

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ISALIAH MA and all others similarly situated

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

ISALIAH MA, an individual; on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and
the general public,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
FOR SENIORS, a California corporation;
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. 24STCV13396

) [Assigned for All Purposes to:
) The Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Dept. SS12]

) **DECLARATION OF AARON A. BARTZ IN**
) **SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL**
) **APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION**
) **SETTLEMENT**

) Date: December 4, 2025

) Time: 10:30 a.m.

) Dept: 12

- 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 licensed to practice before all courts of the State of California. I am the owner of Bartz Law Group APC, and Class Counsel for the Plaintiffs herein. I have personal knowledge of the facts herein. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to those facts under oath.

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL AND NOTICE TO CLASS MEMBERS

4. Pursuant to the Order, on August 7, 2025, the settlement administrator Xpand Legal (“Xpand”), mailed the Class Notice to the 227 class members. (*See* Declaration of Jonathan Paul).

6. The settlement fund is all in (except for the employer's share of payroll taxes, which Defendant shall pay in addition to the \$333,000 settlement), there is no claim form requirement, and no residual will revert to Defendant. No class member has opted out, and no class member has objected to the settlement. In the event a class member does not negotiate

(cash) his or her settlement check, the claims administrator shall distribute the unclaimed funds to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund. The average payment to each class member is approximately \$791.

SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT

7. In summary, the settlement fund is allocated as follows:

- (1) Net settlement fund: \$179,695;
- (2) Attorney's fees and costs: \$111,000 in attorneys' fees and \$15,304.83 in costs;
- (3) Settlement administrator expenses of \$7,000;
- (4) PAGA payment: \$10,000 (\$7,500 to the LWDA, and \$2,500 to aggrieved employees);
- (5) Class representative enhancement of \$10,000 for the named Plaintiff.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

8. This case arises out of wage and hour violations by Defendant Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors ("Defendant") against its current and former California employees. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's operative Complaint is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

9. Pursuant to *Kullar v. Footlocker Retail Inc.*, 168 Cal. App 4th 116, 118 and *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, the following describes the settlement's reasonableness. Plaintiff recognizes the expense and length of continued proceedings necessary to continue the litigation against Defendant through trial and through any possible appeals. Plaintiff has also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of denial of motion for class certification and the uncertain outcomes resulting from further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation.

10. On February 4, 2025, the parties attended a Mediation before Kelly Knight, Esq., and were able to reach a resolution of the case. Prior to attending Mediation, Defendant provided Plaintiff with class-wide data from which Plaintiff's Counsel could extrapolate a damage analysis

in preparation of mediation. There are a total of 227 Class Members and 20,101 workweeks in the Class Period from May 29, 2020 through June 24, 2025. There are also 173 aggrieved employees and 5,198 pay periods within the PAGA Period.

NATURE OF CLAIMS

11. Plaintiff's operative Complaint alleges claims for 1) Failure to Pay All Wages; 2) Waiting Time Penalties; 3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; 4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Proper Rest Periods; 5) Failure to Properly Maintain and Submit Itemized Wage Statements; 6) Unfair Business Practices; 7) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses; and 8) Violation of Labor Code § 2699 (PAGA). Plaintiff further alleges that he and the Class are entitled to damages, restitution, wages, attorneys' fees, and interest, among other remedies. The reasonable exposure and the reasonable settlement value for each of the alleged claims are as follows:

CLAIM	TOTAL EXPOSURE	SETTLEMENT VALUE
Failure to Pay Wages	\$950,841	\$190,168
Meal	\$2,285,448	\$228,545
Rest	\$1,226,383	\$122,638
Waiting time	\$726,588	\$72,658
Paystub	\$327,750	\$32,775
Reimbursement	\$232,000	\$23,200
PAGA	\$2,157,950	\$107,897
TOTAL	\$7,906,960	\$777,881

a. Overtime/Off-the-Clock Wage Violations

Labor Code § 510 provides that "[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek. . . shall be compensated at the rate of no

1 less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee.” Further, “[a]ny work
2 in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular
3 rate of pay . . . , [and] any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall
4 be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of an employee.”

5 Labor Code § 1194 states any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage is
6 entitled to recover the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage, including
7 interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees, and costs of suit.

8 Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to pay all wages due in numerous respects. **First**,
9 Plaintiff asserts that during their daily work shifts, Plaintiff and the putative class had to
10 routinely miss, cut short, or take late meal periods because Defendant was severely understaffed
11 and unequipped to deal with the overwhelming number of clients in urgent need of assistance.
12 Plaintiff further asserts that he and the class members were given no meal break schedules or the
13 time necessary to take such meal periods. Despite Defendant’s meal period policy appearing
14 lawful, Plaintiff contends that he and his fellow employees were required to always enter their
15 time in the company ADP time tracking application to reflect that a 30-minute lunch was taken
16 within the first five hours of their shifts or else face disciplinary consequences.

17 **Second**, Plaintiff and the class worked substantial off-the-clock overtime due to the
18 heavy volume of client needs that primarily occurred in the field and in having to respond to
19 client calls and supervisor emails during all hours of the day both before and after Plaintiff’s and
20 other employees’ work shifts and that Defendant had both actual and constructive knowledge of
21 the off-the-clock hours being worked. *See Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.*, 22 Cal.4th 575, 585
22 (2000) (work “suffered or permitted is work time,” and an employer’s actual or constructive
23 knowledge of such work obligates the employer to compensate the employee for such work).
24 Further, Plaintiff contends that Defendant’s supervisors made it clear to Plaintiff and the other
25 employees that they were not to log overtime hours in their ADP time tracking app or else they
26 were to face disciplinary action. Therefore, Defendant implemented a policy that Plaintiff and
27 the other employees would not be compensated for overtime hours, all the while knowing that
28

1 they were routinely required to work such overtime hours which resulted in violations of Labor
2 Code §§ 510 and 1194, and the relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders. The
3 California Supreme Court has held that an employer must pay its employees for *all* hours
4 worked. (*Troester v. Starbucks Corp.* (2018) 5 Cal. 5th 829, 847 (“An employer that requires its
5 employees to work minutes off the clock on a regular basis or as a regular feature of the job may
6 not evade the obligation to compensate the employee for that time by invoking the *de minimis*
7 doctrine.”).

8 Defendant contends that its payment policies were lawful, and that it paid for all time
9 worked by Plaintiff and the class members.

10 Plaintiff and his expert analyzed payroll and time records for the class members and
11 calculated that the total verdict value for this claim is approximately \$950,841. Plaintiff and his
12 expert assumed 15 minutes per shift of unpaid hours, based on the alleged auto-deduction policy
13 and discussions with the Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s expert reviewed payroll records for the class,
14 including pay period counts per year, and a weighted average rate of pay. Plaintiff places a
15 reasonable settlement value of the overtime/minimum wage claim at twenty percent of the total
16 verdict value, or **\$190,168**. This valuation takes into consideration Class Counsel’s analysis of
17 the law, and defenses alleged and evidence produced by the Defendant.

18 **b. Meal and Rest Period Claims**

19 i. Meal period liability and damages

20 Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and class members with a
21 duty-free 30-minute meal period for every five hours of work as is required by Labor Code § 512
22 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) and in violation of *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior*
23 *Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012). Failure to provide a meal in accordance with the applicable Wage
24 Order(s) results in payment by the employer of one additional hour of pay at the employee’s
25 regular rate of pay for each workday that the rest or meal period is not provided. (Labor Code §
26 226.7.) Defendant also cannot create “incentives to forego, or otherwise encourage[] the skipping
27 of legally protected breaks.” *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at 1040.

1 Plaintiff contends that Defendant's practice of administering its meal period policies is
2 unlawful. **First**, while Defendant's meal period policy appears to be facially compliant,
3 Defendant failed to schedule meal periods, and Plaintiff contends that meal periods were often
4 missed because of Defendant's practice of failing to account for meal periods, which resulted in
5 extensive and numerous violations.

6 **Second**, Plaintiff contends that, while the time records show meal periods were taken by
7 Plaintiff in accordance with California law, the meal breaks logged were entirely fictional as
8 Plaintiff and the other employees were coerced and pressured into logging such meal breaks
9 under threat of disciplinary action if they did not do so. Additionally, such "neat" or perfect time
10 records are immediately suspect. In *Safeway v. Superior Court* (2015) 238 Cal. App. 4th 1138,
11 1153, the Court counseled against arguments that are based on human perfection. The *Safeway*
12 Court stated "One explanation is human perfection: The defendants in *Safeway* never, ever erred.
13 This explanation is possible, but human perfection is rare." Accordingly, Plaintiff contends that
14 the "neat" and perfect meal periods of exactly 30 minutes at the exact same time each and every
15 shift lend themselves to a presumption that the meal periods were not accurately recorded, and
16 further, that there is in effect no record of any meal period having been given, since the utter
17 perfection of these records clearly indicate inaccuracy or, more presumably, that they were
18 coerced under threat of disciplinary action by Defendant.

19 **Third**, Plaintiff asserts that Defendant failed to pay meal period premiums at any time
20 during the class period. A complete lack of premium pay "would require perfection or, more
21 likely, a 'deep, system-wide error' in failing to pay such premiums." *In re Tea Station Inv.*, 2021
22 Bankr. LEXIS 2985, at *22 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2021). Therefore, the lack of meal period
23 premiums paid to the putative class demonstrates that Defendant had a pattern and practice of
24 neglecting to pay meal period premiums for meals which were late, short, interrupted, missed, or
25 on-duty – which represents significant liability exposure for Defendant.

26 Notwithstanding the above, Defendant contends that Plaintiff and class members had the
27 ability and in fact did take meal periods which is reflected in the time records. Defendants
28

1 contend that, if Plaintiff and the class members failed to take their lunch breaks, it was their own
2 choice, and therefore not actionable.

3 Class Counsel and their expert calculated the maximum verdict value of the meal break
4 claim to be approximately \$2,285,448. This calculation is based on a 100% violation rate for the
5 class members, and average rate of pay based on the payroll data for the class. Based on
6 discussions with Plaintiff and interviews of other Class Members, and the defenses raised,
7 Plaintiff believes he had a ten percent probability of recovering all of these damages.
8 Accordingly, Plaintiff contends the reasonable exposure of the meal break claim is
9 approximately **\$228,545**.

10 ii. Rest period liability and damages

11 Section 12(A) of the IWC Wage Order(s) states: “Every employer shall authorize and
12 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
13 each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily
14 at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However,
15 a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three
16 and one-half (3½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which
17 there shall be no deduction from wages.”

18 During rest periods, “employees must not only be relieved of work duties, but also be
19 freed from employer control over how they spend their time.” *Augustus v. ABM Sec. Servs., Inc.*,
20 2 Cal.5th 257, 270 (2016). Further, when an employer adopts common policies that prevent
21 employees from taking their rest breaks, it presents a common factual issue by which liability
22 may follow. *See Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.*, 181 Cal.App.4th 1286, 1304 (2010). Indeed, “[t]he
23 wage orders and governing statute do not countenance an employer’s exerting coercion against
24 the taking of, creating incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally
25 protected breaks.” *Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at 1040.

26 Plaintiff contends that Defendant did not authorize or permit Plaintiff or the class
27 members duty-free rest periods for several reasons. **First**, Defendant’s rest period policy appears
28

1 to be facially non-compliant as it states that employees must notify their supervisor if they intend
2 to leave the premises, which indicates that permission is required to go off-site during their rest
3 break in violation of California law.

4 **Second**, Defendant's record sampling reflected that no premium payments were
5 attributed to any rest period violations. A complete lack of premium pay "would require
6 perfection or, more likely, a 'deep, system-wide error' in failing to pay such premiums." *See*
7 *Safeway v. Superior Court* and *In re Tea Station Inv.*

8 **Third**, Plaintiff asserts that rest periods were routinely impossible to take due to
9 understaffing and high volume of client needs and, even if a break were taken, it was interrupted
10 with work inquiries and other duties, which is "irreconcilable with employees' retention of
11 freedom to use rest periods for their own purposes. *See Augustus, supra*, 2 Cal.5th at 270.

12 Defendant again contends that Plaintiff and class members had the ability and in fact did
13 take compliant rest breaks and that, if Plaintiff and the class members failed to take rest breaks, it
14 was their own choice, and therefore not actionable.

15 Class Counsel and their expert assumed a 50% violation rate for all shifts by class
16 members of 3.5 hours or more, based on discussions with Plaintiff and other class members.
17 Based on that assumption, Class Counsel calculated total violations across the class, multiplied
18 by an average rate of pay for the class members. As such, Class Counsel calculated the
19 maximum verdict value of the rest period claims to be approximately \$1,226,383. Based on the
20 defenses raised, the difficulty of proving rest period violations on a class wide basis, and the lack
21 of objective evidence proving such violations, Plaintiff believes he had a ten percent chance of
22 recovering all of the rest period damages. As such, Plaintiff believes the reasonable exposure of
23 the rest break claim is approximately **\$122,638**.

