

D.LAW, INC.
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
d.arakelyan@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd, Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962- 6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA and MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN**

JAIME ESTRADA, on behalf of
himself, and others similarly situated,
the State of California, and the general
public,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO., a
Nevada corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772

CLASS ACTION

*Assigned for All Purposes to Hon. Jayne Lee, Dept.
10C*

**DECLARATION OF DAVID KELEDJIAN IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

*[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion and
Motion; Memorandum of Points and Authorities;
Declaration of Lilit Tunyan; and [Proposed] Order
Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval]*

Date: December 11, 2025

Time: 9:00 AM

Dept.: 10C

Original Complaint Filed: September 13, 2023

First Amended Complaint Filed: October 2, 2024

Second Amended Complaint Filed: April 2, 2025

Trial Date: None Set

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

1. I am an attorney licensed and admitted to practice before all courts of the State of California, the United States District Court for the Central, Southern, Eastern, and Northern Districts of California. I am Senior Counsel at D.Law, Inc. and counsel for Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA and MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA (“Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and all other similarly situated employees of Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO. (hereinafter “Defendant,” Plaintiffs and Defendant are collectively referred to as the “Parties”).

9
10
11
12
13

14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Termination of Employment); (6) Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Reimburse For
2 Necessary Expenditures); and (7) Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (Unfair Business
3 Practices). This matter was assigned a case number 24STCV02408.

4 5. On January 30, 2024, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff
5 CASILLAS gave timely written notice to Defendant and California's Labor and Workforce
6 Development Agency ("LWDA") by sending his PAGA Notice (LWDA-CM-1008154-24). On
7 February 7, 2024, Plaintiffs CASILLAS and APOLINAR filed an amended their PAGA notice with
8 the LWDA.

9 6. On February 13, 2024, Plaintiff CASILLAS filed his First Amended Complaint
10 adding another plaintiff Manuel Apolinar to the Casillas Action.

11 7. On June 17, 2024, Plaintiffs CAILLAS and APOLINAR filed their Second Amended
12 Complaint in the Los Angeles Superior Court, adding a cause of action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA
13 [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.].

14 8. On June 21, 2024, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff
15 MARTINEZ AYALA gave timely written notice to Defendant and California's Labor and
16 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by sending her PAGA Notice (LWDA-CM-1035810-
17 24). On October 2, 2024, and pursuant to the joint stipulation of the Parties, Plaintiffs filed a First
18 Amended Complaint ("FAC") in this matter, adding Plaintiff MARTINEZ AYALA as an additional
19 named Plaintiff and adding a cause of action for penalties under PAGA.

20 9. After initiating the Action, the Parties agreed to explore resolution via mediation and
21 engage in informal discovery in preparation for mediation.

22 10. On April 2, 2025, pursuant to the Settlement reached between the Parties at
23 mediation, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint to include all Released Claims (defined
24 below) and Released PAGA Claims (defined below), including the addition of Plaintiffs Casillas
25 and Apolinar as named Plaintiffs in this case ("Operative Complaint"). Plaintiffs Casillas' and
26 Apolinar's claims, which had been filed in the Los Angeles Superior Court case of *Casillas, et al v.*
27 *Spears Manufacturing, Co.*, Case No. 24STCV02408, were also added to this Complaint.

28 ///

11. To reiterate, the amount available for distribution to Class Members who do not opt out of the settlement is \$750,000.00 (Seven Hundred Fifty Hundred Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents) (“Gross Settlement Amount” or “GSA”) less the following deductions: (1) up to one-third (33% 1/3) of the GSA, or \$250,000.00, to Class Counsel for Attorneys’ Fees, and \$28,844.23 to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable expenses incurred to prosecute the Action (which is lower than the not to exceed amount of \$30,000.00 Class Counsel estimated in the Settlement Agreement); (2) up to \$20,000.00 to all Plaintiffs (Estrada, Martinez Ayala, Casillas, and Apolinar) as an Enhancement Award for service as the class representatives; (3) up to \$15,000.00 to the Settlement Administrator for its fees and costs to administer the Settlement; and (4) \$60,000.00 to the LWDA of the State of California for settlement of claims for civil penalties under PAGA, which will be paid out of the GSA, leaving \$20,000.00 as the Net PAGA Settlement Amount to be paid to PAGA Members. (Exh. 1, ¶¶ 3.1 – 3.2.5.)

12. From my experience in wage and hour litigation, the present settlement has resulted in a substantial benefit to Class Members. In fact, the Individual Class Payment will average **\$749.72 per participating class member**, the highest payment is **\$2,930.99**, and the lowest payment is **\$18.55** (Declaration of Marya Gonzalez, “Gonzalez Decl.,” ¶ 14.)

SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

13. After preliminary approval of Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix” or “Administrator”), on September 12, 2025, the Administrator sent the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Approval of Settlement (“Class Notice”) to the Class Members’ last-known addresses and made significant efforts to locate Class Members, including performing skip traces on those employees who could not be located. (Gonzalez Decl., ¶ 6.)

14. Of the 1,379 Class Members who were sent notices, 15 Class Notices were returned to Phoenix by the Post Office, and 15 Class Notices were re-mailed, with 0 Class Notices deemed undeliverable. (Gonzalez Decl., ¶¶ 5 – 6.) Class Notices were distributed in accordance with the Court’s preliminary approval order, and the response was excellent. Here, the deadline for submitting a Request for Exclusion from the Settlement, disputing the workweeks and objecting to

1 the Settlement was October 27, 2025. The deadline for those Class Members who received a
2 remailed Class Notice was November 10, 2025. (Gonzalez Decl., ¶ 8.) As of the deadline, **zero**
3 **class members objected** to the settlement, **zero class members opted out** of the Settlement
4 Agreement, and **zero class members** submitted a workweek dispute. (Gonzalez Decl., ¶¶ 8 – 11.)
5 Therefore, there is a total of 1,379 participating Class Members. (*Id.* at ¶ 11.)

6 15. The fact that there was a 100% participation rate indicates that the persons most
7 affected by Defendants’ alleged practices and who stand to benefit most from the settlement agree
8 that this is an outstanding result and a strong indication that the settlement is fair and adequate, and
9 that Class Members found it to be so.

10 16. Phoenix requests an administration expenses payment of \$15,000.00 (*Id.* at ¶ 17.)

11 **REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS**

12 17. The preliminarily approved settlement calls for the payment of up to \$250,000.00 in
13 attorneys’ fees, plus up to \$30,000.00 of Class Counsel’s costs (Class Counsel’s actual costs in this
14 matter are \$28,844.23, which includes the costs incurred by Tunyan Law (\$3,209.40) and D.Law,
15 Inc. (\$25,674.83). This total is slightly less than the allocated amount in the Settlement Agreement).
16 This request is fair, reasonable, and adequate to compensate Class Counsel for the substantial work
17 they have put into this case and the risk they assumed by taking it in the first place. The attorneys’
18 fees award is intended to reimburse Class Counsel for all uncompensated work that they have
19 already done and for all the work they will continue to do in carrying out and overseeing the
20 administration of the settlement.

21 **The Lodestar Method**

22 18. Class Counsel’s lodestar calculation supports the requested attorneys’ fees. The
23 lodestar calculation typically proceeds in three steps. First, a trial court must determine a baseline
24 guide or “lodestar” figure based on the time spent and reasonable hourly compensation for each
25 attorney involved in the case. *Serrano v. Priest* (1975) 20 Cal.3d 25, 48. The court then sets a
26 reasonable hourly fee to apply to the time expended, with reference to the prevailing rates in the
27 geographical area in which the action is pending. *Bihun v. AT&T Information System* (1993) 13
28 Cal.App.4th 976, 997. Finally, a “multiplier” is selected with reference to the following factors: (1)

1 the novelty and difficulty of the issues involved, (2) the skill displayed in presenting them, (3) the
2 extent to which the nature of the litigation precluded other employment by the attorneys, and (4) the
3 contingent nature of the fee award, based on the uncertainty of prevailing on the merits and of
4 establishing eligibility for the award. *Serrano, supra*, 20 Cal.App.3d at 49.

5 19. Class Counsel charges rates commensurate with the prevailing market rates in the
6 Los Angeles area for attorneys of comparable experience and skill in handling complex litigation.
7 Aside from being warranted by our skill, experience, and ability, Class Counsel rates that were used
8 in the application of the lodestar cross-check in this case are supported by the Laffey Matrix attached
9 hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

10 20. As for the *Serrano* factors, all militate in favor of the requested fee award. This case
11 raised a number of complex and contested issues, and Class Counsel exhibited skill and creativity
12 in prosecuting and presenting them. Chief among these was the law relating to meal and rest periods,
13 and failure to pay class members final wages.

14 21. This case was not straightforward. Class Counsel had to spend time researching and
15 analyzing each of these claims and issues in order to adequately assess the liability of Defendants.
16 Class Counsel then had to develop the evidence necessary through both formal and informal
17 discovery to establish Defendants' liability. This was done through carefully sifting through
18 hundreds of pages of documents.

19 22. In sum, Class Counsel had to come up with creative approaches to these issues in
20 litigating the case and, ultimately, negotiating and crafting the settlement. To this end, Class Counsel
21 has devoted a tremendous amount of time and energy. As shown in the table below, Class Counsel
22 have spent a substantial number of hours working on this case. This time commitment was necessary
23 in order to research, construct, and prosecute viable legal claims in the face of stiff opposition, but
24 it has come at a cost. In particular, the time Class Counsel have devoted to this case has prevented
25 them from investing time and effort into other cases. Despite these considerations, Class Counsel
26 zealously represented Plaintiffs and the Class and have obtained a favorable result.

27 23. Such is not always the case. Indeed, Class Counsel has invested time and money into
28 numerous other cases, including class actions, that have fizzled for one reason or another, leaving

1 Class Counsel completely without any compensation for effort. Here, Class Counsel has achieved a
2 beneficial settlement for the Class, but this was by no means a foregone conclusion; indeed, their
3 efforts might have well been frustrated by any number of obstacles with which they were presented
4 along the way. Nor could class certification be guaranteed. However, Class Counsel was able to
5 navigate the shoals of unpredictability to achieve a desirable result, and they have done so without
6 receiving any compensation to speak of thus far because they took this case on a contingency-fee
7 basis.

8 24. From the foregoing analysis, Class Counsel's requested attorneys' fees are fair and
9 reasonable. Class Counsel conservatively estimates that they have invested over 298.1 hours of
10 attorney time in this matter.

