing confusion and improving consistency across reporting periods.
- **More up to date:** Unlike the annual and static Real Rate Report, DynamicInsights is refreshed quarterly, offering more timely insights.
- **Digital-first access:** Delivered via a secure online interface, users can interact with the data, bookmark views, and share insights in real time.

DynamicInsights provides the same level of credibility and analytical power long trusted in the Real Rate Report with more agility and transparency for today's legal environment.

2025 Real Rate Report use considerations

- Examines law firm rates over time
- Identifies rates by location, experience, firm size, areas of expertise, industry, and timekeeper role (i.e., partner, associate, and paralegal)
- Itemizes variables that drive rates up or down

All the analyses included in DynamicInsights and this report are derived from the actual rates charged by law firm professionals as recorded on invoices submitted and approved for payment.

Examining real, approved rate information, along with the ranges of those rates and their changes over time, highlights the role these variables play in driving aggregate legal cost and income. The analyses can energize questions for both corporate clients and law firm principals.

Legal departments might ask whether they are paying the right amount for different types of legal services, while law firm principals might ask whether they are charging the right amount for legal services and whether to modify their pricing approach.

Examples of data to consider when reviewing rates:

- **Industry** – Compare spend and rate trends across various industries
- **Practice area** – Analyze cost variations in different legal practice areas
- **Detailed practice area** – Drill down into niche legal specialties for precise benchmarking
- **Am Law** – Benchmark against top-ranked law firms for competitive rate analysis
- **City** – Understand rate trends in specific metropolitan areas
- **Country** – Gain a global perspective on legal costs and spend management
- **Role** – Assess legal spend distribution across different law firm roles

Real Rate Report Overview

Understanding key statistical terms

To help interpret the legal rate data presented in DynamicInsights and this report, it's important to understand the statistical measures used. Below are definitions of the core metrics:

- **Mean (average):** The sum of all rate values divided by the total number of values added. It provides a general sense of the central tendency of the rates but can be influenced by extreme values (outliers).
- **Median:** The middle value when all rates are arranged in ascending order. If there is an even number of rates being analyzed, the median is the average of the two middle rates. It is a robust measure of central tendency of rates that is less affected by outliers.
- **First quartile (Q1):** The value below which 25% of the rates fall. It marks the lower boundary of the middle 50% of the rates and helps identify the lower range of typical values.
- **Third quartile (Q3):** The value below which 75% of the rates fall. It marks the upper boundary of the middle 50% of the rates and helps identify the upper range of typical values.
- **n:** The number of unique timekeepers contributing to the data.

These metrics are used to provide a more nuanced view of legal rates, helping users identify trends, outliers, and benchmarks across various dimensions.

See clearly. Spend wisely.

Step into the future of legal spend management with responsibly developed AI-powered solutions.



Our innovative Total Spend Management approach leverages AI-powered capabilities to empower intelligent workflows and improved outcomes.



Up to 10% savings on legal spend



Up to 20% improvement in billing guideline compliance



Increased efficiencies free up time for more value-add work






LegalVIEW® DynamicInsights

Legal rates keep climbing and 2026 will be no exception. Stay ahead with award-winning insights designed to give your team the edge in every negotiation.

Data that wins awards...and rate negotiations

- **Unmatched Data Power:** Leverages over **\$200B** in invoice-backed legal spend data to deliver deep, actionable insights.
- **Strategic Legal Spend Management:** Empowers legal teams to negotiate smarter, plan more effectively, and control costs with greater precision.
- **Enhanced Transparency & Collaboration:** Strengthens law firm-client relationships through data-driven transparency and benchmarking.
- **Insight-Driven Decision Making:** Enables analysis across key dimensions to support strategic negotiations and financial optimization.





Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

All data and analysis based on
data collected thru Q2 2025

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

Cities
By Role

2025 Real Rates for Associate and Partner

Trend Analysis - Mean

City	Role	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Los Angeles CA	Partner	565	\$517	\$925	\$1,365	\$993	\$979	\$913
	Associate	518	\$485	\$720	\$982	\$761	\$741	\$684
Louisville KY	Partner	32	\$291	\$395	\$500	\$411	\$395	\$380
	Associate	19	\$275	\$290	\$342	\$304	\$274	\$268
Madison WI	Partner	10	\$275	\$420	\$491	\$420	\$443	\$563
Memphis TN	Partner	22	\$325	\$394	\$470	\$404	\$428	\$387
Miami FL	Partner	191	\$250	\$525	\$733	\$547	\$570	\$575
	Associate	128	\$175	\$330	\$479	\$357	\$389	\$393
Milwaukee WI	Partner	32	\$364	\$459	\$649	\$524	\$581	\$525
	Associate	18	\$322	\$455	\$690	\$498	\$462	\$404
Minneapolis MN	Partner	138	\$475	\$694	\$918	\$692	\$673	\$637
	Associate	111	\$333	\$450	\$620	\$485	\$467	\$432