24 **c. Waiting Time Penalty**

25 The waiting time penalty claim is purely derivative. Class Counsel analyzed the data to
26 find that there are approximately 119 former employees included in the putative class that would
27 be eligible for the Labor Code §203 penalties. Class Counsel calculated the total verdict value at
28

1 approximately \$726,588. This amount was calculated by multiplying the average daily rate of
2 pay during the statutory period by 30, which is the maximum number of days allowable as
3 waiting time penalties under section 203, and then multiplying that by the total number of former
4 employees. Plaintiff further discounted the waiting time penalty claim based on risk and the fact
5 that waiting time penalties are not awarded if a good faith dispute exists as to whether the wages
6 were owing, including whether in fact non-California based employees would be entitled to
7 waiting time penalties. Further, the class would have the burden of proving a “willful”
8 withholding of wages. Plaintiff considered that under Labor Code §203 there is only a penalty if
9 "an employer willfully fails to pay" all wages due to an employee upon separation. Willfulness
10 does not exist if there is a "good faith dispute," in fact or law that wages were due, even if the
11 employer's reasoning ultimately proves incorrect. *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163
12 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1204; 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 13520 ("A 'good faith dispute' that any wages are
13 due occurs when an employer presents a defense, based in law or fact which, if successful, would
14 preclude any recover on the part of the employee. The fact that a defense is ultimately
15 unsuccessful will not preclude a finding that a good faith dispute did exist.")

16 Once Plaintiff determined the maximum reasonable exposure of the claim, Plaintiff
17 placed a settlement value of **\$72,658** or approximately ten percent of the reasonable exposure
18 value, based upon the above discounts applied to the reasonable settlement value of the claim.

19 **d. Paystub**

20 As to the paystub penalty, which is derivative of the other claims identified above, Class
21 Counsel arrived at a maximum reasonable exposure of this claim of approximately \$327,750.
22 This figure was arrived at by assuming that each wage statement that was provided to the class
23 members violated LC §226, and multiplying the number of pay periods during the statutory
24 period by \$50 for initial violations, and \$100 for subsequent violations.

25 Defendant argues that, even assuming there are any violations, which they deny, the fact
26 that derivative violations were minor and that the Defendant had presented evidence of a good
27 faith dispute as to any violation. *Hurst v. Buczek Enters., LLC* (N.D. Cal. 2012) 870 F.Supp.2d
28

1 810, 829 (no section 226 violation where the employer "makes a good faith claim" in its
2 defense); *Harris v. Vector Mktg. Corp.* (2009) 656 F.Supp.2d 1128, 1146 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (the
3 "employer did not knowingly and intentionally fail to provide itemized wage statements" where
4 there was a "good faith dispute").

5 Based on the raised defenses, as well as the risk of certification and related risks of
6 proving all violations, Plaintiff has placed a reasonable settlement value of **\$32,775** or ten
7 percent of the reasonable exposure of the pay stub claim.

8 **e. Reimbursement Claim**

9 Labor Code section 2802 provides, in pertinent part: "An employer shall indemnify his
10 or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct
11 consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of
12 the employer. . . ." The purpose of section 2802 is "to prevent employers from passing their
13 operating expenses on to their employees." *Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.*, 42 Cal.4th
14 554, 562 (2007).

15 Plaintiff alleges that he and other class members were required to use their own personal
16 cell phones for their work, reimbursement was required. *See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Serv.,*
17 *Inc.*, 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144 (2014) (finding that reimbursement for personal cell phone
18 usage required when mandatory for performing one's job). Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that he
19 also used his automobile to run work errands, and travel between different clinics during the day.

20 Defendant contends that Plaintiffs were paid for all of their expenses, and that they were
21 not required to use their cell phone for work purposes, that they were provided work cell phones,
22 and any other expenses incurred were appropriately reimbursed.

23 Based on testimony from Plaintiff and the class members, Plaintiff allocates \$50 per
24 month for the reimbursement claim. As such, the value of this claim as calculated by Plaintiff's
25 expert is approximately \$232,000. Based on the Defendant's defenses, and issues in proving the
26 reimbursement claim on a classwide basis, Plaintiff alleges he had a ten percent chance of
27
28

1 recovery here, and the realistic value of the reimbursement claim is therefore approximately
2 **\$23,200.**

3 **f. PAGA**

4 Plaintiff contends that PAGA penalties are owed based on the numerous alleged Labor
5 Code violations identified above. Once a PAGA violation is found, a court must award civil
6 penalties. *See Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2* (2008) 163 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1211-1213.

7 Nevertheless, a court has discretion to reduce the award of civil penalties if it finds that “based
8 on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award
9 that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(e)(2).

10 Significantly, moreover, because it is an open question regarding the Defendant’s
11 liability, there is a very real possibility that a court would substantially reduce the penalties, even
12 if they are proven. *See, e.g., Fleming v. Covidien, Inc.*, 2011 WL 7563047, *3-4 (C.D. Cal.
13 2011) (reducing penalties from \$2.8 million to \$500,000 based on wage statement violations
14 because to assess full penalties would be unjust and arbitrary); *Thurman v. Bayshore Transit*
15 *Mgmt., Inc.*, 203 Cal.App.4th 1112, 1134 (2012) (reduction of PAGA penalties by 30% affirmed
16 on appeal).

17 Class Counsel and their expert calculated the reasonable PAGA penalties to be valued at
18 \$2,157,950, which includes the stacking of penalties for numerous violations, as set forth above.
19 Based on the uncertainty of recovery on Plaintiff’s claims, Plaintiff believes the PAGA claim’s
20 reasonable value is five percent of the total value, or approximately **\$107,897.**

21 **g. Total Damage Exposure¹**

22 Plaintiff believes that the \$333,000 settlement achieved in this case is very good for the class
23 members. Based upon a reasonable exposure value of \$777,881, the settlement represents
24

25 ¹ The Unfair Competition claim is subsumed into the *Kullar* analysis above. The Unfair
26 Competition claim is based upon the wage and hour violations, and adds an extra year of
27 damages, and is included within the above analysis.
28

1 approximately 43% of that total value. Given the many defenses raised, the uncertainty of the
2 certifiability of any class, and the risks of going to trial, Class Counsel believe this settlement is a
3 good result for all of the class members

4
5 **ATTORNEY COMPETENCE IN CLASS ACTIONS**

6 12. I am experienced class action counsel, including specializing in wage and hour
7 and employment claims. Some of the class action litigation on which I have been approved as
8 Class Counsel include:

- 9 a. *Wilkins, et al. v. Equinox Holdings, Inc.*
10 Los Angeles Superior Court, No.: BC440058
- 11 b. *TBC Retail Group Wage and Hour Cases*
12 Los Angeles Superior Court, No.: JCCP No. 4701
- 13 c. *Casserly v. Randstad US, L.P., et al.*
14 U.S.D.C., Central District of California, No. SACV 12-1023-DOC(ANx)
- 15 d. *Crilly v. Micro Electronics, Inc.*
16 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2013-00662586-CU-OE-CXC
- 17 e. *Concho, et al. v. Pipeline Carriers, Inc. et al.*
18 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30:2013-00649600-DU-OE-CXC
- 19 f. *Holsted et al. v. R.J. Noble Company et. al.*
20 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30:2010-00379770-CU-OE-CXC
- 21 g. *Piggue v. Chief Protective Services, Inc.*
22 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2013-00688107-CU-OE-CXC
- 23 h. *Walsh v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company*
24 Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2011-00498062-CU-OE-CXC
- 25 i. *Woods v. JFK Memorial Hospital*
26 Riverside County Superior Court, No.: INC 1205209
- 27 j. *Ramirez et. al v. Titan Insurance of New Mexico*
28

Riverside County Superior Court, No.: RIC1211890

k. *DeSantos v. Jaco Oil Company, et al.*

U.S.D.C. Eastern District of California, No. 1:14-CV-00738-JLT

l. *Duran v. Big 5 Corp.*

Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC557154

m. *Sheahan v. Celtic Leasing Corporation, Inc.*

Orange County Superior Court No.: 30-2016-00852151-CU-OE-CXC

n. *Panasis v. Control4 Corporation*

United States District Court, Central District of California

Case No. SACV-16-1179-DOC

o. *O&R Construction, LLC v. Dun & Bradstreet, et al.*

United States District Court, Western District of Washington

Case No. C12-2184 TSZ

p. *Matthews v. Whelan Security of California, Inc.*

Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2016-00833250-CU-OE-CXC

q. *Rodriguez v. R.J. Noble Company (Navarro/Kles),*

Orange County Superior Court, No.: 30-2017-00916018-CU-OE-CXC

r. *Wang v. Fountain Valley Regional Hospital*

Orange County Superior Court, No. 30-2015-00821329-CU-OE-CXC

s. *Skerl v. Sutter Bay Hospitals*

San Mateo Superior Court, No. 21-CIV-02057

13. I graduated from Vanderbilt University in 1992 with a Bachelor of Arts in Economics and English, and graduated from Southwestern Law School in 1998. Since becoming a lawyer in 1998, my practice has focused on complex litigation matters, and since 2010, complex employment law and wage and hour matters.

14. I am a member of the California State Bar, the Orange County Bar Association, Los Angeles County Bar Association, and California Employment Lawyers Association. I have

an AV rating from Martindale-Hubbell, the highest possible rating for a lawyer. During my 27+ year career, I have handled many successful employment law matters both at the trial and appellate levels. I estimate that I have represented plaintiffs in hundreds of employment cases, the vast majority of which have resulted in favorable settlements, awards and/or verdicts for my clients. I have successfully prosecuted and obtained significant recoveries in several class action lawsuits and other lawsuits involving complex legal and factual issues. In 2015, I was co-lead counsel in *Walsh v. Pacific Bell*, which settled for \$16,800,000. Recently, in October 2023, I was also co-lead counsel in *Skerl v. Sutter Bay Hospitals*, in which final approval was granted for a \$12,000,000 settlement for health care workers. I have also been involved in many other million and multi-million dollar verdicts and settlements over the years.

15. In addition to myself, Rex J. Phillips, an attorney with over 19 years of experience, also assisted me with the prosecution of this case. Mr. Phillips graduated with Honors from Glendale University College of Law, achieved a B.A. in English from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, and has many years of experience prosecuting employment actions, including wage and hour class and representative actions.

16. Moreover, assisting Mr. Phillips and I on this case were paralegals Nestor Mejia and Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc. Mr. Mejia has an AA from West Los Angeles College in Business Administration, and has many years of experience working on employment and wage and hour matters, including PAGA and complex class actions, for my firm and others within California. Ms. Nguyen-Phuoc has a BA from University of California, Irvine (UCI), and attained a paralegal certificate from UCI in 2023. Ms. Nguyen-Phuoc has worked on various employment and wage and hour matters for the past year.

CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT

17. Plaintiff Isaiah Ma has been intimately involved in the prosecution of this case from the beginning. Prior to filing this case, I spent numerous hours talking to Plaintiff about the wage and hour issues that he experienced while working for Defendant, and worked with him in

1 developing the theories of the case. Mr. Ma was very helpful in helping to interpret the
2 documents produced in informal discovery, and ensuring that this class action lawsuit was
3 targeted towards the most impactful claims. Plaintiff also assisted in the preparation for
4 mediation, and has produced payroll and other employment records to assist Class Counsel in
5 pursuing the claims in this case.

6 18. In addition, Mr. Ma is releasing all claims, not just wage and hour claims, as part
7 of his release in this case. This is significant because Mr. Ma repeatedly complained about
8 safety concerns, even filing whistleblowing complaints before his termination. If Mr. Ma had
9 pursued a retaliation claim, it could have been much more lucrative to him personally than this
10 action. As such, because Plaintiff's release includes a waiver of unknown claims and his rights
11 under California Civil Code § 1542, he can no longer pursue such a claim.

12 19. Mr. Ma has been diligent in every aspect of this case, throughout the pre-filing
13 and discovery, attending mediation, and ensuring that the class received the best resolution
14 possible in this case.

15 20. Based on the work that he has done for the class in this case, the risks of this
16 litigation, I believe Mr. Ma is entitled to his enhancement award of \$10,000.

17 **ATTORNEYS FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES**

18 21. To date, my firm Bartz Law Group APC has spent more than 116 hours on this
19 case and has incurred approximately \$91,267 in fees thus far. My billing rate is currently \$925
20 per hour, and was previously \$850 an hour during this case, and Rex Phillips' billing rate is \$650
21 an hour, and my paralegals, Nestor Mejia and Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc, bill at rates of \$295 and
22 \$215 per hour, respectively. Attached as **Exhibit 4** is a true and correct copy of the attorneys'
23 fees incurred by Bartz Law Group APC in this case. The fees incurred were reasonable and
24 necessary in order to prosecute this case. These rates are well within reasonable market rates in
25 Southern California, and generally modest when compared to other employment law attorneys
26 with comparable experience, and do not reflect the risk with this being a contingency case.
27
28

22. In total, Class Counsel has billed more than 132 hours, representing approximately \$103,084 in attorneys fees in this case. Class Counsel is requesting attorneys' fees of \$111,000, or one-third of the gross settlement amount. Class Counsel believes that pursuant to *Lealao v. Beneficial California, Inc.*, 82 Cal.App.4th 19 (2000), that the fee request in this case is fair and reasonable in view of the typical common fund attorneys' fees awards and similar California class action settlements.

23. Class Counsel has also incurred reasonable and necessary costs to prosecute this action, including filing fees, mediation fees, and expert fees, among others. Class Counsel therefore requests costs of \$15,304.83. My firm's total costs to prosecute this action are \$14,569.17. Attached as **Exhibit 5** are Bartz Law Group APC attorneys' costs incurred in connection with this case.

24. The settlement administrator Apex requests \$7,000 in fees and costs to administer the settlement. Based on my experience in prosecuting wage and hour class actions, Xpand's expenses of \$7,000 to administer the settlement is fair and reasonable, and should be approved.

25. Concurrently with the filing of this Motion, Plaintiff has also transmitted this all motion for final approval papers filed with this Court to the Labor Workforce and Development Agency/Department of Industrial Relations, by online submission, at its website located at <https://dir.govfa.net/432>.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on November 6, 2025, at Irvine, California.