11 25. As a Senior Counsel, my current billing rate \$925.00 (9 years out of law school,
12 adjusted Laffey Matrix rate of \$943.00)¹, and I spent approximately 33.7 hours in this matter with
13 a lodestar amount of \$31,172.50. Managing Attorney David Yeremian's billing rate is \$1,375.00
14 (22 years out of law school, Laffey Matrix rate of \$1,141.00), and he spent 17.6 hours on this matter,
15 with a lodestar amount of \$24,200. Associate Attorney David Arakelyan's current billing rate is
16 \$585.00 (4 years out of law school, adjusted Laffey Matrix rate of \$653.00), and he spent
17 approximately 121.3 hours in this matter with a lodestar amount of \$70,960.50. Senior Attorney
18 Lilit Tunyan's current billing rate is \$600 per hour (4 – 7 years of experience), and she spent
19 approximately 118.9 hours on this matter, with a lodestar amount of \$71,340.00. Associate Attorney
20 Artur Tunyan's current billing rate is \$500 per hour, and he spent approximately 2.9 hours in this
21 matter, with a lodestar amount of \$1,450. (see Tunyan Decl., ¶¶ 9 – 14.) Associate Attorney Norayr
22 Zakayran's current billing rate is \$475.00 per hour, and he spent 1.6 hours on this matter, with a
23 lodestar amount of \$760.00. Associate Attorney Pola Bernabe's billing rate is \$475.00 per hour, and
24 she spent 1 hour on this matter, with a lodestar amount of \$475. Associate Attorney Kevin Burns'
25 billing rate is \$475.00 per hour, and he spent 0.9 hours on this matter, with a lodestar amount of
26

27 ¹ The adjusted Laffey Matrix rate for each attorney was calculated by taking the Laffey Matrix rate, which is based on
28 rates in the Washington-Baltimore area, and applying a locality adjustment rate of approximately 12.4% to account for
the higher wages for federal judiciary workers in San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland and neighboring counties,
including San Joaquin County, compared to federal judiciary workers in the Washington-Baltimore area per the
respective Judicial Salary Plan Tables.

\$427.50. Associate Attorney Lana Hovhannisyan's billing rate is \$475.00 per hour, and she spent 0.2 hours on this matter, with a lodestar amount of \$95.00. Therefore, Class Counsel has collectively incurred 298.1 hours and \$200,880.50 in fees.

26. The table below summarizes Class Counsel's total hours, billables, and costs:

<u>Attorney/Firm</u>	Total Hours	Total Billables	Costs
David Yeremian (D.LAW)	17.6	\$24,200	\$25,674.83
David Keledjian (D.LAW)	33.7	\$31,172.50	
David Arakelyan (D.LAW)	121.3	\$70,960.50	
Norayr Zakaryan (D.LAW)	1.6	\$760	
Pola Bernabe (formerly D.LAW)	1.0	\$475	
Kevin Burns (formerly D.LAW)	0.9	\$427.50	
Lana Hovhannisyan (D.LAW)	0.2	\$95	
Lilit Tunyan (TUNYAN LAW)	118.9	\$71,340	\$3,209.40
Artur Tunyan (TUNYAN LAW)	2.9	\$1,450	
TOTAL:	298.1	\$200,880.50	\$28,884.23

27. Class Multipliers routinely range from 3 to 5, and it is not uncommon that multipliers of between 5 and 10, or higher, are applied. See, e.g., *Wilson v. Bank of Am. Natl. Trust & Savs. Assn.*, No. 643872 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Aug. 16, 1982) (multiplier of 10); *Glendora Comm. Redev. Agency*

1 v. *Demeter* (1984) 155 Cal.App.3d 456, 465 (affirming multiplier of 12 and expressly rejecting the
2 argument that fee was either exorbitant or unconscionable). The fee request of \$250,000.00 results
3 in a modest multiplier of approximately 1.24, which further evidences the reasonableness of the
4 request.

5 **The Percentage-of-the-Benefit Comparison**

6 28. In settlements where a definite monetized fund is created, it is appropriate for courts
7 to evaluate the lodestar amount as a percentage of the recovery and adjust it accordingly if the
8 lodestar differs from the range of percentage fees freely negotiated in comparable litigation. *See*
9 *Lealao v. Beneficial Calif., Inc.* (2000) 82 Cal.App.4th 19, 49-50.

10 29. Class Counsel took this case on a contingent-fee basis against a corporation
11 represented by a reputable defense firm. When we take contingent cases, we must pay careful
12 attention to the economics involved or one bad case can destroy years of work. Accordingly, in such
13 cases, we anticipate that we shall, if successful, receive a fee that exceeds our normal hourly rate;
14 otherwise, the risk is often too great to bear. Even when we work long hours, the number of hours
15 in a day is limited.

16 30. Contingent-fee cases present the very real risk of working hundreds, if not thousands,
17 of hours that may never be entirely compensated. Moreover, while the case is being litigated,
18 counsel must pay overhead (salaries, rent, etc.), provide for their own expenses, and in most cases
19 pay the out-of-pocket expenses incurred on the plaintiffs' behalf. And the prospect of a court-
20 awarded fee does not greatly reduce the risk posed by these cases. In many cases, the prospect is
21 nothing more than a potential that never materializes. First, you must win the case to get a court-
22 awarded fee; even those cases that seem strongest at the onset can be lost and sometimes are lost.
23 Second, there are always the pitfalls and unforeseen obstacles that arise along the way, such as
24 settlement offers that the client may accept without ensuring that we receive a reasonable fee or
25 changes in the law that substantially affect the merits of the case, or other uncertainties involving
26 the client. Finally, there is the great risk inherent in advancing tens if not hundreds of thousands of
27 dollars in out-of-pocket expenses. If that money were to be invested in some sort of financial
28 investment, one would expect a reasonable rate of return on that investment. Here, however, the best

1 we can hope to recover is our money, and then only if we are substantially successful; if we are not,
2 all or part of this “investment” can be lost.

3 31. Class Counsel is well acquainted with the contingent-fee market throughout
4 California, particularly as it pertains to wage-and-hour and class-action litigation. Class Counsel has
5 negotiated numerous contingency-fee agreements with plaintiffs, both as individuals and as
6 representatives in class-action suits. Many of those agreements required that counsel receive a fee
7 under certain scenarios that exceed one-third of the recovery. Class counsel in contingency-fee cases
8 typically receive attorneys’ fees equal to or greater than a third of the gross settlement amount. An
9 award of attorneys’ fees equivalent to one-third of the common fund is commensurate with judicial
10 precedent. See *Crandall v. U-Haul* (Los Angeles County Sup. Ct., Case No. BC178775), the
11 Honorable Steven Czuleger awarded a 40% attorney fee request in an overtime-exemption class
12 action; in *Bushnell v. Cremar, Inc.* (Orange County Sup. Ct., Case No. 657778), the Honorable
13 Donald E. Smallwood awarded attorneys’ fees in the amount of 38%; in *Abzug v. Kerkorian*
14 CA000981 (Los Angeles County Sup. Ct., November 1990), the Honorable R. William Schoettler
15 awarded a 45% fee; in *Haitz v. Meyer, et al.*, Alameda County Sup. Ct., 8-201990 No. 572968-3,
16 the court awarded a 40% fee; in *Elliott v. Clothestime* (Orange County Sup. Ct., Case No. 01-
17 CC00333) the Honorable Jonathan Cannon awarded a 40% fee in a wage-and-hour class action
18 which had not yet proceeded to the class certification stage; in both *Rippee v. Boston Market*
19 *Corporation*, Case No.: 05 CV 1359 BTM (JMA) and *Barile v. Boston Market Corporation*, Case
20 No.: 05 CV 1360 BTM (JMA), the Honorable Judge Barry T. Moskowitz awarded a 40% fee to
21 plaintiff’s counsel in wage-and-hour class actions that had not proceeded to the class-certification
22 stage.

23 32. In light of the foregoing, the fee request in an amount equal to one-third of the Gross
24 Settlement Amount is well within the bounds that have been established by the above-cited
25 authority. Defendant has no objection to an award of fees in the amount requested. Moreover, the
26 Class Notice mailed to Class Members stated the amount of fees requested by Class Counsel;
27 however, not a single Class Member has objected to an award of fees in the amount requested.

28 ///

Costs

33. The preliminarily approved settlement calls for the payment of up to \$30,000.00 for Class Counsel's costs. The actual total costs incurred in litigating this Action for Class Counsel are \$28,884.23. Class Counsel's Cost Log are attached as **Exhibit 3** (D.Law Cost Log) to this Declaration and as **Exhibit 1** to the Declaration of Lilit Tunyan (Tunyan Cost Log). Class Counsel incurred costs including, but not limited to, filing fees (e.g. complaints, stipulations, motions), service of process, mediation fees, expert analysis fees, attorney-service costs for court filings, copy charges for documents, and postage charges, all of which were necessarily and reasonably incurred to prosecute this Action and achieve a settlement that significantly benefits the Class. Thus, Class Counsel requests a reimbursement of their incurred costs in the amount of \$28,884.23, with the difference of the costs allocated in the Settlement Agreement and actual costs incurred to be reverted to the Net Settlement Fund.

ENHANCEMENT AWARD TO THE NAMED PLAINTIFFS IS REASONABLE

34. Plaintiffs are entitled to a reasonable service payment for their efforts and initiative in bringing and helping to prosecute this Action. Plaintiffs assumed great risk by challenging Defendants' wage-and-hour policies and bringing suit against Defendants. Plaintiffs spent time better apprising themselves of their rights, deciding whether remedial action should be taken, how it should be taken, searching for attorneys, and finally contacting their attorneys, who spent many hours with them discussing the case and the law. In the end, Plaintiffs decided to vindicate not only their own rights but also those of their fellow employees by filing a class action lawsuit.

35. The courage it took to stand up to Defendants should not be underestimated. Few people want to confront their employers, let alone sue them. By suing his former employer, Plaintiffs contend that they increased the risk of retaliation by prospective employers to which they may apply in the future.

36. But Plaintiffs did not allow his fear of the potential repercussions of being a class representative to deter them from acting for the benefit of Class Members. They have devoted a substantial amount of time to helping Class Counsel effectively develop and prosecute this Action at every stage of the litigation. Plaintiffs conferred with Class Counsel on numerous occasions to

1 discuss every aspect of this case; provided information about Defendants; reviewed documents;
2 produced documents; identified witnesses; monitored the progress of the litigation; took the time to
3 apprise themselves of the facts, issues, and law regarding the claims at issue, spent time with Class
4 Counsel discussing the terms of the settlement and reviewing and executing the Settlement
5 Agreement. In all, Plaintiffs estimate that he has devoted numerous hours in preparing the Action
6 and seeing it through to settlement.

7 37. Plaintiffs spent a significant amount of time with Class Counsel detailing their
8 knowledge of Defendants' practices and assisting in the prosecution of this Action. They have
9 diligently, adequately, and fairly represented Class Members and have not placed his interests above
10 any member of the putative class. Class Counsel believes that Plaintiffs are entitled to an
11 enhancement award for the time and effort they have devoted to this case. Defendant has agreed not
12 to oppose it. Such payments to class representatives are a common feature of settlements negotiated
13 by Class Counsel, and trial courts routinely approve them. In light of the foregoing, Class Counsel
14 believes the Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of \$5,000.00 to each named
15 Plaintiff (totaling \$20,000.00) is fair and reasonable.

