Miriam L. Schimmel (State Bar No. 185089)
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com
Joana Fang (State Bar No. 309623)
jfang@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
Jared C. Osborne (State Bar No. 335968)
josborne@blackstonepc.com
Jasmine Y. Kianfard (State Bar No. 349975)
jkianfard@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiff COLTON RAY,
individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees
pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

COLTON RAY, individually, and on behalf of other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PAPÉ MACHINERY, INC.; THE PAPÉ GROUP, INC.; and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants

Case No. CV2402126

Honorable Timothy A. Canning
Department 4

DECLARATION OF JASMINE Y. KIANFARD IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT, ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, SERVICE AWARD, AND SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION COSTS

Date:	April 20, 2026
Time:	10:30 a.m.
Department:	4
Complaint Filed:	November 4, 2024
FAC Filed:	March 11, 2026
Trial Date:	Not Set

DECLARATION OF JASMINE Y. KIANFARD

I, Jasmine Y. Kianfard, declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in all Courts of the State of California. I am a member of Blackstone Law, APC ("Plaintiff's Counsel"), attorneys of record for Plaintiff Colton Ray ("Plaintiff"). I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement, Attorney's Fees and Costs, Service Award, and Settlement Administration Costs ("Motion"). I have personal knowledge of the facts contained herein, and, if called to testify, I could and would competently do so.

Procedural History

2. Defendants Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.) (collectively, "Defendants") operate machinery and equipment businesses with locations throughout California. Defendants employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Technician from approximately May 2021 to January 2024.

3. On August 27, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice by electronic submission to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendants, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3, of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendants. A true and correct copy of the August 27, 2024 notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

4. On August 29, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint in the action entitled *Colton Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al*., Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV2401642 ("Class Action")[1], thereby commencing a putative class action against Defendants.

5. On November 4, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. in the action entitled *Colton Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al*., Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV2402126 ("Action"), thereby commencing a representative action under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004,

---

[1] Defendants allege that the entirety of the putative class signed arbitration agreements with class action waivers. Accordingly, the Parties agreed to settle the Action on a PAGA basis and to dismiss the Class Action.

California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA") against Defendants.

6. On May 14, 2025, Plaintiff and Defendants (collectively, the "Parties") participated in a formal mediation conducted by Brandon McKelvey, Esq., a neutral and respected mediator with extensive experience in complex wage and hour matters, and with the aid of the mediator's evaluation, the Parties were able to reach an agreement to resolve the Action in its entirety.

7. On November 4, 2025, Plaintiff submitted an amended written notice by electronic submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendants to clarify that the claims are against Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.). A true and correct copy of the November 4, 2025 amended notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**. The August 27, 2024 and November 4, 2025 letters to the LWDA are together referred to as the "PAGA Notice".

8. On March 2, 2026, the Parties executed the Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement Agreement," "Agreement," or "Settlement"). A true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

9. On March 11, 2026, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq*. ("Operative Complaint") to also clarify that the claims are against Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.).

10. During the course of informal discovery in the Action, Plaintiff's Counsel conducted an intense investigation into the facts of the Action. This included obtaining data, information, and documents relating to the underlying alleged violations, including, but not limited to, Plaintiff's employee file, all of the Aggrieved Employees' time and payroll data, relevant wage and hour policies, and Aggrieved Employees' data points so that Plaintiff could assess the number of alleged potential violations and value of the recoverable penalties, as well as evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of his claims.

///

11. Based on the data, information, and documents received, as well as thorough discussions with Defendants' counsel, Plaintiff's Counsel was able to (i) determine the total number of distinct individuals falling within the definition of "Aggrieved Employees" for the relevant statutory period, (ii) the number of affected pay periods at issue among them, and (iii) construct a damages model that calculated the maximum realistic amount of PAGA penalties that could be levied against Defendants within the relevant statutory period. Defendants, however, disputed Plaintiff's claims and disputed both the existence of and extent of liability as alleged by Plaintiff, which allowed Plaintiff's Counsel to further assess the strength of Plaintiff's claims. Plaintiff's Counsel's experience in litigating similar representative wage and hour claims, the degree of investigation that was conducted here, and the amount of data, information, and documents that was obtained, was sufficient to determine the potential value of the PAGA claims, and to evaluate the strength of these claims for purposes of settlement.

12. The Parties believe the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Parties understand, acknowledge, and agree that the Settlement Agreement constitutes a compromise of Plaintiff's PAGA claims, and that it is the desire and intention of the Parties to affect a final and complete resolution of the Action.

13. Defendants deny all of the claims in the Action, and do not waive, but rather expressly reserve, all rights to challenge all such claims and allegations upon all legal, procedural, and factual grounds should the Settlement Agreement not become final. The Settlement Agreement reflects a compromise reached to end litigation in the Action. Following significant investigation and extensive settlement negotiations, Plaintiff now seeks approval of the proposed Settlement Agreement, which will resolve all representative claims alleged in the Action.