Aaron A. Bartz

EXHIBIT 1

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between plaintiff Isaiah Ma (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors (“Defendant”). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as “Parties,” or individually as “Party.”

1. DEFINITIONS.

- 1.1. “Action” means the Plaintiff’s lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Isaiah Ma v. Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors*, Case No. 24STCV13396, filed in the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County.
- 1.2. “Administrator” means Xpand Legal Consulting, LLC (“Xpand”), 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 Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.4. “Aggrieved Employee” means all current and former non-exempt employees who have worked in California for Defendant at any time from March 18, 2023 through the date of preliminary approval of the settlement, whether or not the Aggrieved Employee opts out of the class settlement, and represented by the Plaintiff and the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.
- 1.5. “Class” means all non-exempt current and former employees who worked in California for Defendant during the Class Period.
- 1.6. “Class Counsel” means Bartz Law Group, APC and United Employees Law Group, PC.
- 1.7. “Class Counsel Fees Payment” and “Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment” mean the amounts allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Action.
- 1.8. “Class Data” means Class Member identifying information in Defendant’s possession including the Class Member’s name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, and number of Class Period Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.
- 1.9. “Class Member” or “Settlement Class Member” means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non-Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee), during the Class Period.
- 1.10. “Class Member Address Search” means the Administrator’s investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members.
- 1.11. “Class Notice” means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be

mailed to Class Members, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

- 1.12. "Class Period" means the period from May 29, 2020 through the date of preliminary approval of the settlement.
- 1.13. "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff Isaiah Ma, seeking Court approval to serve as Class Representative.
- 1.14. "Class Representative Service Payment" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action.
- 1.15. "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles.
- 1.16. "Defendant" means named Defendant Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors.
- 1.17. "Defense Counsel" means Marcus Dong of Kaufman Dolowich LLP.
- 1.18. "Effective Date" means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no Participating Class Member objects to the Settlement, the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members objects to the Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.
- 1.19. "Final Approval" means the Court's order granting final approval of the Settlement.
- 1.20. "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.21. "Final Judgment" means the Judgment Entered by the Court upon Granting Final Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.22. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Three Hundred Thirty-Three Thousand Dollars (\$333,000.00) which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, and the Administrator's Expenses.
- 1.23. "Individual Class Payment" means the Participating Class Member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period.
- 1.24. "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 worked during the PAGA Period.
- 1.25. "Judgment" means the judgment approved by Defense Counsel and entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval.
- 1.26. "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the

agency entitled, under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

- 1.27. “LWDA PAGA Payment” means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).
- 1.28. “Net Settlement Amount” means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.
- 1.29. “Non-Participating Class Member” means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.
- 1.30. “PAGA Pay Period” means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.
- 1.31. “PAGA Period” means the period from March 18, 2023 through the date of preliminary approval of the settlement.
- 1.32. “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).
- 1.33. “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiff’s March 18, 2024 letter to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), asserting claims for civil penalties under, among other things, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 2699, and 2802.
- 1.34. “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount (\$10,000.00), allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees (\$2,500.00) and 75% to LWDA (\$7,500.00) in settlement of PAGA claims.
- 1.35. “Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.
- 1.36. “Plaintiff” means Isaiah Ma, the named plaintiff in the Action.
- 1.37. “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.
- 1.38. “Preliminary Approval Order” means the proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement.
- 1.39. “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.
- 1.40. “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.4 below.
- 1.41. “Released Parties” means: Defendant and each of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, managers, partners, principals, partners, subsidiaries, affiliates, owners, employees, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, and assigns.
- 1.42. “Request for Exclusion” means a Class Member’s submission of a written request to

be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.

- 1.43. “Response Deadline” means 60 days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax or mail his or her Objection to the Settlement.
- 1.44. “Settlement” means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.
- 1.45. “Workweek” means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. RECITALS.

- 2.1. Plaintiff filed the Action on May 29, 2024, alleging causes of action against Defendant for Violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, Failure to Pay Wages including Minimum and Overtime Wages, Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records, Waiting Time Penalties, Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate Wage Statements, Failure to Provide Meal and Rest Periods, Failure to Reimburse Expenses, and Violation of the PAGA. Defendant denies the allegations alleged in the Action, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Action, and denies any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.
- 2.2. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff gave written notice to Defendant and the LWDA by sending the PAGA Notice.
- 2.3. On February 4, 2025, the Parties attended a Mediation before Kelly Knight, Esq., which resulted in this Agreement to settle the Action.
- 2.4. Prior to engaging in Mediation, Plaintiff obtained, through informal discovery, time and payroll records of Defendant, policy documents, and other information and data sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 (“*Dunk/Kullar*”).
- 2.5. The Court has not granted class certification.

3. MONETARY TERMS.

- 3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant promises to pay Three Hundred Thirty Three Thousand Dollars (\$333,000.00) and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount, and to separately pay any and all applicable employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments. Defendant agrees to pay the Gross Settlement Amount, which is the total and all-inclusive amount that Defendant will be obligated to pay under the Settlement embodied by this Agreement. Except as set forth in Paragraph 9, under no circumstances shall the Settlement sum exceed the sum of \$333,000.00, inclusive of class payments, PAGA penalties, attorney’ fees and costs, and administration expenses. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross

Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.

- 3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval:
- 3.3. To Plaintiff: Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of not more than Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) to the Class Representative, in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiff's request for the Class Representative Service Payment that does not exceed the above amount. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the remainder shall be allocated to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.
- 3.4. To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be One Hundred Eleven Thousand Dollars (\$111,000.00) and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000.00). Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided that they do not exceed these amounts. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's Counsel arising from any claim to any portion of the Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment.
- 3.5. To the Administrator: An Administrator Expenses Payment not to exceed Seven Thousand Dollars (\$7,000.00) except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses are less or the Court approves payment less than \$7,000, the Administrator will allocate the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.
- 3.6. To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks.
 - 3.6.1. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms by the Administrator. The 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms by the Administrator. Participating Class

Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

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

3.7. To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% (\$7,500.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% (\$2,500.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.7.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties of \$2,500.00 by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

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

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.

4.1. Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on a review of its records to date, Defendant estimates there are approximately 205 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 18,500 Workweeks from May 29, 2020 to February 4, 2025, and 140 PAGA Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 3,026 PAGA Pay Periods.

4.2. Class Data. Not later than 30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendant will simultaneously deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendant has a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if it discovers that the Class Data omitted class member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendant must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.3. Funding of Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount within 30 days of the Effective Date. Defendant shall also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes. All such funds shall be transmitted to the Administrator in accordance with the above schedule.

- 4.4. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within 10 days after the Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative's Service Payment.
- 4.4.1. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of mailing) when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Settlement Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. 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 a Class Member Address Search for all other Class Members whose checks are returned undelivered without a USPS forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail checks to the USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Class Member Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Class Members whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Class Member whose original check was lost or misplaced, requested by the Class Member prior to the void date.
- 4.4.3. For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).
- 4.4.4. The payment of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate Defendant to confer any additional benefits or make any additional payments to Class Members (such as 401(k) contributions or bonuses) beyond those specified in this Agreement.
5. **RELEASES OF CLAIMS.** Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff, Class Members, and Class Counsel will release

claims against all Released Parties as follows:

- 5.1. Plaintiff's Release. Plaintiff fully releases and forever discharges Defendant and the Released Parties from any and all claims, causes of action, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, attorney's fees, costs, and any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected that arise from or are related to Plaintiff's employment by Defendant or the Action, including but not limited to: (1) the Action and any claims arising out of or related to the Action; (2) any claims under federal, state or local law for or relating to wages, benefits, compensation, vacation or other paid time off, and claims for liquidated damages, penalties, or costs and fees associated therewith, including under the California Labor Code; (3) wrongful termination, discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation, including under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Family Medical Leave Act, the California Family Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Equal Pay Act, the California Labor Code, the California Government Code, (4) any act, omission, or occurrence or claim arising out of or related to the Action or Plaintiff's employment or termination thereof with Defendant taking place on or before the Effective Date; and (5) any other form of relief or remedy of any kind, nature, or description whatsoever, whether premised on statute, contract, tort, or other theory of liability under state, federal, or local law. Plaintiff's Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them.
- 5.2. 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 section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, and that if known by him or her would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or Released Party.
- 5.3. Released Class Claims By Participating Class Members: All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the Class Period facts stated in the Action and Plaintiff's PAGA Notice, including claims under the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law, failure to pay wages (including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages), failure to pay overtime at the regular rate, and double time wages, failure to

provide compliant meal periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant rest periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to maintain requisite payroll records, failure to reimburse expenses, including Labor Code sections section 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2699, and 2802, and unfair or unlawful business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* The Released Class Claims also mean any claims, rights, demands, liabilities, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, obligations, attorneys' fees, costs, any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, and causes of action, that could potentially arise from the receipt of any monies as a result of this Settlement by any member of the Class.

5.3.1. Except as set forth in Paragraph 5.3 of this Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

5.4. Released PAGA Claims by Aggrieved Employees: All Aggrieved Employees, the State of California and Plaintiff shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, released, and discharged Released Parties from the claims for civil penalties that could have been sought by the Labor Commissioner for the violations of the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 identified in the PAGA Notice and the Action during the PAGA Period. The Aggrieved Employees will be issued a check for their share of the individual PAGA payment and will not have the opportunity to opt out of, or object to, the individual PAGA payment and release of the PAGA claims set forth herein. The Aggrieved Employees are bound by the release of the PAGA claims regardless of whether they cash or deposit their individual PAGA payment or opt out of being a Class Member.

6. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL. The Parties agree Plaintiff will prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval").

6.1. Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (s)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; and operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data, and other documents reasonable and necessary to secure approval of the Settlement.

6.2. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in

Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval Order to the Administrator.

- 6.3. Duty to Cooperate. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval, proposed Judgment, and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval or conditions Preliminary Approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.
- 6.4. Plaintiff's Counsel shall submit a copy of the proposed settlement to the LWDA at the same time that it is submitted to the Court pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff's Counsel shall submit a copy of the court's order granting the motion for final approval and Judgment to the LWDA within ten (10) days after entry of the order or Judgment pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(s)(3).

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

- 7.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Xpand to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Xpand 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 to 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 US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.
- 7.4. Notice to Class Members.
 - 7.4.1. No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, PAGA Members, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.
 - 7.4.2. Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service ("USPS") mail, the Class Notice, substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment

and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.

- 7.4.3. Not later than 5 business days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.
- 7.4.4. If the Administrator, Defendant or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 14 days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, whichever are later.

7.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

- 7.5.1. Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than 60 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice. A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed or postmarked by the Response Deadline.
- 7.5.2. The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.
- 7.5.3. Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under

Paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of this Agreement, regardless of whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

7.5.4. Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 5.4 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6. Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have 60 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax or mail. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, redacting all identifying information, to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination of the challenges. The Court will have the final authority in the event that challenges from Class Members remain unresolved.

7.7. Objections to Settlement.

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

7.7.2. Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax or mail. In the alternative, Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than 60 days after the Administrator's mailing of the Class Notice. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Objections, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Objections; and (b) copies of all Objections submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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

7.8. Administrator Duties. The Administrator has a duty to perform or observe all tasks to

be performed or observed by the Administrator contained in this Agreement or otherwise.

- 7.8.1. Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number. The Administrator will establish and maintain and use an internet website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Settlement Agreement, Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payment, the Final Approval and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes and emails.
- 7.8.2. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing the number of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion (“Exclusion List”). Unless otherwise instructed by the Court, the Class Administrator shall keep all class contact information confidential.
- 7.8.3. Weekly Reports. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received with all identifying information redacted, objections received with all identifying information redacted, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods received and/or resolved with all identifying information redacted, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments (“Weekly Report”). The Weekly Reports must include the Administrator’s assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach redacted copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.
- 7.8.4. Workweek and/or Pay Period Challenges. The Administrator has the authority to address and make final decisions consistent with the terms of this Agreement on all Class Member challenges over the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. The Administrator’s decision shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge, unless the Court determines otherwise.
- 7.8.5. Administrator’s Declaration. Not later than 14 days before the date by which Plaintiff is required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion from Settlement it

received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the redacted Exclusion List (unless the Court later requires identification of individuals on the Exclusion list). The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court, including as to disclosure of the identity of individuals who opted out of the settlement class. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

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

8. **MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL.** Not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (s)(2), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel not later than five days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval and proposed Judgment.

- 8.1. Response to Objections. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Participating Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than five court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.
- 8.2. Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Administrator Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.
- 8.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, 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.
- 8.4. Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement or later revisions or amendments thereto, specifically

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

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

9. CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE

Based on its records, Defendant estimates that during the Class Period, there are 205 Class Members and 18,500 Workweeks. Should the final Workweek Amount increase by more than 10% (i.e. more than 1,850 additional work weeks such that the final workweeks being released are greater than 20,350) for the Class Period, the Gross Settlement Amount shall be increased proportionally by the workweeks in excess of 20,350 such that if the workweeks are 12% greater than the certified amount above, the Gross Settlement Amount will increase by 2%. At its option, Defendant may elect to move the end date for the Class Period to the latest date before the workweek count does not exceed 20,350 workweeks.