16 38. California trial courts routinely approve enhancement payments to class
17 representatives in wage-and-hour class-action settlements. See, e.g., *Bennett v. Countrywide*
18 *Financial Corporation* (2005) San Diego Sup. Ct. Case No. GIC840981 (\$35,000); *Hogue v. WH*
19 *Smith of Nevada, Inc.* (2004) San Diego Sup. Ct. Case No. GIC830653 (\$20,000); *Fiez v. Brown*
20 *Group Retail Inc., d.b.a. Famous Footwear* (2003) Orange County Sup. Ct. Case No. 01CC00381
21 (\$35,000 to the current employee of defendant and \$20,000 to former employee); *Barry v. Cost*
22 *Plus, Inc.* (2003) OCSC No. 01CC00380 (\$35,000 for each named plaintiff); *Lajoie v. The Picture*
23 *People, Inc.* (2003) Orange County Sup. Ct. Case No. 01CC00324 (\$25,000 each for two named
24 plaintiffs); *Franco v. Vans, Inc.* (2002) Orange County Sup. Ct. Case No. 01CC03995 (\$35,000 for
25 each named plaintiff); *Crandall v. U-Haul Corporation* (2001) Los Angeles Sup. Ct. Case No. BC
26 178775 (\$20,000 for each named plaintiff); *Joel v. Athlete's Foot Group* (2001) Los Angeles Sup.
27 Ct. Case No. BC 234231 (\$25,000). Plaintiffs' Class Representative Service Payment request is
28 substantially less than the enhancements approved in these cases; therefore, it is reasonable.

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

LABOR CODE § 2699(s)(2) COMPLIANCE

39. In compliance with Labor Code §2699(s)(2), Plaintiffs have attached the proof of service of the Settlement Agreement as **Exhibit 4**.

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

Executed this 17th day of November, 2025, at Glendale, California.

/s/ David Keledjian
David Keledjian

EXHIBIT 1

Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
Artur Tunyan (SBN 349174)
atunyan@tunyanlaw.com
TUNYAN LAW, APC
535 N Brand Blvd., Suite 285
Glendale, California 91203
Telephone: (323) 410-5050

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jovanni Casillas and Manuel Apolinar,
as individuals and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
David Keledjian (SBN 309135)
d.keledjian@d.law
David Arakelyan (SBN 337076)
d.arakelyan@d.law
D.LAW, INC.
450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840,
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jaime Estrada and Maria Martinez Ayala,
as individuals and on behalf of all employees similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN

JAIME ESTRADA, on behalf of himself and all
others similarly situated, and the general public,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO., a Nevada
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772

[Assigned for all purposes to Hon. Jayne Lee,
Dept. 10C]

**CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE**

Complaint Filed: September 13, 2023
FAC Filed: October 2, 2024
Trial: None Set

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA, MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA, JOVANNI CASILLAS and MANUEL APOLINAR (“Plaintiffs”) and Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO. (“Defendant”). The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendant collectively as “Parties,” or individually as “Party.”

1. **DEFINITIONS.**

- 1.1. “Actions” means Plaintiffs Jaime Estrada, Maria Martinez Ayala’s class action lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Jaime Estrada and Maria Martinez Ayala v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772, initiated on September 13, 2023, pending in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Joaquin (“*Estrada*” matter) and Plaintiffs Jovanni Casillas and Manuel Apolinar’s class action lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Jovanni Casillas and Manuel Apolinar v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, Case No. 24STCV02408, initiated on January 30, 2024, pending in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles (“*Casillas*” matter) .
- 1.2. “Administrator” means Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions, 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. “Class” or “Class Members” means all individuals employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees who are not covered by arbitration agreements and worked for Defendant in California during the Class Period.
- 1.5. “Class Counsel” means Tunyan Law, APC and D. Law, Inc.
- 1.6. “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 Actions.

1.7. “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.

1.8. “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 a PAGA Employee).

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

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

1.11. “Class Period” means the period from September 13, 2019 through January 21, 2025.

1.12. “Class Representatives” means the named Plaintiffs in the operative complaint in the Actions seeking Court approval to serve as Class Representatives.

1.13. “Class Representative Service Payments” means the payments to the Class Representatives for initiating the Actions and providing services in support of the Actions.

1.14. “Court” means the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin.

1.15. “Defendant” means named Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO.

1.16. “Defense Counsel” means Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP.

1.17. “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 (c) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

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

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

1.20. “Final Judgment” means the Judgment Entered by the Court upon Granting Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.21. “Gross Settlement Amount” means **Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$750,000.00)** which is the total amount Defendant agrees to pay under the Settlement or as modified pursuant to Paragraph 8 below. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees, Class Counsel Expenses, Class Representatives Service Payments and the Administrator’s Expenses.

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

1.23. “Individual PAGA Payment” means the PAGA 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.

1.24. “Judgment” means the judgment entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval.

1.25. “LWDA” means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the agency entitled, under Labor Code § 2699(i).

1.26. “LWDA PAGA Payment” means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code § 2699(i).

1.27. “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 Representatives Service Payments, Class Counsel Fees Payment,

Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment.
The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

- 1.28. “Non-Participating Class Member” means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.
- 1.29. “PAGA Employees” means all individuals employed by Defendant as non-exempt employees and worked for Defendant in California during the PAGA Period.
- 1.30. “PAGA Pay Period” means any Pay Period during which a PAGA Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.
- 1.31. “PAGA Period” means the period from January 30, 2023 through January 21, 2025.
- 1.32. “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. *et seq.*).
- 1.33. “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiffs’ January 30, 2024, February 7, 2024, June 21, 2024 and January 16, 2025 letters to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a).
- 1.34. “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the PAGA Employees (\$20,000.00) and the 75% to LWDA (\$60,000.00) 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. “Plaintiffs” means JAIME ESTRADA, MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA, JOVANNI CASILLAS and MANUEL APOLINAR, the named Plaintiffs in the Actions.
- 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 5.2 below.
- 1.40. “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

1.41. “Released Parties” means: Defendant and each of its former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, agents, employees, attorneys, insurers, predecessors, successors, 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 forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and PAGA Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, email, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax, email, or mail his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Notice Packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline has expired.

1.44. “Settlement” means the disposition of the Actions 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. On September 13, 2023, Plaintiff Jaime Estrada commenced the *Estrada* Action by filing a complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant for: (1) Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Labor Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7, 512 and 1198; (2) Failure to Provide Rest Periods (Labor Code §§ 204, 223, 226.7 and 1198; (3) Failure to Pay Hourly Wages and Overtime (Labor Code §§ 223, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 11971 and 1198; (4) Failure to Timely Pay All Final Wages (Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203); (5) Failure to Indemnify (Labor Code § 2802); (6) Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.). On October 2, 2024, pursuant to a joint stipulation with Defendant, Plaintiffs Jaime Estrada and Maria Martinez Ayala filed a First Amended Complaint adding a cause of action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.] and adding Plaintiff Martinez Ayala to the Complaint. On March 26, 2025, Plaintiffs Jaime Estrada and Maria Martinez Ayala filed a joint stipulation for seeking leave of the Court to file Second Amended Complaint adding claims for violations for Labor Code §§ 208, 212, 213, 216, 221, 225.5, 226.8, 227., 246, 432, 1198.5, 2100-2112,

1 2810.3 as well as additional Plaintiffs. On April 2, 2025, Plaintiffs Jaime Estrada and Maria Martinez
2 Ayala filed their Second Amended Complaint.

3 2.2. On February 13, 2024, Plaintiff Jovanni Casillas commenced *Casillas* Action by
4 filing a complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant for: (1) Violation of Labor
5 Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198 (Failure to Pay All Wages; (2) Violation of Labor Code §§
6 226.7, 512 (Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (3) Violation of Labor Code § 226.7 (Failure to
7 Provide Rest Periods); (4) Violation of Labor Code § 226, (Failure to Keep Accurate Itemized
8 Wage Statements); (5) Violation of Labor Code §§ 201-203 (Failure to Pay Wages Upon
9 Termination of Employment); (6) Violation of Labor Code § 2802 (Failure to Reimburse For
10 Necessary Expenditures); and (7) Violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (Unfair
11 Business Practices). On February 13, 2024, Plaintiff Jovanni Casillas filed his First Amended
12 Complaint adding another plaintiff Manuel Apolinar to Casillas Action. On June 17, 2024,
13 Plaintiffs Jovanni Casillas and Manuel Apolinar filed their Second Amended Complaint adding a
14 cause of action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.]. The Second Amended
15 Complaint in *Estrada* matter and the Second Amended Complaint in *Casillas* matter are the operative
16 complaints in the Actions (the “Operative Complaints.”) Defendant denies the allegations in the
17 Operative Complaints, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in in the Operative
18 Complaints, and denies any and all liability for the causes of Actions alleged.

19 2.3. After San Joaquin Superior Court grants final approval of this Settlement
20 resolving both *Estrada* and *Casillas* Actions and Defendant funds the entire Gross Settlement
21 Amount and employer’s portion of applicable taxes, Plaintiffs Jovanni Casillas and Manuel
22 Apolinar will file a request for dismissal of *Casillas* Action in Los Angeles Superior Court.

23 2.4. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiffs gave timely written notice to Defendant and
24 the LWDA by sending the PAGA Notice.

25 2.5. On November 11, 2024, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by
26 Hunter Hughes, Esq. and reached an agreement to settle the Actions.

27 2.6. Prior to the mediation, Plaintiffs obtained, through informal discovery, documents and
28 information necessary to evaluate the claims in the Actions, including sample pay and time records for

the Class. Plaintiffs' investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1801 (1996) and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal. App. 4th 116, 129-130 (2008) ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.7. The Court has not granted class certification.

3. **MONETARY TERMS.**

3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 9 below, Defendant promises to pay \$750,000.00 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount, and to separately pay any and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments. 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 PAGA 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:

3.2.1. To Plaintiffs: Class Representatives Service Payments to the Class Representative of not more than \$5,000 to each Class Representative (total of \$20,000.00) in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representatives are entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for a Class Representatives Service Payments that does not exceed this amount. Plaintiffs will seek Court approval for any Class Representatives Service Payments in the Final Approval Motion. If the Court approves Class Representatives Service Payments less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representatives Service Payments using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representatives Service Payments.

3.2.2. To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than 33 and 1/3%, which is currently estimated to be \$250,000.00 and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not

more than \$30,000.00. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments. Plaintiffs will seek court approval for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment in the Final Approval Motion. 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 Plaintiffs' Counsel arising from any claim to any portion any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these Payments.

3.2.3. To the Administrator: An Administrator Expenses Payment not to exceed \$18,000.00 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 \$18,000.00, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions has been selected as the Administrator, based upon its "not to exceed" bid of \$15,000.00.

3.2.4. 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.

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

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

3.2.5. To the LWDA and PAGA Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of \$80,000.00 be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% (\$60,000.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% (\$20,000.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the PAGA Employees’ 25% share of PAGA Penalties (\$20,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all PAGA Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each PAGA Employee’s PAGA Period Pay Periods. P A G A Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

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

4. **SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.**

4.1. Class Workweeks and PAGA Employee Pay Periods. As of November 11, 2024, the number of Workweeks worked by 475 Class Members who did not sign arbitration agreements during the Class Period is estimated to be 18,346 and 906 PAGA Employees during the PAGA Period who worked a total of 23,785 PAGA Pay Periods.

4.2. Class Data. Not later than fifteen (15) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendant will deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of 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, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than fifteen (15) days after the Effective Date.

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

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 when the check will be voided, which date shall be one hundred eighty (180) days after the date of mailing. 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 PAGA Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as PAGA 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 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 USPS forwarding address. Within seven (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 the 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 § 384(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, Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Class Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1. Plaintiffs' Release.