Notice to the LWDA

14. In accordance with California Labor Code sections 2699 *et. seq*., on March 18, 2026, a copy of the proposed Settlement Agreement was submitted to the LWDA via online submission through the LWDA's website. A true and correct copy of the email from the LWDA confirming receipt is attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

///

Summary of the Terms of the Settlement Agreement

15. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties have agreed that the "Aggrieved Employees" shall be defined as "all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period." The "PAGA Period" is the period from August 27, 2023 through March 15, 2025. There are approximately 1,742 Aggrieved Employees who worked approximately 48,075 two-week pay periods during the PAGA Period ("Pay Periods")[2].

16. The Parties have agreed to settle the PAGA claims at issue in the Action for a non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount of One Million Two Hundred Eighty-Nine Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,289,000.00). The Gross Settlement Amount is a common fund and therefore includes all requested costs, fees, and other allocations. The Gross Settlement Amount includes: (1) attorneys' fees in the amount of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $451,150.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,289,000.00); (2) attorneys' actual litigation costs and expenses in the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty-Nine Dollars and Six Cents ($25,839.06); (3) Service Award in the amount of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($7,500.00); and (4) Settlement Administration Costs, not to exceed Twelve Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($12,250.00).

17. After the above-estimated amounts are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Amount will amount to approximately Seven Hundred Ninety-Two Thousand Two Hundred Sixty Dollars and Ninety-Four Cents ($792,260.94), of which sixty-five percent (65%), or approximately Five Hundred Fourteen Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty-Nine Dollars and Sixty-One Cents ($514,969.61), will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment"), and thirty-five percent (35%), or approximately Two Hundred Seventy-Seven Thousand Two Hundred Ninety-One Dollars and Thirty-Three Cents ($277,291.33), will be distributed and paid to Aggrieved Employees ("Employees' Portion") on a *pro rata* basis based upon their number of Pay Periods.

---

[2] Defendants have represented that the number of Aggrieved Employees and Pay Periods during the original PAGA Period contemplated by the Settlement Agreement (August 27, 2023 to July 18, 2025) has triggered the Escalator Clause in Paragraph 3(a)(6). Defendants have selected option 2 of the Escalator Clause and shortened the PAGA Period to end on March 15, 2025.

18. The Aggrieved Employees are estimated to have worked approximately 48,075 pay periods during the period August 27, 2023 to March 15, 2025. If the actual number of Pay Periods is more than ten percent (10%) above 48,075 (i.e., is greater than 52,883 Pay Periods), the Defendants shall have the option to either: (1) proportionally increase the Gross Settlement Amount according to the following formula: Total Number of Pay Periods divided by 52,883 multiplied by the Gross Settlement Amount; or (2) shorten the PAGA Period to the date at which the Pay Periods reach 48,075.[3]

19. No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement, Defendants shall provide the Settlement Administrator with a list of all Aggrieved Employees containing each Aggrieved Employee's (i) first and last name; (ii) last known address; (iii) last known telephone number; (iv) Social Security number; and (v) dates worked during the PAGA Period (collectively, "Aggrieved Employees List").

20. Within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Effective Date, Defendants will transmit the Gross Settlement Amount to a qualified settlement account established by the Settlement Administrator. The "Effective Date" is defined as (a) the last date to appeal the Order and Judgment by the Court and no appeal is filed; or (b) if an appeal is filed, reviewed, or writ is sought from the Order and Judgment, the day after the Order and Judgment is affirmed or the appeal, review, or writ is dismissed or denied, and the Order and Judgment is no longer subject to further judicial review.

21. No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will distribute the Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA Payment, the Service Award, the Settlement Administration Costs, and the Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

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

[3] See n. 2.

Employee(s) at issue and in the amount of their respective Individual PAGA Payment(s).

The Agreement is Fair and Reasonable and Took Into Consideration the Strengths and Weaknesses of Plaintiff's Claims and the Defenses thereto, as well as the Risks and Benefits of the Agreement

23. Here, the Agreement is presumptively fair because: (1) it occurred after counsel for the Parties engaged in significant investigation to evaluate the strength and potential value of the PAGA claims, and the risks of litigating these claims through trial; and (2) it was negotiated at great length and effort by counsel with significant experience in similar complex labor and employment matters.

24. This case and settlement address important employee protections embodied in the California Labor Code. Plaintiff's core allegations are that Defendants systematically violated the California Labor Code by, *inter alia,* failing to properly pay wages for all hours worked, failing to pay overtime at the correct rate, failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods, failing to pay premiums at the correct rate of pay, failing to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, failing to maintain accurate payroll records, failing to provide accurate wage statements, and failing to reimburse necessary business expenses.