10. **AMENDED JUDGMENT.** If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit a proposed amended judgment.
11. **DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO RESCIND.** Defendant retains the right, in the exercise of its sole discretion, to rescind this Settlement Agreement within ten (10) days after the expiration of the opt out period in section 7.5 above, if ten percent (10%) or more of Class Members opt out of this Settlement. All signatories and their counsel must not encourage opt-outs. All signatories and their counsel specifically agree not to solicit opt-outs, directly or indirectly, through any means. In the event that Defendant exercises the right to rescind pursuant to this paragraph, Defendant shall be responsible for all Administrator costs incurred to the date of the rescission.
12. **ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.**

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

- 12.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency.
- 12.3. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant, and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, with any third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.
- 12.4. No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.
- 12.5. Integrated Agreement. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or by any Party.
- 12.6. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and

represent that they are authorized by Plaintiff and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

- 12.7. 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.
- 12.8. 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.
- 12.9. No Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiff, Class 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 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.
- 12.10. Modification of Agreement. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court.
- 12.11. Agreement Binding on Successors. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.
- 12.12. Applicable Law. All terms and conditions of this Agreement and its exhibits will be governed by and interpreted according to the internal laws of the State of California, without regard to conflict of law principles.
- 12.13. Cooperation in Drafting. The Parties have cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. This Agreement will not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting.
- 12.14. Confidentiality. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during the Action and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.
- 12.15. Use of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to 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.
- 12.16. Headings. The descriptive heading of any section or paragraph of this Agreement is

inserted for convenience of reference only and does not constitute a part of this Agreement.

- 12.17. Calendar Days. Unless otherwise noted, all reference to “days” in this Agreement shall be to calendar days. In the event any date or deadline set forth in this Agreement falls on a weekend or federal legal holiday, such date or deadline shall be on the first business day thereafter.
- 12.18. Notice. All notices, demands or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiff:

Bartz Law Group APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92617
Attn: Aaron A. Bartz
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

To Defendant:

Kaufman Dolowich LLP
425 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94104
Attn: Marcus Dong
mdong@kaufmandolowich.com

- 12.19. Execution in Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.
- 12.20. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process.
- 12.21. No Additional Contribution by Defendant. Defendant’s monetary obligation under this Agreement is limited to the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall not be required to pay more than the Gross Settlement Amount to obtain the relief (including, but not limited to, the Settlement, releases of claims and, issuance of the final order and Judgment) provided in this Agreement or to fully and finally settle and resolve the class action claims, individual claims, and PAGA claims.

Notwithstanding the above, in the event that this Agreement is voided or nullified, in whole or in part, however that may occur, or the Settlement of the Action is barred


by operation of law, or invalidated, or ordered not to be carried out by a court of competent jurisdiction, Defendant will cease to have any obligation to pay any portion of the Gross Settlement Amount to anyone under the terms of this Agreement.

- 12.22. Taxes. Plaintiff and each Participating Class Member and Aggrieved Employee will be responsible for paying all applicable state, local, and federal income taxes on their respective amounts received pursuant to this Settlement, and they shall not seek any indemnification from Defendant or the Released Parties in this regard. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's Counsel shall cooperate with Defendant and provide documentation to the extent possible and as reasonably requested to demonstrate any payment of taxes made by Plaintiff and/or any Participating Class Member and aggrieved employee should any taxing authority challenge the allocation of any payments under this Agreement.
- 12.23. In the event that any portion of this Agreement is deemed illegal, invalid or unenforceable in any respect, then such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability will not affect any other provision of this Agreement, and this Agreement shall be construed as though such illegal, invalid or unenforceable provision had never been contained herein, unless a court determines the primary purpose of this Agreement would be frustrated.

IT IS SO AGREED:

Dated: 3/14/2025

"PLAINTIFF"

By: 
Plaintiff, Isalan Ma

"DEFENDANT"

Dated: _____

By: _____
Defendant, Heritage Clinic and The
Community Assistance Program for Seniors
By: Vatche Kelartinian
Its: CEO

by operation of law, or invalidated, or ordered not to be carried out by a court of competent jurisdiction, Defendant will cease to have any obligation to pay any portion of the Gross Settlement Amount to anyone under the terms of this Agreement.

12.22. Taxes. Plaintiff and each Participating Class Member and Aggrieved Employee will be responsible for paying all applicable state, local, and federal income taxes on their respective amounts received pursuant to this Settlement, and they shall not seek any indemnification from Defendant or the Released Parties in this regard. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's Counsel shall cooperate with Defendant and provide documentation to the extent possible and as reasonably requested to demonstrate any payment of taxes made by Plaintiff and/or any Participating Class Member and aggrieved employee should any taxing authority challenge the allocation of any payments under this Agreement.

12.23. In the event that any portion of this Agreement is deemed illegal, invalid or unenforceable in any respect, then such invalidity, illegality or unenforceability will not affect any other provision of this Agreement, and this Agreement shall be construed as though such illegal, invalid or unenforceable provision had never been contained herein, unless a court determines the primary purpose of this Agreement would be frustrated.

IT IS SO AGREED:


"PLAINTIFF"

Dated: _____

By: _____
Plaintiff, Isaiah Ma


"DEFENDANT"

Dated: 3/14/25

By: 
Defendant, Heritage Clinic and The
Community Assistance Program for Seniors
By: Vatche Kelartinian
Its: CEO

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Dated: 3/14/2025

By:  Signed by:
EC5A3FE789D1423...
Aaron A. Bartz
Walter L. Haines
Bartz Law Group, APC; United Employees
Law Group, PC
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ISALAH MA

Dated: _____

By: _____
Marcus Dong
Kaufman Dolowich LLP
Attorneys for Defendant
HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
FOR SENIORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Dated: _____

By: _____

Aaron A. Bartz
Walter L. Haines
Bartz Law Group, APC; United Employees
Law Group, PC
Attorneys for Plaintiff
ISALAH MA

Dated: March 14, 2025

By: _____ 

Marcus Dong
Kaufman Dolowich LLP
Attorneys for Defendant
HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
FOR SENIORS

EXHIBIT A

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

Isaiah Ma v. Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors

Case No. 24STCV13396

The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully!

It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class action lawsuit (“Action”) against Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors (“Defendant”) for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by former employee Isaiah Ma (“Plaintiff”) and seeks payment of (1) past due wages and other relief for a class of all current and former non-exempt employees (“Class Members”) who worked for Defendant during the Class Period (May 29, 2020 to [preliminary approval date]); and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) for all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period (March 18, 2023 to [preliminary approval date]) (“Aggrieved Employees”).

Defendant denies these allegations and maintains that it complied with the law at all times. Defendant believes that Plaintiff’s claims are without merit.

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

Based on Defendant’s records, and the Parties’ current assumptions, **your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be \$_ (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be \$_____**. The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to Defendant’s records you are not eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment under the Settlement because you didn’t work during the PAGA Period.)

The above estimates are based on Defendant’s records showing that **you worked __ workweeks** during the Class Period and **you worked _____ pay periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section D of this Notice.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s attorneys (“Class Counsel”). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendant to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and

Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendant.

If you worked for Defendant during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

- (1) **Do Nothing.** You don't have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment and/or an Individual PAGA Payment. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims and PAGA Period penalty claims against Defendant.
- (2) **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement.** You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting a written request for exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment. You will, however, preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period wage claims against Defendant, and, if you are an Aggrieved Employee, remain eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

Defendant will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

You Don't Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement	If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendant that are covered by this Settlement (Released Claims).
You Can Opt-out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement The Opt-out Deadline is _____	If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section F of this Notice. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. Defendant must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees and the Aggrieved Employees must give up their rights to pursue Released Claims (defined below).

Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement Written Objections Must be Submitted by _____	All Class Members who do not opt-out (“Participating Class Members”) can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court’s decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiff who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiff. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff if you think they are unreasonable. See Section G of this Notice.
You Can Participate in the _____ Final Approval Hearing	The Court’s Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on _____. You don’t have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court’s virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section H of this Notice.
You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks/Pay Periods Written Challenges Must be Submitted by _____	The amount of your Individual Class Payment and PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many Pay Periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Class Period Workweeks and number of PAGA Period Pay Periods you worked according to Defendant’s records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by _____. See Section D of this Notice.

A. WHAT IS THE ACTION ABOUT?

Plaintiff is a former employee of Defendant. The Action accuses Defendant of violating California labor laws by failing to pay overtime wages, minimum wages, wages due upon termination and failing to provide meal periods, rest breaks, reimbursement of expenses and accurate itemized wage statements. Based on the same claims, Plaintiff has also asserted a claim for civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.) (“PAGA”). Plaintiff is represented by attorneys in the Action: Bartz Law Group APC and United Employees Law Group PC (“Class Counsel.”) Defendant strongly denies violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contends that it complied with all applicable laws.

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

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendant or Plaintiff is correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiff and Defendant attended Mediation with Kelly Knight, Esq., to resolve the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations at the Mediation were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement (“Agreement”) and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiff and Defendant have negotiated a proposed Settlement that is subject to the Court’s Final

Approval. Both sides agree the proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendant does not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims. Plaintiff and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendant has agreed to pay a fair, reasonable and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

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

1. Defendant will pay Three Hundred Thirty-Three Thousand Dollars (\$333,000.00) as the Gross Settlement Amount (“Gross Settlement”). Defendant has agreed to deposit the Gross Settlement into an account controlled by the Administrator of the Settlement. The Administrator will use the Gross Settlement to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel’s attorney’s fees and expenses, the Administrator’s expenses, and penalties to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”). Assuming the Court grants Final Approval, Defendant will fund the Gross Settlement no later than 30 days after the Judgment is entered by the Court becomes final. The Judgment will be final on the date it is entered, or a later date if Participating Class Members object to the proposed Settlement or the Judgment is appealed.
2. Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement. At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:
 - a. Up to One Hundred Eleven Thousand Dollars (\$111,000.00) (one-third of the Gross Settlement) to Class Counsel for attorneys’ fees and up to Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000.00) for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.
 - b. Up to Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) to Plaintiff as a Class Representative Service Payment for filing the Action, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. The Class Representative Service Payment will be the only monies Plaintiff will receive other than Plaintiff’s Individual Class Payments and any Individual PAGA Payments.
 - c. Up to Seven Thousand Dollars (\$7,000.00) to the Administrator for services administering the Settlement.
 - d. Up to Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00) for PAGA Penalties, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment (\$7,500.00) and 25% in Individual PAGA Payments (\$2,500.00) to the Aggrieved Employees based on their PAGA Period Pay Periods. Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.
3. Net Settlement Distributed to Class Members. After making the above deductions in amounts approved by the Court, the Administrator will distribute the rest of the

Gross Settlement (the “Net Settlement”) by making Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members based on their Class Period Workweeks.

4. Taxes Owed on Payments to Class Members. Plaintiff and Defendant are asking the Court to approve an allocation of 20% of each Individual Class Payment to taxable wages (“Wage Portion”) and 80% to interest and penalties (“Non-Wage Portion”). The Wage Portion is subject to withholdings and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms by the Administrator. Defendant will separately pay employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion. The Individual PAGA Payments are counted as penalties rather than wages for tax purposes. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments and the Non-Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

Although Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed to these allocations, neither side is giving you any advice on whether your Payments are taxable or how much you might owe in taxes. You are responsible for paying all taxes (including penalties and interest on back taxes) on any Payments received from the proposed Settlement. You should consult a tax advisor if you have any questions about the tax consequences of the proposed Settlement.

5. Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don’t cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the monies will be sent to the California Controller’s Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member.
6. Requests for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (Opt-Outs). You will be treated as a Participating Class Member, participating fully in the Class Settlement, unless you notify the Administrator in writing, not later than **[DATE]**, that you wish to opt-out. In order to opt-out of the Settlement, you should set forth your name, present address, telephone number, and request exclusion from the settlement to the Administrator by the date set forth above. Excluded Class Members (i.e., Non-Participating Class Members) will not receive Individual Class Payments, but will preserve their rights to personally pursue wage and hour claims against Defendant.

You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement. Class Members who exclude themselves from the Class Settlement (Non-Participating Class Members) remain eligible for Individual PAGA Payments and are required to give up their right to assert PAGA claims against Defendant based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Action.

7. The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline to enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendant will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendant.
8. Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, **[INSERT]** (the “Administrator”) to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members’ Requests for Exclusion. The Administrator will also decide Class Member

Challenges over Workweeks, mail and re-mail settlement checks and tax forms, and perform other tasks necessary to administer the Settlement. The Administrator's contact information is contained in Section I of this Notice.

9. Participating Class Members' Release. After the Judgment is final and Defendant has fully funded the Gross Settlement (and separately paid the employer-side payroll taxes), Participating Class Members will be legally barred from asserting any of the claims released under the Settlement. This means that unless you opted out by validly excluding yourself from the Class Settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendant or related entities for wages based on the Class Period facts and PAGA penalties based on PAGA Period facts, as alleged in the Action and resolved by this Settlement. The Participating Class Members will be bound by the following release:

All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from all claims that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the Class Period facts stated in the Action and Plaintiff's PAGA Notice, including claims under the California Labor Code, California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provisions of law, failure to pay wages (including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, failure to pay overtime at the regular rate, and double time wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant rest periods and associated premium pay, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to timely pay wages upon termination of employment, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to reimburse expenses, failure to maintain requisite payroll records, including Labor Code sections section 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2699, and 2802, and unfair or unlawful business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* The Released Class Claims also means any claims, rights, demands, liabilities, damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, obligations, attorneys' fees, costs, any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, and causes of action, that could potentially arise from the receipt of any monies as a result of this Settlement by any member of the Class.

10. Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Release. After the Court's judgment is final, and Defendant has paid the Gross Settlement (and separately paid the employer-side payroll taxes), all Aggrieved Employees will be barred from asserting PAGA claims against Defendant, whether or not they exclude themselves from the Settlement. This means that all Aggrieved Employees, including those who are Participating Class Members and those who opt-out of the Class Settlement, cannot sue, continue to sue, or participate in any other PAGA claim against Defendant or its related persons and entities based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Action and resolved by this Settlement. The Aggrieved Employees' Releases for Participating and Non-

Participating Class Members are as follows:

All Aggrieved Employees, the State of California and Plaintiff shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, released and discharged Defendant and Released Persons from the claims for civil penalties that could have been sought by the Labor Commissioner for the violations of the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 identified in the PAGA Notice and those based solely upon the facts alleged in the PAGA Notice and the Action during the PAGA Period. The Aggrieved Employees will be issued a check for their share of the individual PAGA payment and will not have the opportunity to opt out of, or object to, the individual PAGA payment and release of the PAGA claims set forth herein. The Aggrieved Employees are bound by the release of the PAGA claims regardless of whether they cash or deposit their individual PAGA payment or opt out of being a Class Member.

D. HOW WILL THE ADMINISTRATOR CALCULATE MY PAYMENT?

1. Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks.
2. Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing \$2,500 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by each individual Aggrieved Employee.
3. Workweek/Pay Period Challenges. The number of Class Workweeks you worked during the Class Period and the number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, as recorded in Defendant's records, are stated in the first page of this Notice. You have until **DATE** to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you. You can submit your challenge by signing and sending a letter to the Administrator via mail or fax. **Section I** of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

You need to support your challenge by sending copies of pay stubs or other records. The Administrator will accept Defendant's calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods based on Defendant's records as accurate unless you send copies of records containing contrary information. You should send copies rather than originals because the documents will not be returned to you. The Administrator will resolve Workweek and/or Pay Period challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendant's Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

E. HOW WILL I GET PAID?

1. Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single check to every Participating Class Member (i.e., every Class Member who doesn't opt-out) including those who also qualify as Aggrieved Employees. The single

check will combine the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment.

2. Non-Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single Individual PAGA Payment check to every Aggrieved Employee who opts out of the Class Settlement (i.e., every Non-Participating Class Member).

Your check will be sent to the same address as this Notice. If you change your address, be sure to notify the Administrator as soon as possible. Section I of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

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

Submit a written and signed letter with your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement that you do not want to participate in the Settlement. The Administrator will exclude you based on any writing communicating your request be excluded. Be sure to personally sign your request, and include your identifying information (full name, address, telephone number, approximate dates of employment, and social security number for verification purposes). You must make the request yourself. If someone else makes the request for you, it will not be valid. **The Administrator must be sent your request to be excluded by DATE, or it will be invalid.** Section I of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

G. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. If you wish to remain a Class Member, but you object to the proposed settlement (or any of its terms) and wish the Court to consider your objection at the Final Approval Hearing, you may object to the proposed settlement in writing. You may also appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through an attorney at your own expense. All written objections, supporting papers, and/or notices of intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing must clearly identify the case name and number and be mailed to the Settlement Administrator, _____, at _____. Objections must be postmarked no later than _____. You still may appear at the Final Approval Hearing and raise an objection to the settlement even if you did not submit written objections within this deadline.

H. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on [DATE] at [TIME] in Department 12, of the Los Angeles Superior Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. At the Hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and how much of the Gross Settlement will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiff, and the Administrator. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will hear all objections, as well as arguments for and against the proposed Settlement. You have a right to attend this hearing, but you are not required to do so. You also have the right to hire an attorney to represent you, at your own expense, or to enter an appearance and represent yourself.

I. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The above is a summary of the basic terms of the settlement. For the precise terms and conditions of the settlement, you can telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court

website by going to (<http://www.lacourt.org/casesummary/ui/index.aspx>) and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. 24STCV13396. You can also make an appointment to personally review court documents in the Clerk's Office at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse by calling (213) 830-0800.

**DO NOT TELEPHONE OR CONTACT THE SUPERIOR COURT TO OBTAIN
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.**

**DO NOT TELEPHONE OR CONTACT DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL TO OBTAIN
INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.**

Class Counsel:

Aaron A. Bartz, Esq.
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Telephone: (949) 504-4413

Walter Haines, Esq.
walter@uelglaw.com
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Telephone: (562) 256-1047

Settlement Administrator:

Name of Company

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Fax Number:

J. WHAT IF I LOSE MY SETTLEMENT CHECK?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void, you will have no way to recover the money.

K. WHAT IF I CHANGE MY ADDRESS?

To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

EXHIBIT 2

Electronically Received 03/27/2025 03:57 PM

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ISAIAH MA, and all others similarly situated

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

ISAIAH MA, an individual; on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and
the general public,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
FOR SENIORS, a California corporation; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV13396

[Assigned for All Purposes to:
The Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Dept. SS12]

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: June 10, 2025
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept: 12

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

06/24/2025

David W. Saylor, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: L. McGreené Deputy

1 This matter came on for hearing on June 10, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 12 of the
2 above-referenced Court, located at the Los Angeles Superior Court, 312 North Spring Street, Los
3 Angeles, California 90012, on the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement
4 (“Motion”). Plaintiff ISAIAH MA (“Plaintiff”) appeared through his attorneys of record.
5 Defendant Heritage Clinic and The Community Assistance Program for Seniors (“Defendant”)
6 appeared through its counsel of record.

7 Having fully reviewed and considered the Motion and moving papers, and having
8 analyzed the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”) attached
9 as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Aaron A. Bartz filed with the Motion, THE COURT HEREBY
10 MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS AND ORDERS:

11 1. The Court preliminarily approves the proposed Settlement Agreement as being
12 fair, reasonable, and adequate; and finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement
13 appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which the Court could ultimately
14 give final approval.

15 2. The initial capitalized terms in this Order shall have the same meanings as those
16 set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

17 3. The Court finds that the elements of numerosity, commonality, typicality and
18 adequacy have been established to support conditional certification of the Settlement Class for
19 settlement purposes. Solely for the purposes of the proposed Settlement, a Class is provisionally
20 certified pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and defined as follows:

21 All non-exempt current and former employees who worked in California
22 for Defendant during the Class Period.

23 4. Solely for the purposes of the proposed Settlement, the Court preliminarily
24 approves (a) Bartz Law Group, APC and United Employees Law Group, PC as Class Counsel;
25 and (b) Isaiah Ma as Class Representative. The Court appoints Xpand Legal Consulting, LLC as
26 Settlement Administrator.

27 5. The Court shall hold a final approval hearing (the "Final Approval Hearing") on
28 Dec. 4, 2025 at 10:30 am _____, at _____, to review the notice process and

1 objections to the Settlement, if any; and to determine whether the proposed Settlement on the
2 terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and
3 should be finally approved by the Court; to determine whether the Court should enter the
4 Judgment as provided in the Settlement Agreement; and to determine the amount of attorneys'
5 fees and costs to approve for Class Counsel and the amount of the enhancement award to
6 approve for the Class Representative.

7 6. The Court approves, as to form and content, the Court Approved Notice of Class
8 Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval (the "Settlement Notice"),
9 attached to the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that distribution of the Settlement Notice
10 substantially in the manner set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Settlement Notice meets
11 the requirements of California law and due process, is the best notice practicable under the
12 circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

13 7. The Settlement Administrator shall supervise and administer the notice procedure
14 as set forth in the Settlement Agreement as follows:

15 a. After entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant shall provide
16 the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data for purposes of mailing the Settlement
17 Notices to Class Members. Defendant shall have up to thirty (30) days to provide the
18 Class Data after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order;

19 b. Upon receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator shall
20 perform a search based on the National Change of Address Database maintained by the
21 United States Postal Service to update and correct any known or identifiable address
22 changes. Within fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving the Class Data from
23 Defendant as provided herein, the Settlement Administrator shall mail copies of the
24 Settlement Notice to all Class Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail. The Parties
25 agree that this procedure for notice provides the best notice practicable to Class Members
26 and fully complies with due process;

27 c. Any Settlement Notice returned to the Settlement Administrator as non-
28 deliverable on or before the Response Deadline shall be re-mailed to the forwarding

1 address affixed thereto within five (5) business days of receipt of the returned Settlement
2 Notice by the Settlement Administrator. If no forwarding address is provided, the
3 Settlement Administrator shall attempt to determine a correct address by conducting a
4 Class Member Address Search;

5 d. The Settlement Administrator shall perform all other obligations required
6 under the Settlement Agreement, including those under section 7 of the Settlement
7 Agreement.

8 8. In order for any Settlement Class member to object to this Settlement, or any term
9 of it, the person making the objection may submit the objection to the Settlement Administrator
10 by no later than the Response Deadline specified in the Settlement Notice setting forth the
11 grounds of objection. Any objection shall be sent to the Settlement Administrator, not to the
12 Court. A Class Member may also appear personally or through an attorney, at his or her own
13 expense, at the Final Approval hearing to present his or her objection directly to the Court.

14 9. In order for any Settlement Class member to validly exclude themselves from the
15 Settlement Class and this Settlement (i.e., to validly opt out), a written request for exclusion must
16 be submitted to the Settlement Administrator postmarked no later than the Response Deadline.
17 Any Request for Exclusion shall be submitted to the Settlement Administrator, not to the Court.
18 A Class Member who timely submits a valid Request for Exclusion shall not participate in, or be
19 bound by, the Settlement or the Final Judgment in any respect. Individuals who submit a
20 Request for Exclusion shall not be permitted to file or pursue objections to the Settlement or
21 appear at the Final Approval Hearing to voice any objections to the Settlement.

22 10. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court shall finally determine whether the
23 proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate; and shall also rule on Class Counsel's
24 application for attorneys' fees, the Class Representative enhancement award, reimbursement of
25 Class Counsel's costs, and the Settlement Administrator expenses for administering the
26 Settlement.
27
28

1 11. The Court's preliminary approval of the Settlement is not to be deemed an
2 admission of liability or fault by Defendant, or a finding as to the validity of any claims or
3 defenses asserted in the Action.

4 12. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Final Approval
5 Hearing without further notice to the Class Members, and it will retain jurisdiction to consider all
6 further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement. In the event that
7 the Final Approval Hearing is continued, Class Counsel or the Settlement Administrator shall
8 give notice of the continuance to any objectors to the Settlement.

9 13. If for any reason the Settlement ultimately does not become final, the parties will
10 return to their respective positions in this Action as those positions existed immediately before
11 the Parties executed the Settlement, and nothing stated in the Settlement or any other papers filed
12 with this Court in connection with the Settlement will be deemed an admission of any kind by
13 any of the parties or used as evidence against, or over the objections of, any of the parties for any
14 purpose in this Action or in any other action.

15
16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18
19
20 06/24/2025

21 DATED: _____



Carolyn B. Kuhl

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 3

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413 / Fax: (949) 656-7760
Email: aaron@bartzlawgroup.com

Walter L. Haines, Esq. (SBN 71075)
UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP, PC
8605 Santa Monica Blvd., #63354
West Hollywood, CA 90069
Tel.: (562) 256-1047 / Fax: (562) 256-1006
Email: walter@uelglaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ISIAIAH MA and all others similarly situated

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
5/29/2024 12:02 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By M. Aguirre, Deputy Clerk

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

ISIAIAH MA, an individual; on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated and the
general public,

Plaintiff,

v.

HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
FOR SENIORS, a California Corporation; and
DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. 24STCV13396

) CLASS ACTION

) **COMPLAINT FOR:**

-) 1. Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.
) 2. Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194 and
) 1198;
) 3. Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq.;
) 4. Failure to Provide & Maintain Accurate Wage
) Statements Pursuant to Labor Code §226;
) 5. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code
) §226.7);
) 6. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code
) 226.7);
) 7. Unpaid Wages Due to Illegal Rounding
) (Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2,
) 1197, 1198);
) 8. Failure to Reimburse Expenses (Lab. Code
) §2802);
) 9. Violation of Labor Code §§2698-2699
) (PAGA).

) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiff ISAIAH MA and all other persons similarly situated, and the general public,
2 hereby complain against Defendants HERITAGE CLINIC AND THE COMMUNITY
3 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SENIORS (“Heritage”); and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive
4 (hereinafter Heritage and Does 1-100 are collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”), and on
5 information and belief allege as follows:

6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 **JURISDICTION**

8 1. This is a civil action seeking recovery of unpaid wages, waiting time penalties,
9 pay stub penalties, meal, and rest period premiums under California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 et
10 seq., 201 et seq., and 226.7. Plaintiff, for himself and on behalf of the general public, and all
11 others similarly situated, bring an action for monetary damages for failure to pay wages as well
12 as for restitution for Defendants’ violations of Business and Professions Code (B&PC) §17200,
13 et seq., including full restitution of all compensation retained by Defendants as a result of their
14 unlawful, fraudulent and unfair business practices. Plaintiff seeks all available relief, including
15 full restitution of all compensation retained by Defendants as a result of their unlawful, unfair
16 business practices. Further, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief under B&PC §17200, et seq.

17 **VENUE**

18 2. Venue as to each of the Defendants is proper in this judicial district pursuant to
19 California Code of Civil Procedure (CCP) §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts
20 complained of herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles. Each defendant either owns,
21 maintains offices, transacts business, has an agent or agents within the County of Los Angeles, or
22 otherwise is found within the County of Los Angeles, and each defendant is within the
23 jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

24 **PARTIES**

25 3. Plaintiff Isaiah Ma is an individual over the age of eighteen (18), and at all
26 relevant times, was a resident and a citizen of California.