5.1.1. Scope of Plaintiffs' Release. Plaintiffs and their respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the Class Period, including, but not limited to all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action of every nature and description whatsoever, known or unknown, asserted or that might have been asserted, whether in tort, contract, or for violation of any state or federal statute, rule or regulation arising out of, relating to, or in connection with any act or omission by or on the part of any of the Released Parties arising out of, based upon, or relating to Class Representatives' employment with Defendant or the remuneration for or termination of such employment committed or omitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. ("Plaintiff's Release.") Plaintiffs' 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. Additionally, this release does not extend to any of the claims brought by Plaintiff Martinez Ayala, which were filed and are currently pending in the Superior Court of California, County of Ventura, Case No. 2024CUWT0215565, or any other claims by Plaintiff Martinez Ayala under the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") or any other derivative claims, and respective relief.

Plaintiffs acknowledge that Plaintiffs may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiffs now know or believe to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiffs' Release shall be and remain effective in all

1 respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiffs' discovery
2 of them.

3 5.1.2. Plaintiffs' Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code § 1542. For purposes of
4 Plaintiffs' Release, Plaintiffs expressly waive and relinquish the provisions, rights,
5 and benefits, if any, of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

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

11 5.1.3. Release by Participating Class Members Who Are Not PAGA Employees: All
12 Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former
13 and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and
14 assigns, release Released Parties from any and all claims, obligations, demands,
15 rights, causes of action, and liabilities against Released Parties, whether in law or
16 equity, that have been asserted or that could have been asserted based on the facts
17 alleged in Operative Complaints ("Released Class Claims"). Released Class
18 Claims include, but are not limited to, claims for failure to pay all wages, failure to
19 pay overtime or pay overtime at the correct rate of pay, failure to pay for all hours
20 worked (off-the-clock work), failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest
21 periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay final wages
22 and wages earned during employment, failure to provide accurate, itemized wage
23 statements, failure to provide suitable resting facilities, failure to pay minimum
24 wages, failure to provide proper paid sick leave, unlawful deductions, standard
25 conditions of labor code violations, statutory wage violations, failure to pay vested
26 time off or vacation, failure to provide final pay at place of discharge, seating
27 violations, written description of quota, unlawful agreements, unlawful inquires
28 into criminal history, unlawful PAGA waivers, and failure to maintain accurate and
complete records, and includes all claims for recovery of compensation, overtime
pay, minimum wage, premium pay, and/or all penalties under the California Labor

Code and California’s Wage Orders, and claims derivative and/or related to those claims, including those under the California Business & Professions Code from September 13, 2019 through January 21, 2025. 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, and any other claims specifically mentioned in section 5.1.1.

5.2. Release by Non-Participating Class Members Who Are PAGA Employees: All Non-Participating Class Members who are PAGA Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from any and all claims, obligations, demands, rights, causes of action, and liabilities against Released Parties for PAGA penalties that have been asserted in, or could have been asserted in based on the facts, claims, and/or allegations contained and/or plead in the PAGA Notices attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and the Operative Complaints (“Released PAGA Claims”). Released PAGA Claims include, but are not limited to PAGA penalties for claims for failure to pay all wages, failure to pay overtime or pay overtime at the correct rate of pay, failure to pay for all hours worked (off-the-clock work), failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay final wages and wages earned during employment, failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, and failure to maintain accurate and complete records, and includes all such claims from January 30, 2023 through January 21, 2025.

6. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.

Plaintiffs shall prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval (“Motion for Preliminary Approval”) in San Joaquin County Superior Court.

6.1. Plaintiffs’ Responsibilities. Plaintiffs will prepare and deliver to Defendant’s 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 §

2699(f)(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; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiffs, Class Counsel or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiffs confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members or the Administrator; (v) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code § 2699.3(a)), Operative Complaints (Labor Code § 2699(l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code § 2699(l)(2)) and (vi) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, the Administrator.

6.2. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than sixty (60) 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 to the Administrator.

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

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

7.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Phoenix Settlement

Administration Solutions to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

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

7.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund (“QSF”) under US Treasury Regulation § 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 fourteen (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 (with Spanish translation) substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as **Exhibit A**. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods 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 three (3) business days after the Administrator’s receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the

1 Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS
2 does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class
3 Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address
4 obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate
5 or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the
6 USPS a second time.

7 7.4.4. The deadlines for Class Members' written objections, Challenges to Workweeks
8 and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional
9 fourteen (14) days beyond the forty-five (45) days otherwise provided in the Class
10 Notice for all Class Members whose notice is re-mailed. The Administrator will
11 inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class
12 Notice.

13 7.4.5. If the Administrator, Defendant or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise
14 discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class
15 Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet
16 and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, in an effort to agree on
17 whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will
18 be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the
19 Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring
20 them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than fourteen (14) days
21 after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, which ever
22 are later.

23 7.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

24 7.5.1. Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement
25 must send the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for
26 Exclusion not later than forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails the Class
27 Notice or as otherwise extended for re-mailed Class Notices as described herein. A
28 Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that

1 reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the
2 Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or
3 telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed,
4 emailed, or postmarked by the Response Deadline, subject to extension for
5 remailed Class Notices as described herein.

6 7.5.2. The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it
7 fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator
8 shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably
9 ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's
10 desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not
11 appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to
12 question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may
13 demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's
14 determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise
15 susceptible to challenge.

16 7.5.3. Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for
17 Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement,
18 entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement,
19 including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3
20 of this Agreement, regardless whether the Participating Class Member actually
21 receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

22 7.5.4. Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a
23 Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class
24 Payment or have the right to object to the class Actions components of the
25 Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon
26 entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are PAGA
27 Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 5.4 of this
28 Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6. Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice, or as otherwise extended for re-mailed Class Notices as described herein, to challenge the number of 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, email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. 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 to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination the challenges.

7.7. Objections to Settlement.

7.7.1. Only Participating Class Members may object to the class Actions 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, email, 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 the Response Deadline, or as otherwise extended for re-mailed Class Notices as described herein.

7.7.3. Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class Actions 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 post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Settlement Agreement, the Class Notice, the Final Approval and the Judgment on the Administrator's website. 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 five (5) days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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

7.8.4. 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.

7.8.5. Administrator's Declaration. Not later than fourteen (14) days before the date by which Plaintiffs 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 Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

7.8.6. Final Report by Settlement Administrator. Within fourteen (14) 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 fourteen (14) 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. CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE.

Based on its records, Defendant estimates that, as of November 11, 2024, the number of Workweeks worked by Class Members who did not sign arbitration agreements during the Class Period is estimated to be 18,346. The parties stipulate to a 10% escalation of the estimated Workweeks without any

1 increase to the Gross Settlement Amount. If the number of actual Workweeks during the Class Period
2 exceeds this 10% cushion above the estimated workweek total of 18,346 (i.e., exceeds 20,182
3 Workweeks), the Gross Settlement Amount shall be increased by a pro-rata dollar value equal to the
4 number of Workweeks in excess of 20,182 workweeks.

5 **9. DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW**

6 Defendant may withdraw from Settlement if: (A) the Settlement is construed in such a fashion
7 that Spears is required to pay more than the Gross Settlement Amount and Spears's share of applicable
8 employer payroll taxes, except as specified in Paragraphs 8; (B) the Court does not approve the
9 Settlement; (C) the Court does not certify the Settlement Class, or does not certify a class releasing the
10 Class Claims set forth in this settlement agreement, or does not order the release of claims of the PAGA
11 Members agreed to by the Parties, or otherwise makes an order inconsistent with any of the material
12 terms of this settlement agreement; (D) 5% or more of the Class Members elect to "opt out" of the
13 Settlement Class; or (E) Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' counsel breach of this settlement agreement, including
14 breach of the agreement to dismiss all claims in the Casillas matter following final approval of settlement
15 in the Estrada matter and funding of the GSA.

16 The Parties agree that, if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void ab initio, have
17 no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform
18 under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendant will remain responsible for paying all
19 Settlement Administration Expenses incurred to that point. Defendant must notify Class Counsel
20 and the Court of its election to withdraw not later than seven (7) days after the Administrator sends
21 the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel; late elections will have no effect.

22 **10. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL.**

23 Not later than sixteen (16) court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs will
24 file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the
25 PAGA settlement under Labor Code § 2699(l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed
26 Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiffs shall provide drafts of these documents to
27 Defense Counsel not later than five (5) days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel
28 and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to

resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

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

10.2. Duty to Cooperate. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by 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.

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

10.4. Waiver of Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in 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.

10.5. Appellate Court Orders to Vacate, Reverse, or Materially Modify Judgment. If the

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

11. AMENDED JUDGMENT.

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

12. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

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

12.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendant and

1 Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed,
2 they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to
3 disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or
4 generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the
5 Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement
6 confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate
7 taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or
8 subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each
9 other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiffs,
10 Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any
11 conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, any with
12 third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only
13 that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's
14 communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to
15 Class Members.

16 12.3. No Solicitation. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and
17 employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the
18 Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate
19 with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

20 12.4. Integrated Agreement. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement
21 together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the
22 Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or
23 by any Party.

24 12.5. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and
25 represent that they are authorized by Plaintiffs and Defendant, respectively, to take all appropriate Actions
26 required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to
27 execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any
28 amendments to this Agreement.

12.6. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

execution of this Agreement.

12.14. Use and Return of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Evidence Code § 1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to 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.

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

12.16. 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.

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

To Plaintiffs:

Lilit Tunyan
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com
 Artur Tunyan
atunyan@tunyanlaw.com
TUNYAN LAW, APC
 535 N Brand Blvd. Suite 285
 Glendale, California 91203
 Telephone: (323) 410-5050

Emil Davtyan
emil@d.law
 David Yeremian
d.yeremian@d.law
 David Keledjian
d.keledjian@d.law
 David Arakelyan
d.arakelyan@d.law
D.LAW, INC.
 450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840,
 Glendale, CA 91203
 Telephone: (818) 962-6465
 Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

To Defendant:

Kathryn T. McGuigan
kathryn.mcguigan@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 300 South Grand Avenue
 Twenty-Second Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132
 Telephone: (213) 612-2500
 Facsimile: (213) 612-2501


Kayla K. Cox
kayla.cox@morganlewis.com
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
 Telephone: (415) 442-1197
 Facsimile: (415) 442-1001

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


12.19. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to 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.

Plaintiffs & Class Representatives:


Dated: 4/11/2025

Signed by:

 By: _____
JAIME ESTRADA

Dated: 04/09/2025

Signed by:

 By: _____
MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA

Dated: 4/9/2025 | 6:37 AM PDT

DocuSigned by:

 By: _____
JOVANNI CASILLAS

Dated: 4/8/2025 | 10:14 AM PDT


Signed by:

 By: _____
MANUEL APOLINAR

1 **Plaintiffs’ Counsel:**

2 Dated: 4/9/2025 | 7:43 AM PDT

TUNYAN LAW, APC

3 By:  C1FEE94AA91E49A...

4 Lilit Tunyan
5 Artur Tunyan

6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOVANNI CASILLAS
7 and MANUEL APOLINAR

8 Dated: 4/10/2025

D.LAW, INC.