Section I: High-Level Data Cuts

Cities
By Years of Experience

2025 Real Rates for Partner						Trend Analysis - Mean		
City	Years of Experience	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Phoenix AZ	21 or More Years	25	\$350	\$490	\$674	\$559	\$499	\$540
Pittsburgh PA	Fewer Than 21 Years	41	\$501	\$600	\$810	\$669	\$658	\$599
	21 or More Years	72	\$480	\$691	\$860	\$705	\$733	\$669
Portland ME	21 or More Years	18	\$386	\$435	\$484	\$418	\$421	\$381
Portland OR	Fewer Than 21 Years	17	\$402	\$465	\$525	\$599	\$536	\$509
	21 or More Years	32	\$470	\$525	\$639	\$594	\$607	\$553
Raleigh NC	21 or More Years	12	\$396	\$475	\$510	\$489	\$477	\$477
Richmond VA	Fewer Than 21 Years	10	\$604	\$703	\$855	\$707	\$746	\$687
	21 or More Years	24	\$431	\$713	\$1,084	\$739	\$756	\$726
Salt Lake City UT	Fewer Than 21 Years	12	\$395	\$447	\$459	\$422	\$445	\$412
	21 or More Years	16	\$350	\$463	\$521	\$480	\$433	\$407
San Diego CA	21 or More Years	33	\$438	\$785	\$1,334	\$894	\$898	\$882



Section II: Industry Analysis

All data and analysis based on
data collected thru Q2 2025

Section II: Industry Analysis

Consumer Services

By Detailed Practice Area and
Matter Type

2025 - Real Rates for Associate and Partner

Trend Analysis - Mean

Practice Area	Matter Type	Role	n	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	2025	2024	2023
Employment and Labor: Discrimination, Retaliation and Harassment / EEO	Litigation	Partner	27	\$393	\$495	\$613	\$509	\$463	\$436
		Associate	19	\$400	\$475	\$493	\$437	\$387	\$370
Employment and Labor: Other	Litigation	Partner	24	\$564	\$692	\$1,252	\$956	\$782	\$683
		Associate	14	\$384	\$469	\$564	\$553	\$484	\$458
	Non-Litigation	Partner	25	\$450	\$574	\$695	\$579	\$573	\$548
		Associate	25	\$397	\$450	\$525	\$465	\$472	\$456
Intellectual Property: Patents	Non-Litigation	Partner	41	\$350	\$595	\$691	\$605	\$652	\$634
		Associate	51	\$208	\$373	\$517	\$382	\$378	\$389
Real Estate: Leasing	Non-Litigation	Partner	17	\$410	\$539	\$865	\$616	\$664	\$667
		Associate	10	\$278	\$404	\$617	\$482	\$444	\$478
Real Estate: Other	Non-Litigation	Partner	58	\$480	\$626	\$940	\$694	\$612	\$540
		Associate	39	\$320	\$460	\$733	\$503	\$468	\$415

EXHIBIT 4

Free Newsletter Sign Up

Business & Practice

Big Law Rates Topping \$2,000 Leave Value ‘In Eye of Beholder’

By Roy Strom

Column

June 9, 2022, 2:30 AM

Welcome back to the Big Law Business column on the changing legal marketplace written by me, Roy Strom. Today, we look at a new threshold for lawyers' billing rates and why it's so difficult to put a price on high-powered attorneys. Sign up to receive this column in your inbox on Thursday mornings. Programming note: Big Law Business will be off next week.

Some of the nation's top law firms are charging more than \$2,000 an hour, setting a new pinnacle after a two-year burst in demand.

Partners at Hogan Lovells and Latham & Watkins have crossed the threshold, according to court documents in bankruptcy cases filed within the past year.

Other firms came close to the mark, billing more than \$1,900, according to the documents. They include Kirkland & Ellis, Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, Boies Schiller Flexner, and Sidley Austin.

Simpson Thacher & Bartlett litigator Bryce Friedman, who helps big-name clients out of jams, especially when they're accused of fraud, charges \$1,965 every 60 minutes, according to a court document.

In need of a former acting US Solicitor General? Hogan Lovells partner Neal Katyal bills time at \$2,465 an hour. Want to hire famous litigator David Boies? That'll cost \$1,950 an hour (at least). Reuters was first to report their fees.

Eye-watering rates are nothing new for Big Law firms, which typically ask clients to pay higher prices at least once a year, regardless of broader market conditions.