27 4. Plaintiff is informed, believes, thereon allege that at all times mentioned
28

herein, Defendant Heritage is a California corporation. Defendant Heritage operates community service programs for seniors in Los Angeles, California.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants are licensed to do business in the State of California, County of Los Angeles, and offering services to seniors and others in need. Thus, each named defendant and DOES 1 to 100 are subject to B&PC §17200, et seq. (Unfair Competition Law) and the Labor Code, as hereinafter alleged.

6. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants Heritage and DOES 1 to 100 control and operate the Heritage businesses and establishments in locations within the State of California, including, but not limited to, the County of Los Angeles, for the purposes of hospital care. Thus, each named defendant and DOES 1 to 100 are subject to B&PC §17200, et. seq. (Unfair Competition Law) and the Labor Code as hereinafter alleged.

7. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, those defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek from this Court leave to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants and each fictitious defendant, whether individual, partners, or corporate, was responsible in some manner for the circumstances alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and all others similarly situated hereinafter alleged and the general public to be subjected to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and damages complained of herein.

8. At all times herein mentioned, each of the Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Plaintiff herein alleges that Defendants and each of them is the joint employer of Plaintiff and the classes.

9. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of the said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise.

10. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and each of them concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the complaints, injuries, and damages alleged herein.

11. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants, thereby proximately causing the damages, as herein alleged.

12. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the individual and aggregate monetary damages and restitution sought herein exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to proof. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because the Plaintiff and the putative classes herein were all California citizens.

PLAINTIFF CLASSES

13. The class representative Plaintiff who worked in the position of an hourly non-exempt employee or another similar title while employed by Defendants within the State of California, is as follows:

a. Isaiah Ma

Plaintiff Isaiah Ma worked as a case manager for Defendants between 2023 and 2024.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as a class action pursuant to CCP §382. The Classes which Plaintiff seeks to represent are composed of and defined as follows:

Class 1:

All non-exempt hourly employees from 2020 through the date of judgment, who were not paid premium overtime and/or double time at the employee's regular rate of pay.

Class 2:

All non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants who worked at some point from 2021 through the present, who are no longer employed with Defendants and to whom Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages due upon separation from Defendants (Waiting Time Penalty Class);

Class 3:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants from 2020 to the present who were not provided legally compliant meal periods (Meal Break Class);

Class 4:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants from 2020 through the present who were not provided legally-compliant rest breaks (Rest Break Class);

Class 5:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2023 through the present who were provided a paystub (a.k.a. wage statement) which failed to list all hours actually worked and wages owed (Pay Stub Class).

Class 6:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants in California from 2020 through the present who were not reimbursed for their necessary and reasonable business expenses (Reimbursement Class).

Class 7:

All non-exempt hourly employees who worked for Defendants from 2020 through the present who were subject to Defendants' rounding policy and pay practice (Rounding Class).

The members of the classes are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes is unknown to Plaintiff at this

time; however, it is estimated that the classes number greater than 100 individuals. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspecting Defendants' employment records.

15. There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all others similarly situated which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation to:

- i. Whether Defendants paid their employees proper premium overtime and/or double time at the employees' regular rate for hours over eight (8) in a day and/or forty (40) hours in a week, in paying their hourly non-exempt employees;
- ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions including §510, 1194, and 203 by requiring substantial overtime work and not paying for said work according to the overtime laws of the State of California;
- iii. Whether Defendants failed to pay the appropriate premium overtime compensation to the hourly employees;
- iv. Whether Defendants improperly retained, appropriated or deprived Plaintiff and the class members of the use of monies or sums to which Plaintiff and the class were legally entitled;
- v. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices;
- vi. Whether Defendants and each of them, were participants in the alleged unlawful conduct;
- vii. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- viii. The effect upon and the extent of injuries suffered by Plaintiff and all others similarly situated and the appropriate amount of compensation;
- ix. The appropriate amount of monetary penalties allowed by Labor Code §201, et. seq.;

- 1 x. Whether Defendants pay and continue to pay for missed meal and rest
2 period premiums at an allegedly “reduced” rate of pay in violation of
3 Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders;
- 4 xi. Whether Defendants failed and refused to reimburse Plaintiff and the class
5 members for their reasonable and necessary expenses incurred in fulfilling
6 their work duties for Defendant;
- 7 xii. Whether Defendants engaged in illegal rounding as to Plaintiff and the
8 class members’ hours worked, and time spent during any of their meal
9 periods.

10 16. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims of all members of the classes and
11 subclasses mentioned herein. Plaintiff, as representative parties will fairly and adequately
12 protect the interest of the classes by vigorously pursuing this suit through their attorneys who are
13 skilled and experienced in handling matters of this type. Plaintiff has no claim or interest that is
14 antagonistic to any class member.

15 17. The nature of this action and the nature of laws available to the members of the
16 classes and subclasses identified herein make use of the class action format a particularly
17 efficient and appropriate procedure to afford relief to Plaintiff for the wrongs alleged herein.
18 Further, this claim involves a large corporate employer, Defendant Heritage, and a large number
19 of individual employees (Plaintiff and all others similarly situated) with many relatively small
20 claims with common issues of law and fact. If each employee were required to file an individual
21 lawsuit, the corporate defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they
22 would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with
23 their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each class member to pursue an
24 individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by employees who
25 would be disinclined to pursue an action against their present and/or former employer for an
26 appreciable and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damage to their careers at present
27 and/or subsequent employment. Proof of a common business practice or factual pattern, which
28 the Plaintiff experienced, is representative of the class mentioned herein and will establish the

1 right of each of the members of the named class to recovery on the causes of action alleged
2 herein.

3 18. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even if
4 possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications with
5 respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; which would establish
6 potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or (b) legal determinations
7 concerning individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the
8 interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would substantially
9 impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of
10 the individual members of the class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual
11 prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto.

12 19. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated are entitled to the wages and other
13 monies unlawfully withheld. This action is brought for the benefit of the public.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Violation of B&PC §17200, et seq.)**

16 20. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
17 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

18 21. Beginning on an exact date unknown to Plaintiff but believed to have occurred
19 from 2020, Defendants have engaged in a pattern and practice of acts of unfair competition in
20 violation of B&PC §17200, including the practices alleged herein.

21 22. Defendants, and each of them, own, operate, manage and control community
22 clinics assisting seniors and other patients, and have engaged in the practice of paying their non-
23 exempt hourly employees in a fashion that circumvents California overtime laws.

24 **FAILURE TO PAY PROPER WAGES AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION**

25 23. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that as part of Defendants'
26 ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants' hourly employees worked in excess of eight (8)
27 hours per day, and excess of forty (40) hours per week without receiving the proper regular rate
28 of pay and therefore have failed to receive overtime compensation and/or the proper overtime

1 premium. Defendant has not paid overtime to Plaintiff and the class members, despite the fact
2 that Plaintiff and the class members frequently work prior to and after their shifts completing
3 paperwork, responding to texts and emails, and attending to other work functions, all without
4 pay. Defendants further cap the hours of Plaintiff and the other class members to avoid paying
5 any overtime hours. Defendants are in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, and the
6 relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

7 24. Defendants, and each of them, consistently administered a corporate policy
8 regarding both staffing levels, duties, and responsibilities of Defendants' employees, which
9 required that the entirety of the employees work overtime without proper premium overtime pay
10 and/or the regular rate of pay. This corporate policy and pattern of conduct is accomplished with
11 the advance knowledge and designed intent to avoid paying premium overtime. Accordingly,
12 Plaintiff and the class members are entitled to the proper overtime compensation under
13 California law. Further, Plaintiff and the class are entitled to restitution of these wages obtained
14 by Defendants, and each of them. Furthermore, Defendants have failed to properly include items
15 of remuneration when determining the employees' regular rate, including but not limited to the
16 failure to include the shift differentials and non-discretionary bonuses paid to all eligible
17 employees.

18 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 200, ET SEQ.**

19 25. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that as part of Defendants'
20 ongoing unfair business practices, Defendants failed to provide all employees all wages at the
21 time of their separation in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq., including but not limited to,
22 §§201, 202, 203 & 204.

23 26. Labor Code § 200, et seq. provides that an employer is required to pay an
24 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon the employee's involuntary
25 separation from employment; immediately upon his or her voluntary separation if the employee
26 gave at least seventy-two (72) hours notice, and within seventy-two (72) hours, if the employee
27 voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice.
28

1 27. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that all employees who have
2 been separated from Defendants did not timely receive a final paycheck detailing the proper
3 amount of pay from Defendants in violation of Labor Code § 200, et. seq.

4 28. Pursuant to Labor Code § 200, et seq. employees that no longer work for
5 Defendants, and who were not timely paid, are entitled to one (1) day of pay in penalties for each
6 day that he or she was paid late, until payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

7 **VIOLATION OF MEAL PERIOD PROVISIONS**

8 29. Defendants' improper meal and rest period policies are in violation of California
9 law including, but not limited to Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and the IWC Wage Orders. Plaintiff
10 and these classes are entitled to wages at their regular rate of pay for each violation where
11 Defendants violated the meal and rest break provisions and paid the class the missed meal and
12 rest period premiums at an artificially reduced regular rate. Plaintiff and the class were entitled
13 to 1 hour of pay for each meal and rest break violation at their regular rate of pay. Defendants
14 failed and continue to fail to pay for meal and rest period violations at the employees' regular
15 rate of pay in violation of Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders.

16 30. Plaintiff seeks restitution and injunctive relief for said violations.

17 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein
18 mentioned, Defendants have engaged in unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business practices
19 prohibited by California B&PC § 17200, thereby depriving their employees and the putative class
20 the minimum working standards and conditions due to them under the California labor laws and
21 Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders as specifically described herein. Plaintiff seeks an
22 injunction preventing Defendants from continuing their unfair business practice of improperly
23 depriving their employees of overtime pay, and payment of their regular rate of pay for meal and
24 rest period premiums. Plaintiff further seeks an order requiring Defendants to identify by full
25 name, telephone number, and last known address employees who worked or still work for
26 Defendants from 2020 through the date of judgment; Plaintiff further seeks an order requiring
27 Defendants to timely pay restitution to all current and former employees, including back wages,
28 premium payments, and interest.

1 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO ILLEGAL ROUNDING**

2 32. Defendants have adopted and implemented an illegal rounding policy that
3 disproportionately impacts employees, which results in lost wages for hourly employees.

4 33. Defendants' conduct in their rounding of Plaintiff' and other members of the
5 class' time and failing to pay all wages due is also unfair within the meaning of Business and
6 Professions Code §17200 because it is against established public policy and has been pursued to
7 attain an unjustified monetary advantage for Defendants by unfairly and unlawfully reducing
8 Plaintiff' and the other class members' wages, and by rounding down Plaintiff' and class
9 members' meal periods, such that they were not entitled to at least 30 minute duty-free meal
10 periods. As such, Defendants' business practices, including their illegal rounding policy and
11 practice, is unfair, illegal, and fraudulent, in that such policy and practice was intended to reduce
12 lawful wages due, and deceive Plaintiff and the other class members' into believing that they
13 were being paid for all hours worked and receiving mandatory 30-minute duty-free meal periods,
14 when in fact they were not.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **RECOVERY OF UNPAID WAGES & PENALTIES**

17 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198)**

18 34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
19 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

20 35. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated identified herein were and are employed
21 and scheduled as a matter of established company policy to work and in fact worked as non-
22 exempt hourly employees in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or in excess of forty (40)
23 hours per week. Defendants employed and scheduled all employees without providing overtime
24 compensation for such excess hours worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and the
25 relevant California Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) orders. Labor Code § 204 establishes
26 the fundamental right of all employees in the State of California to be paid the proper amount of
27 wages in a timely fashion for their work, including overtime. Defendants always had a written
28

1 and verbal agreement to pay overtime and double time based on the Plaintiff's and classes'
2 regular rate of pay.

3 36. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218 and 1194(a), Plaintiff may bring a civil action for
4 overtime wages directly against the employer without first filing a claim with the Division of
5 Labor Standards Enforcement (hereinafter "DLSE") and may recover such wages, together with
6 interest thereon, penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs.

7 37. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have failed to pay to Plaintiff and all
8 persons similarly situated wages when due as required by Labor Code § 204.

9 38. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer than
10 the hours set by the IWC or under conditions prohibited by the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

11 39. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges
12 that Defendants have treated Plaintiff as hourly non-exempt employees. Despite this
13 classification, Defendants have willfully violated the Labor Code with respect to meeting the
14 requirements of paying one (1) regular rate of pay and calculating overtime and double time
15 based on that regular rate, as hereinbefore alleged. Defendants have failed to properly pay
16 premium overtime for hours worked in a week, and as such, Defendants are able to reduce their
17 overhead and operating expenses and gain an unfair advantage over competing companies
18 complying with state law. Furthermore, Defendants have failed to include all items of
19 remuneration when determining the employees' regular rate of pay, as described above.

20 40. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that the hourly non-exempt
21 class was never paid any premium compensation or paid significantly less premium
22 compensation for work accomplished in excess of forty (40) hours per week, and/or eight (8)
23 hours per day.

24 41. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants have a policy of
25 not paying overtime to their employees even though the employees actually worked the overtime
26 hours. Further, Plaintiff alleges that in an attempt to circumvent the overtime requirements,
27 Defendants code work differently from other hours worked so as not to incur overtime payments
28

1 for consecutive hours worked. Essentially, the employee is subject to a forfeiture of wages for
2 the hours worked.