25. Defendants maintained several defenses to Plaintiff's theories of liability, which, if successfully argued and proven, had the potential to eliminate or substantially reduce recovery. Throughout this litigation, Defendants maintained, and continue to maintain, that they had, and continue to have, compliant employment policies and practices throughout the time period at issue. Defendants deny that they ever violated any provision of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, those sections for which Plaintiff seeks penalties under PAGA. Defendants further denied, and continue to deny, that the lawsuit is appropriate for representative treatment for any purpose other than settlement. Defendants also challenged Plaintiff's standing as an aggrieved employee and denied that any of Defendants' other employees whom Plaintiff seeks to represent are aggrieved. Defendants also argued that an important feature of PAGA is that the Court retains discretion to lower the penalties if, based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case, to do otherwise would result in an award that is "unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory."

///

26. Even if violations of the California Labor Code occurred, which Defendants deny, Defendants contended that said violations would only be considered "initial violations" and thus heightened "subsequent violation" penalties were not warranted.

27. Defendants also contended that, with respect to PAGA claims, the Court was unlikely to assess cumulative penalties for the maximum number of possible, separate California Labor Code violations, because it would be unjust, arbitrary, oppressive, and/or confiscatory, especially where certain conduct may be regulated by multiple provisions of the California Labor Code that are interrelated and work in tandem.

28. While Plaintiff maintains that his PAGA claims have merit, in reaching the Agreement, Plaintiff and his counsel took into account the strengths and weaknesses of each side's position, and the uncertainty of how the case might have concluded as litigation continued, at trial, and/or upon appeal. The Agreement achieves a sizeable benefit obtained.

29. As set forth in the Motion, the California Labor Code does not set forth the criteria by which a PAGA settlement is to be evaluated; it is presumed that a reviewing court may take into consideration some of the factors that courts use when reviewing a class action settlement.[4] "[A] PAGA claim asserted on a non-class representative basis...is not considered a class action but a law enforcement action, and therefore does not have to meet the requirements of [a class action]." *Casida v. Sears Holdings Corp.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9302 at *8 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2012). However, a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each claim, along with an estimate of the total potential recovery is as follows:

i. Unpaid Wages

30. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at their applicable minimum, regular, and overtime rates for their work, and failed to compensate them for all hours that they worked. For example, Plaintiff reported that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked off-the-clock prior to clocking-in and/or after clocking-out for their shifts and during purported meal periods.

[4] As this is not a class action, the *Kullar* factors pertaining to the risk of maintaining class action status through trial and the reaction of class members to the proposed settlement are inapplicable.

31. Defendants denied these claims, arguing that their overtime policies and practices comply with California. Defendants further contended that their non-exempt employees were responsible for accurately recording their own hours and that they were not aware that any work had been performed off-the-clock.

32. If a violation was found to have occurred in every one of the aggregate pay periods within the relevant time period, the potential maximum exposure for this claim would be $4,807,500[5].

ii. Meal Periods

33. Plaintiff asserted that Defendants failed to provide employees with lawful meal periods. For example, Plaintiff reported that his meal periods were often interrupted by supervisors asking him to do work while he was eating due to understaffing. Additionally, Plaintiff alleged that throughout the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay all premiums for meal period violations.

34. Defendants argued that the Aggrieved Employees were permitted, if not encouraged, to take their meal breaks. Defendants also argued that their written meal break policy was lawful and employees' time records reflected that they took lawful meal periods. Moreover, litigating the meal period claims would be inherently difficult as it would need to be proven that compliant meal periods were not provided, but time records would not indicate whether or not a meal period was interrupted. Additionally, Plaintiff's analysis revealed that Defendants paid meal premium payments in 47% of all pay periods. Taking into account meal premium premiums paid, Plaintiff's analysis revealed only a 5% violate rate of purported unique meal period violations.

35. If a violation was found to have occurred in every one of the aggregate pay periods within the relevant time period, the potential maximum exposure for this claim would be $763,500.

iii. Rest Periods

36. Plaintiff argued that Defendants failed to schedule, permit, or authorize compliant rest periods. For example, Plaintiff alleged that Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were routinely not authorized nor permitted to receive uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods during their shifts due to

---

[5] While the California Labor Code provides for $100 for the first violation and up to $250 for each subsequent violation (depending on the underlying violation), Plaintiff used this simple computation of the total number of aggregate pay periods times a $100 penalty for analysis purposes only to account for the argument that the imposition of PAGA penalties is discretionary and courts have the power to reduce or assess penalties based on the specifics of each case.

constant interruption with work requests. Here, Plaintiff faced the challenge of having to prove each alleged rest period violation with only testimony from Aggrieved Employees.

37. If a violation was found to have occurred in every one of the aggregate pay periods within the relevant time period, the potential maximum exposure for this claim would be $4,807,500.

.iv. Unreimbursed Business Expenses

38. Plaintiff alleged that Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business expenses that were never fully reimbursed by Defendants, including the usage of their personal cell phones and the purchase of tools for work-related purposes.

39. Defendants contended that they had a policy and practice of reimbursing employees for necessary business-related expenses. Defendants further contended that, with respect to the alleged expenses for which Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees never requested reimbursement from Defendants, they did not know and had no reason to know that alleged business-related expenses had been incurred.