9 By: 

10 Emil Davtyan
11 David Yeremian
12 David Keledjian
13 David Arakelyan

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA,
15 MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA

16 **Defendant:**

17 Dated: ____

SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO.

18 By: _____
19 Print Name

20 _____
21 Signature

22 _____
23 Title

24 **Defendant’s Counsel:**

25 Dated: ____

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

26 By: _____
27 Kathryn T. McGuigan
28 Kayla K. Cox

Attorneys for Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO.

Plaintiffs' Counsel:

Dated: ____

TUNYAN LAW, APC

By: _____

Lilit Tunyan
Artur Tunyan

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOVANNI CASILLAS
and MANUEL APOLINAR

Dated: ____

D.LAW, INC.

By: _____

Emil Davtyan
David Yeremian
David Keledjian
David Arakelyan

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA,
MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA

Defendant:

Dated: 4/22/2025

SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO.

By: Robert Kirkelie

Print Name

Robert Kirkelie

Signature


Manager

Title

Defendant's Counsel:

Dated: 4/23/2025

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Kathryn T. McGuigan
Kayla K. Cox

Attorneys for Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO.

EXHIBIT A

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

Estrada, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.

San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772

Casillas, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.

Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV02408

*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 employee class action lawsuits (“Actions”) against Defendant SPEARS MANUFACTURING CO. (“Defendant”) for alleged wage and hour violations. The Actions were filed by Defendant’s former employees Plaintiffs JAIME ESTRADA, MARIA MARTINEZ AYALA, JOVANNI CASILLAS and MANUEL APOLINAR (“Plaintiffs”) and seek payment of back wages, penalties, expense reimbursements for a class of hourly employees who are not covered by arbitration agreements and who worked for Defendant during the Class Period (September 13, 2019 through January 21, 2025) (“Class Members”) and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) for all hourly employees who worked for Defendant during the PAGA Period (January 30, 2023 and January 21, 2025) (“PAGA Employees”).

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 \$ [REDACTED] (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be \$ [REDACTED]**. 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 [REDACTED] workweeks** during the Class Period and **you worked [REDACTED] pay periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks or pay periods during any of the respective periods, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 4 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 Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs’ 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 PAGA 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 the 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 a PAGA 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 6 of this Notice. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. Defendant must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all PAGA Employees and the PAGA 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 Plaintiffs who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiffs, but every dollar paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiffs reduces the overall amount paid to Participating Class Members. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs if you think they are unreasonable. See Section 7 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 8 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 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 4 of this Notice.

1. WHAT IS THE ACTION ABOUT?

Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendant. The Actions accuse Defendant of violating California labor laws by failing to pay all wages, wages due upon termination and reimbursable expenses and failing to provide meal periods, rest breaks and accurate itemized wage statements. Based on the same claims, Plaintiffs have also asserted a claim for civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.) ("PAGA"). Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys in the Action: Tunyan Law, APC and D.Law, INC. ("Class Counsel.")

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

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

The settlement is not an admission of any wrongdoing by Defendant or an indication that any law was violated or that this case was suitable for class or representative treatment, and the Court has not decided in favor of Plaintiffs or Defendant. There was no trial.

Instead, Plaintiffs and Defendant hired an experienced, neutral mediator Hunter Hughes in an effort to resolve the Actions by negotiating to end the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement ("Agreement") and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Actions and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiffs 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.

Plaintiffs 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 PAGA Employees. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

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

1. Defendant Will Pay \$750,000.00 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 not more than fifteen (15) days after the Judgment entered by the Court becomes final. The Judgment will be final on the date the Court enters Judgment, 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, Plaintiffs 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 \$250,000.00 (33 and 1/3% of the Gross Settlement) to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and up to \$30,000.00 for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.
 - B. Up to \$5,000.00 to each Class Representative (total \$20,000.00) as a Class Representative Award for filing the Actions, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. A Class Representative Awards will be the only monies Plaintiffs will receive for representing the Class in this Action other than Plaintiffs' Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment.
 - C. Up to \$30,000 to the Administrator for services administering the Settlement (estimated to be \$15,000).
 - D. Up to \$80,000 for PAGA Penalties, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% in Individual PAGA Payments to the PAGA 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. Plaintiffs and Defendant are asking the Court to approve an allocation of 20 % of each Individual Class Payment to taxable wages (“Wage Portion”) and 80% to interest and penalties (“Non-Wage Portion.”). The Wage Portion is subject to withholdings and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms. Defendant will separately pay employer payroll taxes it owes on the Wage portion. The Individual PAGA Payments are counted as penalties rather than wages for tax purposes. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments and the Non-Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

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

5. Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don’t cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the monies will be deposited with the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in your name. If the monies represented by your check is sent to the Controller’s Unclaimed Property, you should consult the rules of the Fund for instructions on how to retrieve your money.
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 [REDACTED], that you wish to opt-out. The easiest way to notify the Administrator is to send a written and signed Request for Exclusion by the [REDACTED] Response Deadline. The Request for Exclusion should be a signed letter from a Class Member or his/her representative setting forth a Class Member’s name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement electing to be excluded from the Settlement. 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 enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiffs 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, Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions (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 9 of this Notice.

9. Participating Class Members' Release. After the Judgment is final and Defendant has fully funded the Gross Settlement and separately paid all employer 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 another 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 any and all claims, obligations, demands, rights, causes of action, and liabilities against Released Parties, whether in law or equity, that have been asserted or that could have been asserted based on the facts alleged in the operative complaints for the Actions ("Released Class Claims"). Released Class Claims include, but are not limited to, claims for failure to pay all wages, failure to pay overtime or pay overtime at the correct rate of pay, failure to pay for all hours worked (off-the-clock work), failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay final wages and wages earned during employment, failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, failure to provide suitable resting facilities, failure to pay minimum wages, failure to provide proper paid sick leave, unlawful deductions, standard conditions of labor code violations, statutory wage violations, failure to pay vested time off or vacation, failure to provide final pay at place of discharge, seating violations, written description of quota, unlawful agreements, unlawful inquires into criminal history, unlawful PAGA waivers, and failure to maintain accurate and complete records, and includes all claims for recovery of compensation, overtime pay, minimum wage, premium pay, and/or all penalties under the California Labor Code and California's Wage Orders, and claims derivative and/or related to those claims, including those under the California Business & Professions Code from September 13, 2019 through January 21, 2025. 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.

10. PAGA 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 PAGA Employees will be barred from asserting PAGA claims against Defendant, whether or not they exclude themselves from the Settlement. This means that all PAGA 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 entities based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Action and resolved by this Settlement.

The PAGA Employees' Releases for Participating and Non-Participating Class Members are as follows:

All Participating and Non-Participating Class Members who are PAGA Employees are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from any and all claims, obligations, demands, rights, causes of action,

and liabilities against Released Parties for PAGA penalties that have been asserted in, or could have been asserted in based on the facts, claims, and/or allegations contained and/or plead in the PAGA Notices attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibit B and the operative complaints of the Actions (“Released PAGA Claims”). Released PAGA Claims include, but are not limited to PAGA penalties for claims for failure to pay all wages, failure to pay overtime or pay overtime at the correct rate of pay, failure to pay for all hours worked (off-the-clock work), failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay final wages and wages earned during employment, failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements, and failure to maintain accurate and complete records, and includes all such claims from January 30, 2023 through January 21, 2025.

4. HOW WILL THE ADMINISTRATOR CALCULATE MY PAYMENT?

1. Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members, and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Workweeks worked by each individual Participating Class Member.
2. Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing \$20,000.00 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all PAGA Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by each individual PAGA 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 [REDACTED] 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, email or fax. Section 9 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.

5. 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 PAGA 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 PAGA 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 9 of this Notice has the Administrator’s contact information.

6. 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, identify the Actions as *Estrada, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772 or *Casillas, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV02408, 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 [REDACTED], or it will be invalid.** Section 9 of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

7. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiffs and Defendant are asking the Court to approve. At least 16 days before the [REDACTED] Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel and/or Plaintiffs will file in Court (1) a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, approval of Counsel's Fees, Litigation Expenses and Service Award stating (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiffs is requesting as a Class Representative Service Award. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is in Section 9 of this Notice) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on the Administrator's Website [REDACTED] or the Court's website <https://cms.sjcourts.org/fullcourtweb/civilCase.do?CourtCaseId=0&r=D6X>.

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement, the Motion for Final Approval and Fees, Litigation Expenses and Service Award may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. **The deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is [REDACTED].** Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action and include your name, current address, telephone number, and approximate dates of employment for Defendant and sign the objection. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. See Section 8 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing.

8. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on _____ at _____ in Department 10C of the San Joaquin Superior Court, located at 180 E Weber Ave, Stockton, CA 95202. 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, Plaintiffs, and the Administrator. The Court will invite comment from objectors, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel before making a decision. You can attend (or hire a lawyer to attend) either personally or remotely by calling into (209) 992-5590: Dept. 10C (Judge Lee): Bridge # 6937; Pin # 6822. Check the Court's website for the most current information. It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. You should check the Administrator's website [REDACTED] beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing.

9. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The Agreement sets forth everything Defendant and Plaintiffs have promised to do under the proposed Settlement. The easiest way to read the Agreement, the Judgment or any other Settlement documents is to go to

Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions ' website at _____. You can also telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below or consult the Superior Court website by going to <https://cms.sjcourts.org/fullcourtweb/civilCase.do?CourtCaseId=0&r=D6X> and entering the Case Number for the Action for *Estrada, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0009772 Action or (<http://www.lacourt.org/casesummary/ui/index.aspx>) and entering the Case Number for *Casillas, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 24STCV02408 Action.

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

Class Counsel:

Emil Davtyan

emil@d.law

David Yeremian

d.yeremian@d.law

David Keledjian

d.keledjian@d.law

David Arakelyan

d.arakelyan@d.law

D.LAW, INC.

450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840,

Glendale, CA 91203

Telephone: (818) 962-6465

Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Lilit Tunyan

ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

Artur Tunyan

atunyan@tunyanlaw.com

TUNYAN LAW, APC

535 N Brand Blvd. Suite 285

Glendale, California 91203

Telephone: (323) 410-5050

Settlement Administrator:

Phoenix Settlement Administrators

Email Address: mike@phoenixclassaction.com

Mailing Address:

Telephone: 949-331-0131

Fax Number:

10. WHAT IF I LOSE MY SETTLEMENT CHECK?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void you should consult the Unclaimed Property Fund for instructions on how to retrieve the funds.

11. 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 “B”



535 N Brand Blvd. Suite 285
Glendale, CA 91203
Tel: (323) 410-5050
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

January 30, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Return Receipt Requested

Agent for Service of Process for
Spears Manufacturing Co.
Darlene Fourriel
15853 Olden Street
Sylmar, California 91342

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION § 2698 ET SEQ.**

Re: Casillas v. Spears Manufacturing Co.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that The Sentinel Firm, APC has been retained by Jovanni Casillas (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer Spears Manufacturing Co. (“Defendant”). Pursuant to the joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement entered between Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC and Plaintiff’s written consent to joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement, Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC will be jointly prosecuting Plaintiff’s action against Defendant. The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Plaintiff alleges Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

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

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. Defendant has a corporate office and mailing address in Los Angeles County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a shift production lead from February 15, 2015 to November 18, 2023. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 days per week and over 10-11 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

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

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

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

Pursuant to relevant Industrial Welfare Commission Order Section 2 (n) split shift means a work schedule, which is interrupted by non-paid non-working periods established by the employer,

other than bona fide rest or meal periods. Section 4(c) also provides that when an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday.