3 42. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants consistently
4 administered a corporate policy regarding both staffing levels and duties and responsibilities of
5 the members of the classes which required the entirety of all classes to work overtime without
6 proper premium pay. This included a uniform corporate policy and practice of failing to include
7 all remuneration into the regular rate for purposes of calculating premium overtime payments
8 and meal period penalties. This corporate policy and pattern of conduct was/is accomplished
9 with the advance knowledge and design of all Defendants herein. Thus, Plaintiff and all others
10 similarly situated routinely, regularly, and customarily performed overtime work. Accordingly,
11 Plaintiff and all others similarly situated are entitled to overtime compensation under California
12 law. Further, Defendants disseminated false information throughout Defendants' facilities and
13 among the employees reciting that all hourly non-exempt employees would receive premium
14 overtime pay.

15 43. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that the obligations and
16 responsibilities of the class employees are irrelevant because Plaintiff and all others similarly
17 situated merely allege wrongdoing with Defendants' pay plans. Further, the duties of Plaintiff
18 and all others similarly situated are not relevant in certifying any of the classes. Defendants'
19 hourly non-exempt employees work routinely in excess of eight (8) hours per day, forty (40)
20 hours per week, and/or and they were not, and have never been, paid the proper regular rate of
21 compensation nor the proper premium compensation for their overtime work.

22 44. Defendants, and each of them, in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, et seq.,
23 respectively, had a consistent and uniform policy, practice, and procedure of willfully failing to
24 pay the earned and unpaid wages of all such former employees. Defendants have willfully failed
25 to pay the earned and unpaid wages of such individuals, including, but not limited to regular pay,
26 premium pay, and other wages earned and remaining uncompensated according to amendment,
27 or proof.
28

1 45. The pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
2 illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to
3 recovery by Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, in a civil action, for the unpaid balance of
4 the full amount of the all wages owing, including the proper calculation of the regular rate and
5 the proper overtime premiums calculated at 1.5 or 2 times the legal regular rate which are owing,
6 including interest thereon, willful penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit
7 according to the mandate of Labor Code § 1194, et. seq.

8 46. Likewise, Defendants have a pattern, practice, and uniform administration of
9 corporate policy regarding failure to comply with the required provisions of Labor Code § 226.7,
10 in failing to pay Plaintiff and the class the meal and rest period premium payment at the regular
11 rate.

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq.)**

14 47. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporate by reference herein the allegations of all
15 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

16 48. Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., provides that an employer is required to pay an
17 employee all wages (including accrued vacation) immediately upon an employee's involuntary
18 separation from employment; immediately upon his voluntary separation if the employee gave at
19 least seventy two (72) hours notice, and within seventy-two (72) hours, if the employee
20 voluntarily separated, but did not give at least seventy-two (72) hours notice.

21 49. Plaintiff and other former employees of Defendants employed in the State of
22 California separated from employment with Defendants, and did not timely receive a final
23 paycheck with all of their wages due from Defendants in violation of Labor Code §§
24 200, et seq. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants also violated the
25 mandates of Labor Code §§ 200, et seq., as to other employees whose employment ended during
26 the period of time covered by this action.

27 50. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 200, et. seq., each member of the class that no longer
28 works for Defendants, and who was not timely paid all of his or her wages due is entitled to one

(1) day of pay in penalties for each day that he or she was paid late, until payment was made, up to a maximum of thirty (30) days.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(Violation of Labor Code § 226)

54. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference herein the allegations of all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

55. Labor Code §226(a) provides, in pertinent part:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of 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. . . .

56. During the Class Period, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the Class Members, including Plaintiff, with timely and accurate wage and hour statements showing gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions made, net wages earned, the name and address of the legal entity employing that Class Member, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by that Class Member.

57. The Class Members, including Plaintiff, suffered injury as a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to provide the Class Members, with the wage and hour statements required by law.

58. Based on Defendants' conduct as alleged herein, Defendants are liable for actual damages, statutory damages, and/or statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, attorney's fees and costs, and other applicable provisions of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Order.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS
(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512)

59. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein, the allegations of paragraphs above.

60. California Labor Code § 512 and the IWC Wage Orders provide state that an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, and an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an “on duty” meal period and counted as time worked. California Labor Code § 226.7(a) further states that no employer shall require any employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC.

61. Employers are prohibited from exerting coercion against the taking of, creating incentives to forego, or otherwise encouraging the skipping of legally protected breaks.

62. Plaintiff and members of the Class were not provided with or given the opportunity to take the requisite meal periods before the end of the first 5 hours of work, nor were they provided with or given the opportunity to take a proper second meal period during the days when they worked more than 10 hours in a day. Defendants coerced Plaintiff and the members of the Class to forego meal periods by disciplining and/or threatening disciplinary action against them if they attempted to take meal periods, created incentives to forego meal breaks, and encouraged the skipping of meal periods by scheduling work to coincide with the meal periods, among other things. In addition, the pace of the job required Class Members to eat

1 while working in order to keep up with their work duties. As a result, Plaintiff and members of
2 the Class were required to work and/or were not relieved of all duties during any meal period
3 taken, and thus were considered “on duty;” however, Defendants failed to count as time worked
4 any “on duty” meal period taken by Plaintiff and the members of the Class.

5 63. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and IWC Wage Orders, if an
6 employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable
7 provisions of the IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at
8 the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday that the meal period is not provided. As
9 such, Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to an additional one hour’s pay for each day
10 in which Plaintiff and members of the Class were not provided a proper meal break under the
11 above-described authorities.

12 64. Plaintiff and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on all
13 unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from the
14 date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

15 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE OR PERMIT REST PERIODS**

17 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226.7)**

18 65. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
19 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

20 66. The IWC Wage Orders provide that every employer shall authorize and permit all
21 employees to take rest periods. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours
22 worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four hours of work, or a major
23 fraction thereof. An employer must provide employees with 10 minutes’ rest for shifts from
24 three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10
25 hours, and 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.

26 67. Plaintiff and Class Members were not permitted to take rest periods, were
27 required to work during their rest periods, and/or were disciplined and/or were advised that they
28

1 would be disciplined if they took rest periods during work hours, in contravention of California
2 law.

3 68. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c) and the applicable IWC Wage
4 Orders, if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the
5 applicable IWC Wage Orders, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
6 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

7 69. As such, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to an additional one hour's
8 pay for each day in which they were not provided a proper rest period under the above-described
9 authorities.

10 70. Plaintiff and the members of the Class request that the Court award interest on all
11 unpaid wages at the legal rate specified by California Civil Code § 3289(b), accruing from the
12 date the wages were due and payable pursuant to Labor Code § 218.6.

13 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO ILLEGAL ROUNDING**

15 **(Violation of (Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2,**
16 **1197, 1198)**

17 71. Plaintiff re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the
18 allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

19 72. Labor Code § 510(a) states in pertinent part: "Any work in excess of eight hours
20 in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek . . . shall be
21 compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for any
22 employee."

23 73. The applicable Wage Orders provide that effective January 1, 2024, "[e]very
24 employer shall pay to each employee . . . wages not less than . . . \$16 per hour for all hours
25 worked. . ."

26 74. Labor Code § 1194(a) states: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a
27 lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime
28 compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid

1 balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest
2 thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit."

3 75. Pursuant to Labor Code §1197, payment of less than the minimum wage fixed by
4 the Labor Commissioner is unlawful.

5 76. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1198: "The employment of any employee for longer
6 hours than those fixed by the [Wage Order] or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage
7 Order] is unlawful."

8 77. Pursuant to the applicable Wage Orders, Defendants are required to pay Plaintiff
9 and the members of the Class for all hours worked, including all-time during which an employee
10 is subject to the control of an employer, as well as all-time the employee is suffered or permitted
11 to work, whether or not required to do so.

12 78. Defendants, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, uniformly
13 and consistently, adopted and implemented a rounding system whereby the hours worked by
14 Plaintiff and members of the Class were rounded, usually down, so that during the course of their
15 employment, Plaintiff and the members of the Class were paid far less than they would have
16 been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time, rather than rounded time. Moreover,
17 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon allege that the rounding policy and
18 procedure was applied to clocking in and out for meal periods, such that Plaintiff and members
19 of the Class were not entitled to all of the time to properly take their meal periods as required by
20 law.

21 79. Based on Defendants' illegal rounding policy and practice, Plaintiff and the
22 members of the Class were required to remain under Defendants' control without pay, resulting
23 in Plaintiff and the members of the Class earning less than the minimum wage or the full amount
24 of overtime compensation for overtime hours worked.

25 80. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194(a) and Civil Code 3287, Plaintiff and the
26 members of the Class are entitled to pre-judgment interest on all amounts recovered herein.
27 Moreover, further to Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 1194, Plaintiff and the members of the Class seek
28 an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting this action.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO REIMBURSE EXPENSES

(Violation of (Labor Code § 2802))

81. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

82. California Labor Code § 2802 provides that “[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

83. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that at all relevant times Plaintiffs and the class members incurred certain expenses for their jobs with Defendants, including but not limited to using their own automobiles to perform outreach and other services for seniors and other adult program participants. Despite this, Defendants failed and refused to indemnify Plaintiffs and the class for all of their expenditures in carrying out their duties for Defendants.

84. As a result of Defendants’ failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the class members, they have suffered losses according to proof, including prejudgment interest, costs, and attorneys’ fees in prosecuting this case.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699)

85. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference as if fully set forth herein, the allegations of the preceding paragraphs.

86. On or about March 18, 2024, Plaintiff Ma provided written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

87. The LWDA failed to respond to Plaintiffs’ counsel’s correspondence and failed to notify Plaintiffs’ counsel as to whether it would investigate the allegations contained therein,

1 within the time period requirements of the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA), under Labor
2 Code §2699.3. Plaintiffs have fully complied with the notice requirements set forth in Labor
3 Code §2699.3 in order to commence a civil action against an employer pursuant to Labor Code
4 §2699.

5 88. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs for all hours worked, minimum wages,
6 overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest
7 periods, failure to pay all wages upon termination or resignation, and failure to provide accurate
8 itemized wage statements, failure to reimburse expenses, will subject Defendants to civil
9 penalties pursuant to, without limitation, Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 510, 512, 1174,
10 1194, 1198, 2802, and IWC Wage Orders.

11 89. Plaintiffs are aggrieved employees as defined in Labor Code §§2699(a) and (c),
12 and related Labor Code provisions. Plaintiffs bring this cause of action on behalf of themselves,
13 as private attorneys general, and in a representative capacity on behalf of other aggrieved
14 employees, affected by the labor law violations alleged herein.

15 90. Defendants committed numerous violations of the California Labor Code and
16 IWC Wage Orders against the Plaintiffs, and on information and belief, against members of the
17 Class and other current and former employees while they were employed by Defendants,
18 including but not limited to:

19 a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 510, 511, 1194 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
20 failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
21 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum, straight time and overtime wages
22 owed in compliance with California law;

23 b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage
24 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class by failing to pay for a missed
25 meal or rest period at the regular rate of pay;

26 c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
27 failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
28 current and former employees of Defendants, all minimum wages owed in compliance with
California law;

1 d. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 204, 510, 511 and/or IWC Wage
2 Orders by failing to pay Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief,
3 other current and former employees of Defendants, all wages owed in a timely manner in
4 compliance with California law;

5 e. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7, 512, and /or IWC Wage Orders by
6 failing to provide Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and belief, other
7 current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite meal periods
8 in compliance with California law;

9 f. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226.7 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
10 failing to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the members of the Class, and on information and
11 belief, other current and former employees of Defendants, the opportunity to take the requisite
12 rest periods in compliance with California law;

13 g. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226, 1174 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
14 failing to properly maintain accurate employment time and records, maintain and/or submit
15 accurate itemized wage statements on behalf of Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and on
16 information and belief, on behalf of other current and former employees of Defendants as
17 described herein; and

18 h. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and/or IWC Wage Orders by
19 failing to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and on information and belief, other current and former
20 employees of Defendants as described herein;

21 i. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 and/or the IWC Wage Orders by failing
22 to pay Plaintiffs and other members of the Class all of their reasonable and necessary expenses.

23 91. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs, members of the Class, and all other
24 aggrieved current and former employees seek to recover civil penalties, as otherwise provided by
25 statute and wage order, for which Defendants are liable as a result of their violations of the
26 California Labor Code and applicable wage order(s) in an amount to be proven at trial. These
27 penalties include, but are not limited to, those provided by Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204,
28 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1194, 1197, 2699, and IWC Wage Orders.
Plaintiffs and aggrieved current and former employees further seek and award of reasonable
attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 and 2699.