40. If a violation was found to have occurred in every one of the aggregate pay periods within the relevant time period, the potential maximum exposure for this claim would be $4,807,500.

v. Derivative Claims

41. As with all derivative claims, success depends on the success of the underlying claims. Here, Plaintiff's claims for inaccurate wage statements, failure to pay all wages due during employment and upon termination, and failure to keep requisite payroll records would only succeed if the underlying claims for failure to pay wages for off-the-clock work, failure to pay overtime, and failure to pay premiums for all meal and rest periods not lawfully provided were successful. Therefore, these claims were subject to the same risks of failure as discussed above.

42. Again, if a violation was found to have occurred in every one of the aggregate pay periods within the relevant time period, the potential maximum exposure for this claim would be $4,807,500.

///

///

///

vi. Total PAGA Penalties

43. Plaintiff's Counsel considered information obtained through investigations and obtained from Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as well as data provided by Defendants, and created valuation models. Based thereon and assuming that the Court would be satisfied that the PAGA claims were susceptible to being efficiently tried and adjudicated on a representative basis, and that it could be shown that civil penalties under the California Labor Code are owed of one penalty per pay period during the relevant time period, Defendants' estimated total exposure in theory would exceed several million dollars. However, Plaintiff's Counsel considered the fact that, by law, the Court has the discretion to reduce and/or assess lower penalties, that it was not clear that heightened penalties would apply, and that stacking and/or cumulative penalties may not be allowed. Based thereon and the application of one penalty per pay period in the relevant time period, the estimated total exposure was $4,807,500. Plaintiff's Counsel then considered the defenses asserted, information and evidence obtained, and circumstances in this case, which posed risks to representative adjudication and monetary recovery. Accordingly, a discount of 50% was applied to account for the risks associated with proving the underlying violations and the cost and delay in recovering the alleged potential penalties (bringing the value of this claim closer to $2,403,750), and a discount of 40% was applied to account for the risks associated with succeeding on the merits and establishing liability (bringing the value of this claim closer to $1,442,250). In light thereof, the Gross Settlement Amount of $1,289,000 is a significant settlement.

The Amount in the Settlement Agreement

44. The Net Settlement Amount is currently estimated to be approximately Seven Hundred Ninety-Two Thousand Two Hundred Sixty Dollars and Ninety-Four Cents ($792,260.94). After all deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount are made for the Attorneys' Fees and Costs, the Service Award, and the Settlement Administration Costs, approximately Five Hundred Fourteen Thousand Nine Hundred Sixty-Nine Dollars and Sixty-One Cents ($514,969.61) (i.e. 65% of the Net Settlement Amount) will go to the LWDA, and approximately Two Hundred Seventy-Seven Thousand Two Hundred Ninety-One Dollars and Thirty-Three Cents ($277,291.33) (i.e. 35% of the Net Settlement Amount) will go to the Aggrieved Employees, as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699(m).

There is no reason to doubt the fairness of the proposed plan of allocation of the Net Settlement Amount as it complies with California Labor Code section 2699(m).

45. The Settlement Agreement is a compromise of highly disputed claims. Plaintiff and his counsel recognize the expense and length of continued proceedings necessary to litigate the matter through trial and any possible appeals. Plaintiff and his counsel have also taken into account the uncertainty and risk of the outcome of further litigation, and the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. Plaintiff and his counsel are also aware of the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability, both generally and in response to Defendants' defenses thereto, and the difficulties in establishing Defendants' liability for, and the right to recover, penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and other Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff and his counsel have also taken into account Defendants' agreement to enter into a settlement that confers significant relief upon the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California. Considering all of the facts in this case, Plaintiff and his counsel have determined that the Agreement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the PAGA claims, and that it is in the best interests of the Aggrieved Employees and the State of California.

46. The result achieved in this case is well within the range of what is considered an acceptable settlement under the circumstances, especially when compared to the settlement of PAGA claims in other cases.

The Agreement was Negotiated by Experienced Counsel

47. In the view of Plaintiff's Counsel, the benefits conferred by the Agreement are eminently fair and reasonable, and in the best interests of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees in light of the risk, delay, and uncertainty of continued litigation and the substantial monetary benefits provided for by the Agreement.

48. Here, the extent of informal discovery conducted was sufficient to enable Plaintiff's Counsel to evaluate the strength and value of the PAGA claims for purposes of settlement. The settlement negotiations were conducted by highly capable and experienced counsel. Plaintiff's Counsel are respected members of the bar with strong records of vigorous and effective advocacy, and are experienced in handling complex wage and hour class action litigation. Accordingly, Plaintiff's

Counsel had sufficient information and experience to act intelligently in negotiating the Agreement.

The Requested Attorneys' Fees are Fair and Reasonable

49. Plaintiff's Counsel's application for attorneys' fees in light of the facts and circumstances surrounding this matter is well-within the range of reasonableness. Plaintiff's Counsel has vigorously litigated this case since it was commenced, with the very real possibility of an unsuccessful outcome and no fee recovery of any kind.