Throughout the statutory time period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work "off-the-clock". During the statutory period Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to arrive early to stay in a separate line to undergo COVID pre-screening prior to clocking in to work and to stay in a different line to clock in to work but did not compensate for that time. Defendant also regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to clock out for meal periods but continue working. Throughout the statutory period Defendant also required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work split shifts but refused to pay split shift premiums. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. In doing so, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

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

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that

were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to often times interrupt their meal periods and get back to work to continue working. Most importantly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were instructed to clock out for meal periods but to continue working so that in their timesheets it looked like they took their meal periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also not authorized to take their second meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked

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

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

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to purchase tools

and materials including but not limited to wrenches, set screwdrivers, toolboxes necessary to perform their work but were not reimbursed for those tools. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to use their personal vehicles to drive to Defendant's other location but were not reimbursed for mileage. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would also use their personal cell phones to communicate with supervisors and coworkers regarding work but were not reimbursed for cell phone usage. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).

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

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

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

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

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

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

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Lab. Code § 204(a). The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Lab. Code § 204(d).

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

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

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

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

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;

7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
8. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address and address of the agent for service as indicated on the first page.

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiff becomes aware of additional compensation owed or losses incurred by Plaintiff or by any other aggrieved employee of Defendant or any additional facts, Plaintiff expressly reserves the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending the claim letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
TUNYAN LAW, APC



535 N Brand Blvd. Suite 285
Glendale, CA 91203
Tel: (323) 410-5050
ltunyan@tunyanlaw.com

February 7, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Return Receipt Requested

Agent for Service of Process for
Spears Manufacturing Co.
Darlene Fourriel
15853 Olden Street
Sylmar, California 91342

**AMENDED NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION § 2698 ET SEQ.**

Re: Casillas, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that The Sentinel Firm, APC has been retained by Jovanni Casillas and Manuel Apolinar (“Plaintiffs”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer Spears Manufacturing Co. (“Defendant”). Pursuant to the joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement entered between Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC and Plaintiffs’ written consent to joint prosecution and fee sharing agreement, Tunyan Law, APC and The Sentinel Firm, APC will be jointly prosecuting Plaintiffs’ action against Defendant. The purpose of this amended letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Plaintiffs allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of themselves as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. Defendant has a corporate office and mailing address in Los Angeles County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff Giovanni Casillas worked for Defendant as a shift production lead from February 15, 2015 to November 18, 2023. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. Plaintiff Manuel Apolinar worked for Defendant as a shipping and receiving lead from approximately January 2023 to October 2023. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 days per week and over 10-11 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

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

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

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

Pursuant to relevant Industrial Welfare Commission Order Section 2 (n) split shift means a work schedule, which is interrupted by non-paid non-working periods established by the employer, other than bona fide rest or meal periods. Section 4(c) also provides that when an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday.

Throughout the statutory time period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. Defendant regularly used a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant's operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. Throughout the statutory period, Defendant also maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work "off-the-clock". During the statutory period Defendants regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to arrive early to stay in a separate line to undergo COVID pre-screening prior to clocking in to work and to stay in a different line to clock in to work but did not compensate for that time. Defendant also regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to clock out for meal periods but continue working. Throughout the statutory period Defendant also required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work split shifts but refused to pay split shift premiums. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendant failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees worked. In doing so, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

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

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day

without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to often times interrupt their meal periods and get back to work to continue working. Most importantly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were instructed to clock out for meal periods but to continue working so that in their timesheets it looked like they took their meal periods. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were also not authorized to take their second meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked

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

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

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

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to purchase tools

and materials including but not limited to wrenches, set screwdrivers, toolboxes necessary to perform their work but were not reimbursed for those tools. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to use their personal vehicles to drive to Defendant's other location but were not reimbursed for mileage. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees would also use their personal cell phones to communicate with supervisors and coworkers regarding work but were not reimbursed for cell phone usage. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).

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

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

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

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

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

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. Lab. Code § 204(a). The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Lab. Code § 204(d).

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

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

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

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

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;

7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
8. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address and address of the agent for service as indicated on the first page.

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiffs become aware of additional compensation owed or losses incurred by Plaintiffs or by any other aggrieved employee of Defendant or any additional facts, Plaintiffs expressly reserve the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending the claim letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Lilit Tunyan, Esq.
TUNYAN LAW, APC



880 E. Broadway
Glendale, CA 91205

 (818) 962-6465
 (818) 962-6469

June 21, 2024

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION AND MAIL:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Spears Manufacturing Co.

Darlene Fourriel, Agent for Service of Process
15853 Olden Street
Sylmar, CA 91342

Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 4776 8400 51

Spears Manufacturing Co.

155 Country Estate Circle, Suite 400
Reno, NV 89511

Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 4776 8425 98

LWDA Case No.: LWDA-CM-1035810-24

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, et seq. Penalties – PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
*Maria Martinez v. Spears Manufacturing Co..***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Maria Martinez (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly situated aggrieved employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, , 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, et seq., and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 et. seq. (“the Act”). Unless specified below, Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, Spears Manufacturing Co., and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act. The Complaint will be filed in San Joaquin County Superior Court. The Complaint allegations and claims are incorporated into this Notice Letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff an all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiff’s class-wide claims and claims under



the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees”).

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants’ payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants’ control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management’s requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

This uncompensated time caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Aggrieved Employees to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees’ meal periods were consistently interrupted due to heavy workload and assignments from Management. Additionally, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants’ policy of not scheduling each meal period as part



of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights, and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take rest breaks in compliance with the California Law. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on the premises during their rest breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload and until there were other employees available to relieve them of duty. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave Defendant's premises during the rest periods, which were also interrupted.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements 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." Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees were not recorded in "ink or other indelible form."

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as "net wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as "all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation of



Labor Code § 226.

Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant's employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to pay the costs of protective gear, such as safety glasses and gloves, as well as tools, including cutters, razors, and plastic, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants' employ. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the Class Action Complaint, the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:¹

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines "Hours Worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states: "The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit."

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants' violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.



Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management's requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

Defendants have the ability to pay minimum and overtime wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Aggrieved Employees.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes,



including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants also failed to Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management's requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved



Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of 8, 10, and 12 hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants,



and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on the premises during their rest breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload and until there were other employees available to relieve them of duty. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave Defendant's premises during the rest periods, which were also interrupted.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to pay the costs of protective gear, such as safety glasses and gloves, as well as tools, including cutters, razors, and plastic, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants' employ. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work



related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.

Additionally, for the purposes of Subsection (a)(9), Plaintiff seeks to expand the scope of the Aggrieved Employees she seeks to represent to extend to all individuals employed by Defendants during the applicable period. The wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to state all applicable hourly rates for which Aggrieved Employees were paid as required by Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil



and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Plaintiff was not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours he worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that he was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.



Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199,



2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

The Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, , 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802, including as follows:

(a) **Wage Claims:** For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked, failure to pay proper reporting time and sick pay under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 227.3, 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) **Meal and Rest Period Claims:** For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) **Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records:** For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order,



and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5 and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

This letter provided the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

///

///

///

///

///

///



Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'David Yeremian', is written over the printed name.

David Yeremian

Cc: **Spears Manufacturing Co.**, by Certified Mail

January 15, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION AND MAIL:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Spears Manufacturing Co.
Darlene Fourriel, Agent for Service of Process
15853 Olden Street
Sylmar, CA 91342

Spear Manufacturing Co.
155 Country Estate Circle, Suite 400
Reno, NV 89511

LWDA Case No.: LWDA-CM-1035810-24

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* Penalties – Amended PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
*Maria Martinez v. Spears Manufacturing Co.***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Maria Martinez (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly situated aggrieved employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 212, 213, 216, 221, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 227.3, 246, 432, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2100 – 2112, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, 2802, 2810.3; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* (“the Act”). Unless specified below, Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, Speears Manufactruing Co., and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act. The Amended Complaint will be filed in San Joaquin County Superior Court. The Complaint allegations and claims are incorporated into this Notice Letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff an all of their Aggrieved Employees in California.



The Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiff's class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt hourly employee in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present (Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as "Aggrieved Employees").

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management's requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

This uncompensated time caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Aggrieved Employees to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees' meal periods were consistently interrupted due to heavy workload and assignments from Management. Additionally, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each



five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights, and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take rest breaks in compliance with the California Law. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on the premises during their rest breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload and until there were other employees available to relieve them of duty. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave Defendant's premises during the rest periods, which were also interrupted.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of unlawfully receiving and/or collecting wages from Aggrieved Employees. Specifically, Defendants deducted Aggrieved Employees' vested wages for Screening Fees incurred.

Defendants also had a common policy and practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all reporting time pay to which they were entitled under California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to show up to work on a regular basis without being paid half of their usual or scheduled day's work.

Defendants also had a common policy and practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees all reporting time pay to which they were entitled under California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to show up to work on a regular basis without being paid half of their usual or scheduled day's work.

Defendants also refused to pay wages due and payable and/or denied the validity of any claim to wages due. Defendants failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay the Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay for each meal and/or rest period not provided or that was invalid.

Defendants also had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees the requisite and accrued vacation time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees accrued vested vacation wages during their employment with Defendants. However, Defendants failed to pay all accrued vacation time owed to Aggrieved Employees upon their separation from employment.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees



the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

Defendants, as client employer, were required to share with a labor contractor all civil legal responsibility and civil liability for all workers supplied by that labor contractor in California for the payment of wages. Defendants shifted to the labor contractor legal duties or liabilities under workplace safety provisions with respect to Aggrieved Employees provided by the labor contractor.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systematically failing to provide Aggrieved Employees who were terminated with a final paycheck at the place of discharge and/or failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with a final paycheck at the office or agency of Defendants in the county where the work was performed.

Upon hire, Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a written description of each quota to which each Aggrieved Employee was subject to, including quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be handled within a defined period of time and any potential adverse employment action that may result from failure to meet the quota. These policy and practice further prevented Aggrieved Employees from taking their meal and rest periods and violated various provisions of health and safety laws, as described below.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements 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.” Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees were not recorded in “ink or other indelible form.”

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements 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.” Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees were not recorded in “ink or other indelible form.”

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as “gross wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as “total hours worked by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by



the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiff’s and Aggrieved Employees’ wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

Defendants also failed to maintain proper time, pay, and personnel records in violation of Labor Code sections 226(b) – (c), 432, and 1198.5. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with an opportunity to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment within 21 days of the date of such a request and failed to properly maintain and produce employee’s personnel records. Lastly, Defendants also failed to furnish copies of all employment records bearing the Aggrieved Employees’ signatures.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to enter into unlawful agreements as a condition of employment, including unlawful meal period waivers, unlawful non-solicitation and non-complete agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements, unlawful forum selection clauses, unlawful choice of law provisions, and an unlawful PAGA waiver. Defendants also inquired into the criminal history of Aggrieved Employees, including arrests not resulting in convictions, prior to extending a job offer and as a condition of employment, in violation of California Labor Code sections 432.5 – 432.7.

Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant’s employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to pay the costs of protective gear, such as safety glasses and gloves, as well as tools, including cutters, razors, and plastic, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants’ employ. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

Defendants also failed to provide suitable seating to Aggrieved Employees. The operations at Defendant’s facilities allowed for the presence and use of a stool or seat by Aggrieved Employees during the performance of their work duties. The nature of the effected job positions can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat or stool. However, Defendant failed to provide Aggrieved Employees suitable seating when the nature of these employees’ work reasonably permitted sitting.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the Class Action Complaint, the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:¹

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants’ violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.



Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states, “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants’ payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they



were actually under Defendants' control. Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management's requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

Defendants have the ability to pay minimum and overtime wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Aggrieved Employees.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve



(12) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants also failed to Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work before the beginning of their shifts and had to wait in line in order to clock in for work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to don on their vests and gather their tools prior to clocking in for the day. Throughout their shifts, Aggrieved Employees were systemically required to complete various tasks and respond to management's requests after clocking out for the day. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work-related tasks during unpaid meal periods. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees had to perform post-shift work, off the clock, as they were required to lock up their vests and tools in a locker after they had clocked out for the day. Lastly, Aggrieved Employees worked on weekends, including Sundays, but were not paid proper wages, including overtime wages, for the additional day of work. The forgoing and uncompensated working time was under the direction and control of Defendants, for which no wages were paid.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of 8, 10, and 12 hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime



compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages In Violation of Labor Code § 208

Labor Code Section 208 provides:

Every employee who is discharged shall be paid at the place of discharge, and every employee who quits shall be paid at the office or agency of the employer in the county where the employee has been performing labor. All payments shall be made in the manner provided by law.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systematically failing to provide Aggrieved Employees who were terminated with a final paycheck at the place of discharge and/or failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with a final paycheck at the office or agency of Defendants in the county where the work was performed.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to properly Aggrieved Employees at the office or agency of Defendants in the county where worked was performed under Labor Code § 208, seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 208, 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Contracted Wage Scale in Violation of Labor Code § 223

Labor Code § 223 provides:

Where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or by contract.

Aggrieved Employees were entitled to [prevailing wages; contract wages] at a given rate. However, Defendants failed to pay the agreed rate owe to Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 223

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to properly Aggrieved Employees at the agreed contract rates of pay under Labor Code § 223, seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 223, 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systematically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work.



Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to remain on the premises during their rest breaks; (4) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring putative class members to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload and until there were other employees available to relieve them of duty. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave Defendant's premises during the rest periods, which were also interrupted.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.



Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Proper Sick Time

Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee "who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid sick days . . . of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked" and "no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period."

Additionally, Subsection (l) of Section 246 provides:

For the purposes of this section, an employer shall calculate paid sick leave using any of the following calculations:

(1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 246, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 246, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Proper Reporting Time Pay

The IWC Wage Orders, require that reporting time pay be provided to any employee who is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work.

Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all or substantially all of the Aggrieved Employees are subject to Defendants' policies and practices requiring them to call in or otherwise show up to work but not being paid half said their usual or scheduled day's work.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 510, 1198, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil



penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 246, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1)

Failure to Pay Vested Vacation Wages Upon Separation in Violation of Labor Code § 227.3

California Labor Code section 227.3 provides:

Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Aggrieved Employees accrued vested vacation time during their employment with Defendants. However, Defendants' implemented a common policy and practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees for all accrued vacation wages upon separation of employment, in violation of Labor Code 227.3.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 227.3, 1198, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 246, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unlawful Receipt and Collection of Wages in Violation of Labor Code § 221

Labor Code § 221 provides, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee."

Defendants had a common policy and practice of unlawfully receiving and/or collecting wages from Aggrieved Employees. Specifically, Defendants deducted Aggrieved Employees' vested wages for Screening Fees incurred.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages owed, including all unlawfully deducted, received, and/or collected amounts due and owing to Aggrieved Employees, under Labor Code §§ 221, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses



in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to pay the costs of protective gear, such as safety glasses and gloves, as well as tools, including cutters, razors, and plastic, all necessary to perform, their duties under Defendants' employ. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.

Additionally, for the purposes of Subsection (a)(9), Plaintiff seeks to expand the scope of the Aggrieved Employees she seeks to represent to extend to all individuals employed by Defendants during the applicable period. The wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to state all applicable hourly rates for which Aggrieved Employees were paid as required by Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding



an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Provide Time, Pay and Personnel Records in Violation of Labor Code §§ 226 (b) – (c), 1198.5, and 432:

Time and Pay Records:

Labor Code section 226 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 require that employers keep the following information on file for each employee for a minimum of three years: the employee's dates of employment; the employee's hourly rates and the corresponding number of hours worked by the employee at each hourly rate, when the employee begins and ends each work period (including meal periods) and split intervals; total hours worked by the employee; all deductions; gross wages earned; and net wages earned.

Section (b) of Labor Code section 226 further requires employers to "afford current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment upon reasonable request to the employer." Section (c) of Labor Code section 226 provides that, "an employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or receive a copy of records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A violation of this subdivision is an infraction." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 226(f).

Personnel Records:

In addition to their right to time and pay records, employees, and their representatives, have the right to inspect and receive a copy of their personnel files pursuant to Labor Code section 1198.5. This statute applies to both former and current employees. Labor Code section 432 further specifies that employers must furnish copies of all employment records bearing the employee's signature.



Labor Code section 1198.5 also requires that the file be made available for inspection or receipt within a "reasonable" amount of time, but "not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives a written request." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe likewise entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 1198.5(k).

Defendants failed to timely produce or make available a current or former employee's personnel records and/or payroll records when requested pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. Defendants also failed and continue to fail to timely produce complete payroll and personnel records when requested by Aggrieved Employees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees time, pay, and personnel records in violation of Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, and 2699. Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages owed, including all unlawfully deducted, received, and/or collected amounts due and owing to Aggrieved Employees, under Labor Code §§ 226, 1198.5, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Plaintiff was not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours he worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that he was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.



In light of the foregoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages Due, Negotiable and Payable in Cash on Demand in Violation of Labor Code §§ 212 and 213

Labor Code § 212 states that no employer “shall issue in payment of wages due” by “order, check, draft, note, memorandum, or other acknowledgment of indebtedness, unless it is negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of business in the state.”

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, with an order, check, draft, note, memorandum, or other acknowledgment of indebtedness that was payable on demand, without discount at some established place of business in the state. Defendants issued pay cards to Aggrieved Employees for wages earned. These pay cards were useable for a fee and did not have a provision for use and payment in California at no cost to the employee. Therefore, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with checks, drafts, notes or other acknowledgements of indebtedness that were payable on demand without discount as required by Labor Code § 212, which required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to incur fees to use, was not fully cashable, and not usable at all financial institutions.

Such a pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding illegal employee compensation as described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the class in a civil action for damages and wages owed and for costs and attorneys' fees under Labor Code §§ 212 and 213.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or



termination, under Labor Code §§ 212, 213, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Refusal to Make Payment Per Labor Code § 216

Labor Code section 216 makes it unlawful for an employer to refuse to pay wages due and payable and/or deny the validity of any claim to wages due.

Defendants violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 216 by failing to pay the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay the Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay for each meal and/or rest period not provided or that was invalid. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155.

These violations subject Defendants to civil penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Labor Code § 225.5 establishes that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty ... for each failure to pay each employee." Each violation results in a separate civil penalty, for each non-exempt Aggrieved Employee, for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).



Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Provide Suitable Seating

Plaintiff also alleges that operations at Defendants' facilities allowed for the presence and use of a stool or seat by the Aggrieved Employees during the performance of their work duties. The nature of the effected job positions can reasonably be accomplished while using a seat or stool. California Labor Code § 1198 requires that "... the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the ... standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." Paragraph (14)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that "[a]ll working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats." Paragraph 14(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that "[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees suitable seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting. Defendants knew or should have known that Aggrieved Employees were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that Defendants did not provide suitable seating and did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties.

Through their conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code § 1198 and Paragraph 14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide suitable seating to Aggrieved Employees. Defendants have violated the California Labor Code, including Section 1198, and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged, including Paragraph 14 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.



Failure to Properly Pay Temporary Agency Workers

Labor Code section 2810.3 requires a client employer to share with a labor contractor all civil legal responsibility and civil liability for all workers supplied by that labor contractor in California for the payment of wages. Section 2810.3 prohibits a client employer from shifting to the labor contractor legal duties or liabilities under workplace safety provisions with respect to workers provided by the labor contractor. It defines a client employer as a business entity that obtains or is provided workers to perform labor within the usual course of business from a labor contractor. It defines a labor contractor as an individual or entity that supplies workers, either with or without a contract, to a client employer to perform labor within the client employer's usual course of business.

Defendants, through their conduct, qualify as a client employer under Labor Code section 2810.3 for purposes of liability. Thus, Defendants have violated the California Labor Code and are liable for these violations.

Failure to Provide Description of Quotas to Aggrieved Employees In Violation of Labor Code §§ 2100 – 2112

Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2100-2112, employers with one hundred (100) or more employees at a single warehouse distribution center, or one thousand (1,000) or more employees at one or more warehouse distribution centers in California are required to provide nonexempt employees, upon hire, with a written description of each quota they are subject to (e.g., quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be handled) within a defined period of time and any potential adverse employment action that may result from failure to meet the quota. Labor Code Section 2102 prohibits adverse employment actions against employees who fail to meet their quota if the quota was not properly disclosed to the employee and prohibits quotas that prevent an employee from taking his or her meal or rest breaks, use of restrooms, or that interfere with compliance with California's occupational health and safety laws.

Labor Code Section 2101 provides:

Each employer shall provide to each employee, upon hire, or within 30 days of the effective date of this part, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject, including the quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be produced or handled, within the defined time period, and any potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota.

Labor Code Section 2102 provides:

An employee shall not be required to meet a quota that prevents compliance with meal or rest periods, use of bathroom facilities, including reasonable travel time to and from bathroom facilities, or occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards. An employer shall not take adverse employment action against an employee for failure to meet a quota that does not allow a worker to comply with meal and rest periods, or occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards, or for failure to meet a quota that has not been disclosed to the employee pursuant to



Section 2101.

Labor Code Section 2104 provides in pertinent part:

(a)(1) If a current or former employee believes that meeting a quota caused a violation of their right to a meal or rest period or required them to violate any occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards, they have the right to request, and the employer shall provide, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject and a copy of the most recent 90 days of the employee's own personal work speed data.

(2) If a former employee requests a written description of the quotas to which they were subject and a copy of their own personal work speed data pursuant to paragraph (1), the employer shall provide 90 days of the former employee's quotas and personal work speed data for the 90 days prior to the date of the employee's separation from the employer.