"Value is in the eye of the beholder," said John O'Connor, a San Francisco-based expert on legal fees. "The perceived value of a good lawyer can reach into the multi-billions of dollars."

Kirkland & Ellis declined to comment on its billing rates. None of the other firms responded to requests to comment.

Charge It Up

Big Law firms are crossing the \$2,000-an-hour threshold after two years of surging rates driven by an increase in demand for lawyers.

Firm	Highest Billing Rate
Hogan Lovells	\$2,465
Latham & Watkins	\$2,075
Kirkland & Ellis	\$1,995
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett	\$1,965
Boies Schiller Flexner	\$1,950
Sidley Austin	\$1,900

Source: Court documents

Bloomberg Law

Law firms have been more successful raising rates than most other businesses over the past 15 years.

Law firm rates rose by roughly 40 percent from 2007 to 2020, or just short of 3 percent per year, Thomson Reuters Peer Monitor data show. US inflation rose by about 28% during that time.

The 100 largest law firms in the past two years achieved their largest rate increases in more than a decade, Peer Monitor says. The rates surged more than 6% in 2020 and grew another 5.6% through November of last year. Neither level had been breached since 2008.

The price hikes occurred during a once-in-a-decade surge in demand for law services, which propelled profits at firms to new levels. Fourteen law firms reported average profits per equity partner in 2021 over \$5 million, according to data from The American Lawyer. That was up from six the previous year.

The highest-performing firms, where lawyers charge the highest prices, have outperformed their smaller peers. Firms with leading practices in markets such as mergers and acquisitions, capital markets, and real estate were forced to turn away work at some points during the pandemic-fueled surge.

Firms receive relatively tepid pushback from their giant corporate clients, especially when advising on bet-the-company litigation or billion-dollar deals.

The portion of bills law firms collected—a sign of how willingly clients pay full-freight—rose during the previous two years after drifting lower following the Great Financial Crisis. Collection rates last year breached 90% for the first time since 2009, Peer Monitor data show.

Professional rules prohibit lawyers from charging “unconscionable” or “unreasonable” rates. But that doesn’t preclude clients from paying any price they perceive as valuable, said Jacqueline Vinaccia, a San Diego-based lawyer who testifies on lawyer fee disputes.

Lawyers’ fees are usually only contested when they will be paid by a third party.

That happened recently with Hogan Lovells’ Katyal, whose nearly \$2,500 an hour fee was contested in May by a US trustee overseeing a bankruptcy case involving a Johnson & Johnson unit facing claims its talc-based powders caused cancer.

The trustee, who protects the financial interests of bankruptcy estates, argued Katyal’s fee was more than \$1,000 an hour higher than rates charged by lawyers in the same case at Jones Day and Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom.

A hearing on the trustee’s objection is scheduled for next week. Hogan Lovells did not respond to a request for comment on the objection.

Vinaccia said the firm’s options will be to reduce its fee, withdraw from the case, or argue the levy is reasonable, most likely based on Katyal’s extensive experience arguing appeals.

Still, the hourly rate shows just how valuable the most prestigious lawyers’ time can be—even compared to their highly compensated competitors.

“If the argument is that Jones Day and Skadden Arps are less expensive, then you’re already talking about the cream of the crop, the top-of-the-barrel law firms,” Vinaccia said. “I can’t imagine a case in which I might argue those two firms are more reasonable than the rates I’m dealing with.”

Worth Your Time

On Cravath: Cravath Swaine & Moore is heading to Washington, opening its first new office since 1973 by hiring former heads of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Meghan Tribe reports the move comes as Big Law firms are looking to add federal government expertise as clients face more regulatory scrutiny.

On Big Law Promotions: It’s rare that associates get promotions to partner in June, but Camille Vasquez is now a Brown Rudnick partner after she shot to fame representing Johnny Depp in his defamation trial against ex-wife Amber Heard.

On Working From Home: I spoke this week with Quinn Emanuel’s John Quinn about why he thinks law firm life is never going back to the office-first culture that was upset by the pandemic. Listen to the podcast [here](#).



That's it for this week! Thanks for reading and please send me your thoughts, critiques, and tips.