50. In the present case, Plaintiff's Counsel has borne all of the risks and costs of litigation and will not receive any compensation until recovery is obtained. Plaintiff's Counsel is experienced in complex wage-and-hour litigation and used that experience to obtain a favorable result for Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California. Considering the amount of fees requested, work performed, risks incurred, and experience of Plaintiff's Counsel in handling similar matters, Plaintiff maintains that the requested attorneys' fees of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount (i.e., $451,150.00 if the Gross Settlement Amount is $1,289,000.00) are reasonable and should be awarded.

51. The effectiveness of Plaintiff's Counsel's prosecution of this matter has translated into tangible monetary benefits for the Aggrieved Employees as follows: (1) Aggrieved Employees will obtain monetary recovery over a relatively short period of time, as opposed to waiting additional years for the same, or potentially worse, result; (2) a guaranteed result that compares favorably with other representative PAGA actions of this type, given the strengths and weaknesses of the case; and (3) significant savings in Plaintiff's Counsel's fees and/or costs that would have only increased significantly had the case progressed through trial and/or appeals.

52. Plaintiff's Counsel is experienced in complex representative and class action wage-and-hour litigation. Blackstone Law, APC ("Blackstone") has been counsel of record on several class and PAGA actions that have since been resolved, the most recent of which are attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**. The attorneys who worked on the Action are all experienced in litigating wage and hour matters as follows:

///

///

a. Jonathan M. Genish is the founder of Blackstone. He received his law degree from Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar in 2008. During law school, he clerked at the litigation firm Oved & Oved, LLP and was published several times in various small publications. Upon graduation, he was rehired by Freedman & Taitelman, LLP as an associate and remained employed there from September 2008 through August 2015. During his tenure, he managed hundreds (perhaps thousands) of complex litigation cases, ranging from employment, corporate, entertainment, and general business litigation matters, though his primary area of expertise was employment, both single plaintiff and representative actions. On the vast majority of those cases, he was the only or primary attorney managing the case and thus obtained extensive experience. In that capacity, he conducted wage and hour and wrongful termination labor and employment intakes; was the primary contact for all clients; took and defended hundreds (if not thousands) of depositions; propounded and responded to all discovery; prepared and opposed all motions and pleadings, including dispositive and certification motions; strategized on all cases; attended all hearings; attended all mediations; coordinated with class action administrators; prepared and worked with experts; first and second chaired multiple trials and arbitrations; and engaged in all other intricate facets of litigation. During that time, he represented a wide range of clients from sole proprietorships to Fortune 500 companies in state, federal, complex, and appellate courts. Many of the cases he managed were highly publicized, with articles written about them in the Los Angeles Times, Deadline, The Hollywood Reporter, Business Insider, Law360, and others. Super Lawyers has regularly honored him as a Southern California Rising Star since 2012. He is currently the managing partner of Blackstone overseeing roughly 500 labor and employment cases, approximately 80% of which include a wage and hour component. The majority of those cases are wage-and-hour putative class actions or representative PAGA actions seeking relief on behalf of thousands of California employees. His billable rate is $1,295, which is well within the prevailing rate for attorneys with his experience in this area of practice in Southern California.

b. Miriam L. Schimmel is a 29-year litigator who joined Blackstone in June 2022, following ten years of working with two well-known plaintiff-side wage and hour law firms in Los Angeles. She obtained her Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from the University of

California at Los Angeles in 1992. Thereafter, she received her law degree from Loyola Law School in 1996 and was admitted to the California State Bar in December 1996. Since her admission to the Bar, she has devoted her practice to a wide variety of litigation matters on both the plaintiff and defense side, including general business, toxic tort, medical device, and pharmaceutical matters. Since 2010, her practice has been devoted almost entirely to employment litigation consisting of wage and hour class actions and representative actions pursuant to PAGA, as well as individual actions based on violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"). Approximately 75% of her work in this regard has been on behalf of employees (plaintiffs), while the remaining 25% was on behalf of employers/businesses. On many of those cases, she was the senior lead attorney managing the litigation and overseeing other attorneys. In that capacity, she obtained extensive experience analyzing potential wage and hour and wrongful termination claims for viability; took and defended hundreds of depositions; propounded and responded to discovery; prepared and opposed a wide variety of motions and pleadings, including dispositive and certification motions, as well as settlement approval motions; strategized on all cases; participated in and directed communication with class members; attended hearings; led and participated in mediations; coordinated with class action administrators; prepared and worked with experts; and engaged in all other related aspects of litigation in state, federal, complex, and appellate courts. Her billable rate is $1,075, which is well within the prevailing rate for attorneys with her experience in this area of practice in Southern California.

c. Joana Fang is a highly skilled nine-year lawyer who is part of the team at Blackstone that litigated this matter. She is a 2015 graduate of Loyola Law School, and a 2011 graduate of University of California, Berkeley where she was a double major in Legal Studies and Media Studies. Since passing the Bar, Ms. Fang has exclusively represented plaintiffs in wage and hour litigation, as well as catastrophic injury complex litigation. She is admitted to the State of California, all federal district courts of California, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit. She was most recently recognized as a 2025 Southern California Rising Star by Super Lawyers. Her hourly rate of $750 is reasonable based on her education and experience and is in line with the market rate.