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

3 1. That the Court determines this action may be maintained as a class action;

4 **As to the First Cause of Action:**

5 2. For an order preliminarily and permanently enjoining Defendants from engaging
6 in the practices challenged herein;

7 3. An order for full restitution of all monies, as necessary and according to proof, to
8 restore any and all monies withheld by the Defendants by means of the unfair practices
9 complained of herein. Plaintiff seeks, on behalf of the putative class, the appointment of a
10 receiver, as necessary. The restitution includes all monies retained as wages, as defined in Labor
11 Code §§ 201, 202, 510, and 1194, and interest, and attorneys' fees as a result of the unfair
12 business practices;

13 4. For an order finding and declaring that Defendant's acts and practices as
14 challenged herein are unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent;

15 5. For an accounting, under the administration of Plaintiff and subject to court
16 supervision, to determine the amount to be returned by Defendants and the amounts to be
17 refunded to members who are or were not paid all their wages due to Defendants' unfair business
18 practices;

19 6. For the creation of an administrative process wherein each injured current and
20 former employee receives his or her back wages in the form of overtime pay or alternatively that
21 each current or former eligible employee may submit a claim in order to receive his/her money;

22 7. For an order requiring Defendants to make full restitution and payment pursuant
23 to B&PC Sections 17200, et seq.;

24 8. For all other appropriate declaratory and equitable relief;

25 9. For pre-judgment interest to the extent permitted by law;

26 10. For an order requiring Defendants to identify, by name, address, and telephone
27 number of each person who worked as an hourly non-exempt employee for Defendants from four
28 (4) years before the filing of the original complaint in this action through the time of judgment;

11. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Second and Fourth Cause of Action:

12. For damages according to proof, as set forth in Labor Code §§ 510, 226.7 and 1194, et seq., (and the applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission wage orders) regarding wages due and owing;

13. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code § 1194 and California Civil Code § 3287(b), for waiting time penalties as authorized by Labor Code § 203, and for reasonable attorneys' fees;

14. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Third Cause of Action:

15. For waiting for time penalties for all former employees not timely paying their last paycheck, including vacation pay;

16. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

17. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action:

18. For recovery as authorized by Labor Code §226(e);

19. For injunctive relief to ensure Defendants' compliance with Labor Code §226 and the IWC Wage Orders §7(A) pursuant to Labor Code §226(h);

20. For an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §226(e) and/or §226(h);

21. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action:

22. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided, impeded, discouraged, and/or dissuaded;

23. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action:

24. One (1) hour of pay at each of the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not authorized or permitted, or impeded, interrupted, discouraged, and/or dissuaded;

25. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action:

26. For recovery of the unpaid balance of the full amount of unpaid minimum wage or overtime and double-time compensation, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198 due and owing, according to proof;

27. For liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid pursuant to Labor Code § 1194.2(a);

28. For pre-judgment interest as allowed by Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194(a), and Civil Code § 3287;

29. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.5 and/or 1194(a);

30. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action:

31. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code § 2698 and 2699;

32. For an order imposing all civil and statutory penalties provided by law;

33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g); and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to All Causes of Action:

35. For reasonable costs incurred;

36. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

1 Dated: May 29, 2024

BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC

2
3 By: /s/ Aaron A. Bartz
4 Aaron A. Bartz
5 Attorney for Plaintiff Isaiah Ma and all other
6 similarly situated employees
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

Dated: May 29, 2024

26

EXHIBIT 4

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
11/06/2025		Revise and final all final approval papers. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	3.00h	\$925.00	-	\$2,775.00
11/03/2025		Review and revise motion for final approval papers. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
10/27/2025		Prepare supporting documents for final approval, and revise same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.50h	\$925.00	-	\$1,387.50
10/26/2025		Prepare Judgment and supporting declaration. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.50h	\$925.00	-	\$1,387.50
10/24/2025		Review and revise administrator declaration. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00h	\$925.00	-	\$925.00
10/23/2025		Prepare motion for final approval and supporting declaration. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	4.90h	\$925.00	-	\$4,532.50
10/23/2025		Review of settlement administrator declaration, and conference regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.60h	\$925.00	-	\$555.00
10/06/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update.	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		Unbilled	the Community Assistance Program for Seniors					
09/29/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00
09/23/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00
09/17/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00
09/08/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00
09/02/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update; Conference with paralegal regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.60h	\$925.00	-	\$555.00
08/25/2025		Review settlement administrator email and class mailing update. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.40h	\$925.00	-	\$370.00
07/30/2025		Review of further emails from OPC and administrator regarding class notice, and review class notice.	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance	Aaron Bartz	0.60h	\$925.00	-	\$555.00

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		Unbilled	Program for Seniors					
07/28/2025		Review further emails from settlement administrator regarding preliminary calculations, and respond to same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.50h	\$925.00	-	\$462.50
07/25/2025		Review case for further handling, and review and respond to emails from settlement administrator. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.50h	\$925.00	-	\$462.50
07/18/2025		Review and respond to emails regarding escalator clause, and prepare memo regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.70h	\$925.00	-	\$647.50
06/26/2025		Review and respond to settlement administrator; Review class notice. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00h	\$925.00	-	\$925.00
06/25/2025		Review Court Order, and prepare Notice; Confer with settlement administrator regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
06/24/2025		Review and consider case documents, and prepare for hearing, and attend same; Review and respond to emails with OPC, and with settlement administrator. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.50h	\$925.00	-	\$1,387.50
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
06/23/2025		Review documents in preparation for hearing on preliminary approval. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00h	\$925.00	-	\$925.00
03/27/2025		Review, revise and final Motion for Preliminary Approval motion and supporting papers. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	3.00h	\$925.00	-	\$2,775.00
03/27/2025		Prepare tables for MPA and file and serve MPA and supporting documents; Conferences with AB regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	2.50h	\$215.00	-	\$537.50
03/25/2025		Review and revise motion for preliminary approval and supporting documents. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
03/19/2025		Continued drafting of motion for preliminary approval of class settlement and supporting declarations, proposed order. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	5.40h	\$650.00	-	\$3,510.00
03/19/2025		Review and revise Motion for Preliminary Approval and supporting declaration. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	3.00h	\$925.00	-	\$2,775.00
03/18/2025		Review case file regarding settlement and damage calculations; draft motion for	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance	Rex Phillips	7.60h	\$650.00	-	\$4,940.00
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		preliminary approval of class settlement. Unbilled	Program for Seniors					
03/18/2025		Review and consider motion for settlement approval, and research regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
03/11/2025		Review for consideration of motion for preliminary approval of settlement. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	2.50h	\$650.00	-	\$1,625.00
03/11/2025		Revise and final settlement agreement, and prepare email to OPC regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	0.50h	\$925.00	-	\$462.50
03/06/2025		Confer with RP regarding case; Review changes to settlement agreement, and review and respond to email regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00h	\$925.00	-	\$925.00
02/20/2025		Review case file and settlement regarding preparation for motion for preliminary approval of settlement. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.70h	\$650.00	-	\$455.00
02/04/2025		Review case file and payroll records regarding potential issues to be raised at mediation; coordinate contact with client	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		regarding mediation Unbilled						
02/04/2025		Prepare for mediation, and attendance at same; Prepare MOU, and exchange emails with co-counsel and OPC regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	10.00h	\$925.00	-	\$9,250.00
02/03/2025		Review and consider mediation materials, and prepare for mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
01/28/2025		Review, revise and final Mediation Brief. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
01/27/2025		Review and consider mediation brief, and research regarding same; Prepare emails regarding same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	2.00h	\$925.00	-	\$1,850.00
01/22/2025		Draft mediation brief; research regarding the same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	6.40h	\$650.00	-	\$4,160.00
01/21/2025		Review case file in preparation for drafting mediation brief; telephone conference with client regarding factual issues related to labor code violations; begin drafting mediation	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	3.80h	\$650.00	-	\$2,470.00
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		brief. Unbilled						
01/17/2025		Draft mediation brief. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	2.40h	\$650.00	-	\$1,560.00
01/15/2025		Draft mediation brief; research regarding the same; payroll data review regarding the same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	2.20h	\$650.00	-	\$1,430.00
01/14/2025		Review class data provided by Defendant for drafting mediation brief; review case file, client documents and paystubs regarding the same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	1.40h	\$650.00	-	\$910.00
01/13/2025		Internal case review with Aaron Bartz for further handling regarding mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.30h	\$650.00	-	\$195.00
01/10/2025		review case file for further handling and preparation for drafting mediation brief; research regarding the same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	1.60h	\$650.00	-	\$1,040.00
01/10/2025		Review documents produced by Plaintiff for mediation purposes; continued review of data produced by Defendant for mediation purposes.	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	1.20h	\$650.00	-	\$780.00
					116.55h		\$0.00	\$91,267.15
							0.00h	116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
Unbilled								
01/09/2025		Review class data provided by Defendant for mediation purposes; review case file regarding the same. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	1.30h	\$650.00	-	\$845.00
01/06/2025		Emails with OPC regarding data exchange for mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
01/02/2025		Review case file regarding theories of liability for mediation; email to OPC regarding class data for mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.80h	\$650.00	-	\$520.00
12/20/2024		Client conference call re case status and mediation Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	0.25h	\$295.00	-	\$73.75
12/18/2024		Telephone conference with OPC regarding class data for mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
12/17/2024		Emails with OPC regarding class data for mediation. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
11/22/2024		Email to OPC regarding mediation data request.	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and	Rex Phillips	0.20h	\$650.00	-	\$130.00
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		Unbilled	the Community Assistance Program for Seniors					
11/21/2024		Telephone conference with OPC regarding mediation data request. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
11/21/2024		Email to OPC regarding mediation data request. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.20h	\$650.00	-	\$130.00
09/13/2024		Prepare for and attend case management conference. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	1.00h	\$650.00	-	\$650.00
09/06/2024		Review joint status report and OPC's edits regarding the same; finalize joint status report and prepare for filing. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Rex Phillips	0.40h	\$650.00	-	\$260.00
09/04/2024		Review case for further handling, and prepare Joint Report. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00h	\$850.00	-	\$850.00
09/04/2024		Draft Joint report shell and review minute order for Attorney review Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	1.00h	\$295.00	-	\$295.00
07/03/2024		Client Conference call re Case status	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance	Nestor Mejia	0.17h	\$295.00	-	\$50.15

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:29 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		Unbilled	Program for Seniors					
06/11/2024		Case review Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	0.17h	\$295.00	-	\$50.15
06/11/2024		Client conference call re case status Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	0.00h	\$295.00	-	\$0.00
06/11/2024		Prepare POS for filing and conference with Client re Case status Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	0.34h	\$295.00	-	\$100.30
06/06/2024		Researched local rules and procedures Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen- Phuoc	0.17h	\$215.00	-	\$36.55
05/29/2024		Prepare Complaint, Summons and Civil Case Cover Sheet for filing with Court. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen- Phuoc	0.25h	\$215.00	-	\$53.75
05/27/2024		Review and consider client documents, and research regarding claims; Prepare Complaint. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	6.50h	\$850.00	-	\$5,525.00
03/18/2024		Review of client documents, and research claims; Prepare PAGA letter, and coordinate filing and	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance	Aaron Bartz	4.00h	\$850.00	-	\$3,400.00
					116.55h		\$0.00	\$91,267.15
							0.00h	116.55h

Activities Export

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		service of same. Unbilled	Program for Seniors					
03/15/2024		Review case documents, and research regarding potential claims. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	5.00h	\$850.00	-	\$4,250.00
02/26/2024		Initial call will PC regarding new case Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	1.00h	\$295.00	-	\$295.00
					116.55h		\$0.00 0.00h	\$91,267.15 116.55h

EXHIBIT 5

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:28 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
11/04/2025		Filing fees re Motion for Final Approval and Case Anywhere Fees through end of class administration (anticipated). Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$750.00	-	\$750.00
11/03/2025		Case Anywhere Fees. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
10/03/2025		Caseanywhere Fees Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
09/03/2025		caseanywhere Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
08/05/2025		Caseanywhere Fees Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
07/02/2025		Caseanywhere Fees Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$55.00	-	\$55.00
06/24/2025		Notice of Order MPA - OL Confirmation #32671887 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$23.44	-	\$23.44
06/04/2025		CaseAnywhere Fees.	00076-Ma	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:28 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
		Unbilled	Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors					
05/08/2025	CaseAnywhere Fees. Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
04/06/2025	CaseAnywhere Fees. Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$97.00	-	\$97.00
04/01/2025	MPA Courtesy Copy - OL Confirmation #32163573 Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$46.46	-	\$46.46
03/27/2025	MPA - OL Confirmation #32141359 Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$86.42	-	\$86.42
03/24/2025	JT Calcs Invoice - Damages Analysis. Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$1,600.00	-	\$1,600.00
03/06/2025	CaseAnywhere Fees. Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$49.00	-	\$49.00
03/03/2025	JSR via One Legal Confirmation #31983316 Unbilled		00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$23.44	-	\$23.44

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:28 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
Program for Seniors								
02/05/2025		CaseAnywhere Fees. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$147.00	-	\$147.00
12/23/2024		Judicate West - Mediation Fees (Kelly A. Knight). Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$9,450.00	-	\$9,450.00
11/10/2024		Case Anywhere Fees. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$105.96	-	\$105.96
09/06/2024		One Legal Filing re Joint Status report Confirmation #31059255 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	1.00	\$19.15	-	\$19.15
06/19/2024		Nationwide - Service of Process. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$231.17	-	\$231.17
06/11/2024		One Legal Filing re Sub Service of POS Confirmation #30591729 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Nestor Mejia	1.00	\$19.15	-	\$19.15
05/30/2024		Re-submission of Summons x2 Confirmation #30524632 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen- Phuoc	1.00	\$14.95	-	\$14.95
							\$0.00 0.00h	\$14,569.17 0.00h

Activities Export

11/06/2025

1:28 PM

Date	Type	Description	Matter	User	Qty	Rate (\$)	Non-billable (\$)	Billable (\$)
05/29/2024		Re-submission of Summons on OneLegal Confirmation #30520938 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$19.15	-	\$19.15
05/29/2024		Filed complaint, summons and civil case sheet via one legal Confirmation #30517170 Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Leanne Nguyen-Phuoc	1.00	\$1,454.15	-	\$1,454.15
03/18/2024		PAGA Notice filing fee. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$75.00	-	\$75.00
03/18/2024		Certified Mailing re PAGA notice. Unbilled	00076-Ma Ma v Heritage Clinic and the Community Assistance Program for Seniors	Aaron Bartz	1.00	\$8.73	-	\$8.73
							\$0.00 0.00h	\$14,569.17 0.00h