To contact the reporter on this story: Roy Strom in Chicago at rstrom@bloomberglaw.com

To contact the editors responsible for this story: Chris Opfer at copfer@bloomberglaw.com; John Hughes at jhughes@bloombergindustry.com

Documents

[Trustee's Objection](#)

Related Articles

[Overworked Big Law Can't Find Enough Lawyers With Demand Surging](#)

Dec. 9, 2021, 3:00 AM

[Never Underestimate Big Law's Ability to Raise Billing Rates](#)

Aug. 12, 2021, 3:00 AM

Law Firms

Simpson Thacher
Hogan Lovells
Jones Day
Skadden
Sidley Austin
Quinn Emanuel
Cravath Swaine & Moore
Latham & Watkins
Kirkland & Ellis
Boies Schiller Flexner

Topics

expert fees
compensation of bankruptcy attorney
acquisitions
U.S. trustees
financial markets
client-paid legal fees
data breaches

Companies

Johnson & Johnson
Thomson Reuters Corp

EXHIBIT 5

Wilshire Law Firm, PLC
Transaction Detail by Account
All Transactions

11/8/2024
Accrual Basis

<u>Type</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Memo</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Balance</u>
COS						
Mediation Fees						
	8/13/2025	928	Mediation Fees - Cha Mediation Services	50% Mediation Fees	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
Total MEDIATION FEES					\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
Consultant Fees						
	11/6/2025	16514	Consultant Fee - Berger Consulting Group LLC	17.9 hours of work	\$10,292.50	\$10,292.50
Total CONSULTANT FEES					\$10,292.50	\$10,292.50
Filing Fees						
	11/01/2023	21524942	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	Complaint,CCCS,Summons-Atty Svc for Court Fili...	\$1,494.99	\$1,494.99
	12/14/2023		Filing Fee - Department of Industrial Relations	PAGA Notice Filing	\$75.00	\$1,569.99
	12/22/2023	69369	Filing Fee - Valpro Attorney Services, LLC	File POS	\$45.00	\$1,614.99
	12/22/2023	69301	Service Fee - Valpro Attorney Services, LLC	Serve Crothall Healthcare	\$141.00	\$1,755.99
	02/06/2024	22170029	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	ISCR	\$19.71	\$1,775.70
	02/09/2024	22208084	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	Ntc of posting JF	\$174.14	\$1,949.84
	02/20/2024	22268674	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	Amended Comp	\$19.71	\$1,969.55
	05/03/2024		Document Purchase - Los Angeles Superior Court	PA	\$1.00	\$1,970.55
	05/08/2024	22851374	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	JSCR	\$20.74	\$1,991.29
	06/06/2024	22170029(2)	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC		\$1.00	\$1,992.29
	06/06/2024	22208084(2)	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC		\$1.00	\$1,993.29
	06/06/2024	22268674(2)	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC		\$1.00	\$1,994.29
	08/21/2024	23568793	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	Joint Stat Conf Report	\$20.74	\$2,015.03
	09/06/2024		Document Purchase - Los Angeles Superior Court		\$2.00	\$2,017.03
	02/21/2025	24763855	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	SCR	\$23.44	\$2,040.47
	05/23/2025	25448225	Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	SCR	\$23.44	\$2,063.91
	07/28/2026		Filing Fee - One Legal LLC	SCR	\$24.53	\$2,088.44
Total FILING FEES					\$2,088.44	\$2,088.44
Other Costs						
	7/28/2023	E-3152199	DocuSign Envelope		\$1.89	\$1.89
Total OTHER COSTS					\$1.89	\$1.89
TOTAL					\$18,382.83	\$18,382.83

EXHIBIT 6

From: [DIR PAGA Unit](#)
To: [Rebecca Padilla](#)
Subject: Thank you for your Court Complaint Submission.
Date: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 5:56:36 PM

03/27/2024 05:56:19 PM

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

Item submitted: Court Complaint

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

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

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

EXHIBIT 7



Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

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

Date Tue 9/29/2026 2:36 PM

To Giancarlo Recinos' Team <Giancarlorecinosteam@wilshirelawfirm.com>

09/29/2026 02:35:58 PM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 09/29/2026 02:35:58 PM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-999402-23

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

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: [https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flabor.ca.gov%2FPrivate Attorneys General Act.htm&data=05%7C02%7Cdariane.rose%40wilshirelawfirm.com%7C0b23eb704dbd463e812808df1e71aef0%7C9ada260a4f194da187b814d372333753%7C1%7C0%7C639263145780674053%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRy.dWUsIiYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIslAIiOiJXaW4zMilslkFOljoitWFFpbCIsIldUljoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=OU5gY7DN%2FQitUhRfKpV91HyubQQi4M0DZ2%2B7zydcig4%3D&reserved=0](https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flabor.ca.gov%2FPrivate%20Attorneys%20General%20Act.htm&data=05%7C02%7Cdariane.rose%40wilshirelawfirm.com%7C0b23eb704dbd463e812808df1e71aef0%7C9ada260a4f194da187b814d372333753%7C1%7C0%7C639263145780674053%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRy.dWUsIiYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIslAIiOiJXaW4zMilslkFOljoitWFFpbCIsIldUljoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=OU5gY7DN%2FQitUhRfKpV91HyubQQi4M0DZ2%2B7zydcig4%3D&reserved=0)