///

///

d. Alexandra Rose joined Blackstone from a highly reputable employment law firm. She graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2016 and from New England Law | Boston with a Juris Doctor degree in 2019 and the State Bars of New York and New Jersey in 2023. She is additionally licensed in all federal district courts of California. She has worked on many wage and hour class action and PAGA representative matters, and her work has included, *inter alia*, researching and drafting pleadings, administrative notice exhaustion, drafting, negotiating, and finalizing stipulations and settlement agreements, engaging in motion practice, claims evaluation and analysis, and making court appearances. She was admitted to the State Bar of California in December of 2019. Her hourly rate of $750 is reasonable based on my education and experience and is in line with the market rate.

e. Jared C. Osborne joined Blackstone also from a highly reputable employment law firm. He graduated from New York University with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 2009 and from University of Southern California Gould School of Law (USC) with a Juris Doctor degree in 2020. While at USC, he was an Executive Senior Editor on the Southern California Law Review and graduated in the top 10% of his class. He was admitted to the State Bar of California in February 2021. Since his admittance, he has worked exclusively as a Plaintiff's side employment attorney handling both individual and class action cases. He was most recently recognized as a 2025 Southern California Rising Star by Super Lawyers. His hourly rate of $675 is reasonable based on his education and experience and is in line with the market rate

f. I recently joined Blackstone. I received my Bachelor of Arts degree from California State University, Fullerton in 2015, my Master of Journalism from University of Southern California, Los Angeles in 2016, and my Juris Doctor degree from Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law in 2021. I was admitted to the State Bar of California in 2023. My hourly rate of $550 is reasonable based on my education and experience and is in line with the market rate.

53. Blackstone has spent approximately 288.20 total hours litigating this matter. To date, our total fees incurred amount to $254,927. Each attorney who worked on this matter engaged in a multitude of tasks, including communicating with the client and defense counsel; investigating the facts and researching appliable legal issues; drafting pleadings and the mediation brief; reviewing

documents; preparing for and attending mediation; and facilitating the settlement by drafting the settlement documents and documents for obtaining settlement approval. A summary of Blackstone's lodestar for each attorney who worked on this matter is as follows:

Attorney	**Position**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total**
Jonathan M. Genish	Managing Partner	33.60	$1,295	$43,512
Miriam L. Schimmel	Senior Counsel	91.20	$1,075	$98,040
Joana Fang	Senior Associate	72.30	$750	$54,225
Alexandra Rose	Senior Associate	35.60	$750	$26,700
Jared C. Osborne	Senior Associate	15.40	$675	$10,395
Jasmine Y. Kianfard	Associate	40.10	$550	$22,055

54. We expect to spend an additional 10 hours ($5,500) in connection with finalizing the Motion, preparing for the approval hearing, and managing the Agreement through its conclusion, including anticipated communications with defense counsel, the Settlement Administrator, and our client. Based thereon, the total amount of Plaintiff's Counsel's fees through closure of this matter are estimated to be approximately $260,427.

The Requested Attorneys' Costs and Expenses are Fair and Reasonable

55. The Agreement provides for reimbursement of Plaintiff's Counsel's actual litigation costs and expenses of up to Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00). However, Plaintiff's Counsel seeks reimbursement of a total of Twenty-Five Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty-Nine Dollars and Six Cents ($25,839.06) in litigation costs and expenses. A true and correct itemized list of Blackstone's litigation costs and expenses is attached hereto as **Exhibit 6**. This amount was reasonable and necessary in the prosecution of this matter.

The Settlement Administration Costs are Fair and Reasonable

56. As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Parties have agreed to retain, subject to approval by the Court, ILYM Group, Inc., to handle the administration of the Agreement. The fees and expenses of the Settlement Administrator are estimated not to exceed Twelve Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($12,250.00). These costs include, but are not limited to,

expenses for preparing, printing, and mailing the Cover Letter and Individual PAGA Payment checks to the Aggrieved Employees, re-mailing the returned Individual PAGA Payment checks to any new addresses obtained, and handling inquiries from Aggrieved Employees regarding the Agreement, among other things. Accordingly, the Court should grant approval of the Settlement Administration Costs in the amount of *up to* Twelve Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($12,250.00) to ILYM Group, Inc., a necessary third-party for handling the settlement process.

The Service Award Is Fair and Reasonable

57. As part of the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff respectfully requests a reasonable Service Award of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($7,500.00) to Plaintiff. This Service Award is eminently reasonable given the time and effort Plaintiff spent on this matter, his services on behalf of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees, and his broader, general release of claims.