(b) An employer that receives a written or oral request for information pursuant to subdivision (a) shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request.

During the relevant period, Defendants employed 100 or more Aggrieved Employees at a single warehouse distribution center and/or employed 1,000 or more Aggrieved Employees at one or more distribution centers in California rendering Defendants subject to the provisions of Labor Code Sections 2100-2112.

Defendants had/have a policy and practice of failing to provide Aggrieved Employees, upon hire, with a written description of each quota they are subject to (e.g., quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be handled) within a defined period of time and any potential adverse employment action that may result from failure to meet the quota. Based on further information and belief, Defendants had/have a policy and practice of subjecting Aggrieved Employees to quotas that prevented those Aggrieved Employees from taking their meal and rest periods and/or using bathroom facilities and/or interfered with compliance of California's occupational health and safety laws.

Defendants have/had a policy and practice of subjecting Aggrieved Employees to adverse employment actions for failure to meet a quota that was not disclosed pursuant to Labor Code Section 2101 and/ or did not allow them to comply with meal and rest period laws and/or occupational health and safety laws, in violation of Labor Code section 2102.

Defendants failed and continue to fail to timely produce upon written and/or oral request by current and/or former Aggrieved Employees of the belief that meeting a quota caused a violation of their right to a meal or rest period and/or required them to violate any occupational health and safety laws, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject and/or a copy of the most recent 90 days of the Aggrieved Employees' own personal work speed data.



As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Defendants violated Labor Code section 2100-2112 as to Aggrieved Employees and are subject to civil penalties.

Unlawful Agreements and Unlawful Inquiries into Criminal History under Labor Code § 432

Unlawful Agreements

Labor Code section 432.5 provides that "no employer ... shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer. .. to be prohibited by law." Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to unlawful non-solicitation/non-compete agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements, unlawful releases and/or waivers, including but not limited to, unlawful meal period waivers, unlawful forum selection clauses and/or choice of law provisions/agreements and/or unlawful criminal and/or financial checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

Labor Code section 432.6(a), provides that "a person shall not, as a condition of employment, continued employment, or the receipt of any employment-related benefit, require any applicant for employment or any employee to waive any right ... " Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to sign meal period waivers that were universally signed as a condition of employment, including but not limited to, during the onboarding process. By requiring Aggrieved Employees to sign unlawful meal period waivers as a condition of obtaining and/or maintaining employment, Defendants violated Labor Code section 432.5. Further, these invalid waivers are otherwise unlawful under Labor Code section 432.6.

By requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a condition of employment, Defendants violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Unlawful Inquiries into Criminal History:

Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on information and belief, Defendants asked Aggrieved Employees about arrests not resulting in convictions on their employment application, in violation of California law.

Upon information and belief, Defendants, in violation of California law, including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("PEHA"), asked Aggrieved Employees about convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on their employment application in violation of California law.



By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, Defendants violated Labor Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an employment offer, Defendants violated California's Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

As a result of Defendants' unlawful actions, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 432.5 – 432.7 as to Aggrieved Employees and are subject to civil penalties.

Unlawful PAGA Waiver:

An action pursuant to PAGA "' .. is a representative action on behalf of the state.'" *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87. It is well settled that agreements purporting to waive an employee's right to a trial of PAGA claims is contrary to California law and unenforceable. See *Iskanian v CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 384 ("We conclude that where, as here, an employment agreement compels the waiver of representative claims under the PAGA, it is contrary to public policy and unenforceable as a matter of state law.")

Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that a court cannot compel arbitration of an aggrieved employee's individual PAGA claim because there is no such thing as an individual PAGA claim. *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87 ("There is no individual component to a PAGA action because 'every PAGA action ... is a representative action on behalf of the state.'")

Defendants further violated Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring the Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to other unlawful agreements, including but not limited to, an unlawful waiver of right to trial of PAGA claims in PAGA and/or representative actions as a condition of employment. By imposing such a requirement on Aggrieved Employees, Defendants required written agreement to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment, in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

The Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty



provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 212, 213, 216, 221, 225.5, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 227.3, 246, 432, 510, 512, 515, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2100 – 2112, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802, 2810.3, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked, failure to pay proper reporting time and sick pay under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 208, 212, 213, 216, 221, 225.5, 226.8, 227.3, 246, 510, 515, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2100 – 2112, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1); 2810.3

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 216, 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2100 – 2112 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 432, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to “a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...” Additionally, an employer's failure to comply within the timeframe for the production of personnel, time and pay records, as outlined in Labor Code § 226(f), entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar (\$750) penalty from the employer.

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);



(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5 and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

This letter provided the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'David Yeremian', is written over the typed name.

David Yeremian

Cc: **Spears Manufacturing Co.**, by Certified Mail

EXHIBIT 2

LAFFEY MATRIX

[History](#)
[Case Law](#)
[See the Matrix](#)
[Contact us](#)
[Home](#)

			Years Out of Law School *				
Year	Adjustmt Factor**	Paralegal/ Law Clerk	1-3	4-7	8-10	11-19	20 +
6/01/24- 5/31/25	1.080182	\$258	\$473	\$581	\$839	\$948	\$1141
6/01/23- 5/31/24	1.059295	\$239	\$437	\$538	\$777	\$878	\$1057
6/01/22- 5/31/23	1.085091	\$225	\$413	\$508	\$733	\$829	\$997
6/01/21- 5/31/22	1.006053	\$208	\$381	\$468	\$676	\$764	\$919
6/01/20- 5/31/21	1.015894	\$206	\$378	\$465	\$672	\$759	\$914
6/01/19- 5/31/20	1.0049	\$203	\$372	\$458	\$661	\$747	\$899
6/01/18- 5/31/19	1.0350	\$202	\$371	\$455	\$658	\$742	\$894
6/01/17- 5/31/18	1.0463	\$196	\$359	\$440	\$636	\$717	\$864
6/01/16- 5/31/17	1.0369	\$187	\$343	\$421	\$608	\$685	\$826
6/01/15- 5/31/16	1.0089	\$180	\$331	\$406	\$586	\$661	\$796
6/01/14- 5/31/15	1.0235	\$179	\$328	\$402	\$581	\$655	\$789
6/01/13- 5/31/14	1.0244	\$175	\$320	\$393	\$567	\$640	\$771
6/01/12- 5/31/13	1.0258	\$170	\$312	\$383	\$554	\$625	\$753
6/01/11- 5/31/12	1.0352	\$166	\$305	\$374	\$540	\$609	\$734
6/01/10- 5/31/11	1.0337	\$161	\$294	\$361	\$522	\$589	\$709
6/01/09- 5/31/10	1.0220	\$155	\$285	\$349	\$505	\$569	\$686
6/01/08- 5/31/09	1.0399	\$152	\$279	\$342	\$494	\$557	\$671
6/01/07-5/31/08	1.0516	\$146	\$268	\$329	\$475	\$536	\$645
6/01/06-5/31/07	1.0256	\$139	\$255	\$313	\$452	\$509	\$614
6/1/05-5/31/06	1.0427	\$136	\$249	\$305	\$441	\$497	\$598
6/1/04-5/31/05	1.0455	\$130	\$239	\$293	\$423	\$476	\$574
6/1/03-6/1/04	1.0507	\$124	\$228	\$280	\$405	\$456	\$549
6/1/02-5/31/03	1.0727	\$118	\$217	\$267	\$385	\$434	\$522
6/1/01-5/31/02	1.0407	\$110	\$203	\$249	\$359	\$404	\$487
6/1/00-5/31/01	1.0529	\$106	\$195	\$239	\$345	\$388	\$468
6/1/99-5/31/00	1.0491	\$101	\$185	\$227	\$328	\$369	\$444
6/1/98-5/31/99	1.0439	\$96	\$176	\$216	\$312	\$352	\$424
6/1/97-5/31/98	1.0419	\$92	\$169	\$207	\$299	\$337	\$406
6/1/96-5/31/97	1.0396	\$88	\$162	\$198	\$287	\$323	\$389

6/1/95-5/31/96	1.032	\$85	\$155	\$191	\$276	\$311	\$375
6/1/94-5/31/95	1.0237	\$82	\$151	\$185	\$267	\$301	\$363

The methodology of calculation and benchmarking for this Updated Laffey Matrix has been approved in a number of cases. See, e.g., *DL v. District of Columbia*, 267 F.Supp.3d 55, 69 (D.D.C. 2017)

* $\frac{1}{2}$ Years Out of Law School $\frac{1}{2}$ is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. $\frac{1}{2}$ 1-3" includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). $\frac{1}{2}$ 4-7" applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier $\frac{1}{2}$ 1-3" from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier $\frac{1}{2}$ 4-7" on June 1, 1999, and tier $\frac{1}{2}$ 8-10" on June 1, 2003.

** The Adjustment Factor refers to the nation-wide Legal Services Component of the Consumer Price Index produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

EXHIBIT 3

Estrada, et al. v. Spears Manufacturing Co.
Litigation Costs

Service Date	Details	Provider	Amount
9/13/23	Summons and Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 1,658.30
9/19/23	Process of Service - Koy Saechao, ASP	Rapid Legal	\$ 87.55
9/22/23	POS of Summons - Koy Saechao, ASP	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
9/22/23	(Rejected) POS of Summons	Rapid Legal	\$ 92.70
10/13/23	Notice of Case Management Conference (3.11.24)	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
12/20/23	Process of Service - Darlene Fourriel, ASP	Rapid Legal	\$ 242.05
12/22/23	Notice of Unavailability (2023)	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
12/26/23	POS of Summons - Darlene Fourriel, ASP	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
3/12/24	Case Management Statement (3.11.24)	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
3/12/24	Courtesy Copy - Case Management Statement (3.11.24)	Rapid Legal	\$ 51.50
6/21/24	PAGA Letter	LWDA	\$ 75.00
6/21/24	PAGA Letter Postage	USPS	\$ 17.66
8/30/24	Joint Stipulation for Leave to File First Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 200.85
9/10/24	Mediation (9.27.24)	Hughs, III, Hunter R.	\$ 11,000.00
9/13/24	Joint Stipulation to Withdraw Joint Stipulation for Leave to File First Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 149.35
9/25/24	Notice of Change of Address	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
9/26/24	(Refile) Joint Stipulation for Leave to File First Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 200.85
10/2/24	First Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 180.25
11/19/24	Expert Analysis	Berger Consulting Group	\$ 8,905.00
12/5/24	Joint Case Management Statement and Request for Continuance (12.11.24)	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
1/15/25	Amended PAGA Letter Postage	USPS	\$ 20.12
3/26/25	Joint Stipulation for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 200.85
4/2/25	Second Amended Complaint	Rapid Legal	\$ 180.25
4/8/25	Joint Case Management Statement and Request for Continuance (4.9.25)	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
7/8/25	Motion for Preliminary Approval	Rapid Legal	\$ 474.55
7/11/25	Notice of Motion for Preliminary Approval	Rapid Legal	\$ 175.95
TBD	Motion for Final Approval	Rapid Legal	\$ 474.55
TBD	Notice of Entry of Order	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75
TBD	Declaration of Class Admin re Final Disbursement	Rapid Legal	\$ 128.75

Total \$25,674.83