58. By initiating and pursuing the Action, Plaintiff stepped into the shoes of the State of California and undertook the responsibilities of serving in a representative capacity. Plaintiff was available whenever Plaintiff's Counsel needed him and actively tried to obtain information that would benefit the prosecution of the Action.

59. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully submits that it is appropriate and just for Plaintiff to receive a Service Award in the amount of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($7,500.00) in addition to the Individual PAGA Payment he will receive as an Aggrieved Employee, for his services on behalf of the State of California and the other Aggrieved Employees, as well as for his broader, general release of claims.

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

Executed on 03/20/2026, at Los Angeles, California.

Jasmine Y. Kianfard

Jasmine Y. Kianfard

EXHIBIT 1

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

Miriam Schimmel, Esq.
mschimmel@blackstonepc.com

August 27, 2024

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: ***Colton Ray v. Pape' Machinery, Inc.; The Pape' Group, Inc.***

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Colton Ray ("Claimant") with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Pape' Machinery, Inc. and The Pape' Group, Inc. (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Colton Ray from approximately May 2021 to January 2024 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Colton Ray worked as a Technician for Employers and was based out of Employers' facility located at 20 Depot Rd, Fortuna, CA 95540.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant's notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order"). Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

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

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock prior to clocking-in and/or after clocking-out for their shifts. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

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

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders;

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

penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5^{th}) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10^{th}) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

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

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with

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

California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

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

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

Miriam L Schimmel

Miriam Schimmel, Esq.

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

The Pape' Group, Inc. 355 Goodpasture Island Road, Suite 300 Eugene, Oregon 97401	The Pape' Group, Inc. c/o C T Corporation System 330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700 Glendale, CA 91203
Pape' Machinery, Inc. 355 Goodpasture Island Road, Suite 300 Eugene, OR 97401	Pape' Machinery, Inc. c/o C T Corporation System 330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700 Glendale, CA 91203

EXHIBIT 2

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

Alexandra Rose, Esq.
arose@blackstonepc.com

November 4, 2025

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: ***Colton Ray v. Pape' Machinery, Inc.; The Pape' Group, Inc.***
Case No. LWDA-CM-1047759-24

To Whom It May Concern:

On August 27, 2024, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"), our office provided notice to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on behalf of Colton Ray ("Claimant") that Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under PAGA with respect to his claims under the California Labor Code against Pape' Machinery, Inc. and The Pape' Group, Inc. (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers").

We write to inform you of this amended notice to provide clarification that the "Employers" include The Papé Group, Inc.; Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.

This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Colton Ray from approximately May 2021 to January 2024 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Colton Ray worked as a Technician for Employers and was based out of Employers' facility located at 20 Depot Rd, Fortuna, CA 95540.

Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant's amended notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order"). Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock prior to clocking-in and/or after clocking-out for their shifts. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

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

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id*.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5^{th}) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10^{th}) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia,* overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

BLACKSTONE LAW

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

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with

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

the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

Alexandra Rose, Esq.

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

Barbara A. Blackburn
BBlackburn@littler.com
Rachel E. Simons
RESimons@littler.com
LITTLER MENDELSON P.C.
500 Capitol Mall, Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attorneys for Pape' Machinery, Inc. and The Pape' Group, Inc.

EXHIBIT 3

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

This Private Attorneys General Act Settlement Agreement and Release (Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement") is entered into by and between Colton Ray ("Plaintiff"), individually and as a representative of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees (as defined in Section 3(a)(5) below) and Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.) (together, "Defendants"), subject to approval by the Court. The term "Party" or "Parties" as used herein shall refer to Plaintiff, Defendants, or both, as may be appropriate.

1. **Recitals.** This Settlement Agreement is made with reference to the following facts:

(a) On August 27, 2024, Blackstone Law, APC ("Plaintiff's Counsel"), submitted a letter on behalf of Plaintiff to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and Defendants to notify the LWDA and Defendants pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), of Plaintiff's intent to seek civil penalties under PAGA for Defendants' alleged violations of/seeking penalties under California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, thereby initiating LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-1047759-24;

(b) On November 4, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq.*, commencing a representative action under PAGA against Defendants, entitled *Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc. et al.*, Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV2402126 ("Action").

(c) On May 14, 2025, the Parties mediated the Action with Brandon McKelvey, Esq., and, with the aid of the mediator's evaluation, the Parties ultimately reached the Settlement described herein to resolve the Action in its entirety (settlement occurred on May 19, 2025);

(d) On November 4, 2025, Plaintiff's Counsel submitted an amended letter on behalf of Plaintiff to the LWDA and Defendants to clarify that the claims are against The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.). The August 27, 2024 and November 4, 2025 letters to the LWDA are together referred to as the "PAGA Notice";

(e) Plaintiff agrees to file a First Amended Complaint for Enforcement Action Under the Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698 *Et Seq.* ("Operative Complaint") to also clarify that the claims are against The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.);

(f) There has been no determination on the merits of the Action or the PAGA Notice but, in order to avoid additional cost and the uncertainty of litigation, the Parties desire to resolve the Action and Released Claims (as defined in Section 6(a) below).

2. **No Admission of Wrongdoing.** The Parties agree that neither this Settlement Agreement nor the furnishing of the consideration for this Settlement Agreement shall be deemed or construed at any time for any purpose as an admission by the Released Parties of wrongdoing or evidence of any liability or unlawful conduct of any kind.

3. **Consideration.**

(a) Defendants shall pay the maximum gross sum of One Million Two Hundred Eighty-Nine Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($1,289,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to resolve the Action and Released Claims (as defined in Section 6(a) below), which will be paid as follows:

(1) Attorneys' fees in the amount of thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is Four Hundred Fifty One Thousand One Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($451,150.00), and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of up to Thirty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($30,000.00) (collectively, "Attorneys' Fees and Costs") to Plaintiff's Counsel, which Defendants will not contest.

(2) A service award of up to the amount of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents ($7,500.00) ("Service Award") to Plaintiff, which Defendants will not contest.

(3) Costs and expenses of administration of the Settlement up to the amount of Twelve Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and Zero Cents ($12,250.00) ("Settlement Administration Costs") to ILYM Group, Inc. ("Settlement Administrator").

(4) The amounts stated in Sections 3(a)(1) – 3(a)(3) above, once approved by the Court, shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The balance remaining after these deductions is referred to as the "Net Settlement Amount."

(5) Sixty-five percent (65%) of the Net Settlement Amount will be distributed to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment"); and the remaining thirty-five percent (35%) will be distributed to all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period ("Aggrieved Employees"). The period August 27, 2023 to July 18, 2025 is the "PAGA Period." The thirty-five percent (35%) portion of the Net Settlement Amount payable to the Aggrieved Employees is referred to as the "Employees' Portion."

(6) The Aggrieved Employees are estimated to consist of approximately 1,742 individuals who worked approximately 48,075 two-week pay periods during the period August 27, 2023 to March 15, 2025. If the actual number of Pay Periods (as defined in Section 5(b) below) is more than ten percent (10%) above 48,075 (i.e., is greater than 52,883 Pay Periods),

the Defendants shall have the option to either: 1) proportionally increase the Gross Settlement Amount according to the following formula: Total Number of Pay Periods divided by 52,883 multiplied by the Gross Settlement Amount; or 2) shorten the PAGA Period to the date at which the Pay Periods reach 48,075.

(b) Because this is a settlement of PAGA claims for civil penalties only, no portion of the Settlement is allocated to unpaid wages. One hundred percent (100%) of the payments for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Service Award, and the Net Settlement Amount to be paid to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees as described in Section 3(a) above will be treated and reported for tax purposes as non-wage payments and the Settlement Administrator will be responsible for issuing IRS Forms 1099, as required.

4. **<u>Approval and Implementation of the PAGA Settlement and Dismissal of the Class Action</u>.**

(a) The Parties are aware that some courts have approved a PAGA settlement and entered an order approving the settlement and judgment and thereafter closed the case, while others have approved a PAGA settlement and entered only an order approving the settlement with later instructions to file a request for dismissal of the action. The Parties agree to cooperate and take any and all steps required by the Court in the Action to implement the settlement and terminate the Action pursuant to settlement (i.e., to terminate the Action by way of judgment or dismissal).

(b) The Parties further agree to cooperate in the drafting and/or filing of any further documents and/or filings reasonably necessary to be prepared and/or filed, and to take all steps that may be requested by the Court in order to obtain approval and implementation of this Settlement Agreement, and the payments described in Section 3(a) above.

(c) The Parties shall seek to obtain Court approval of this Settlement Agreement by way of an unopposed motion to be filed by Plaintiff's Counsel. Plaintiff's Counsel shall provide a draft of all documents to be submitted in connection with the motion to approve this Settlement Agreement to Barbara A. Blackburn and Rachel E. Simons of Littler Mendelson P.C. ("Defendants' Counsel") for review. Defendants' Counsel will be given an opportunity to comment on the papers prior to their being filed with the Court, and such comments will be implemented to the extent reasonable. As part of this Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff also agrees to dismiss without prejudice Case No. CV2401642, entitled *Colton Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc.; The Papé Group Inc.; and DOES 1 through 25* (the "Class Action"), which was also filed in the Humboldt County Superior Court. The Parties agree to cooperate to submit whatever the Court requires to effectuate dismissal of the Class Action.

The Parties expressly acknowledge that the Court's approval of the Settlement Agreement is a condition precedent to any payments described in this Settlement Agreement. Therefore, the Parties further acknowledge that, should the Court not grant approval of this Settlement Agreement and/or should the Court refuse to grant judgment or dismissal of the Action and close the Action based on the Settlement, the entirety of this Settlement Agreement shall be null and void. Should the Court not approve dismissal of the Class

Action, Plaintiff agrees to stipulate to individual arbitration of the claims asserted in the Class Action.

5. **Payment of the Gross Settlement Amount / Notice to Recipients.**

(a) Subject to Court approval of this Settlement Agreement, payment of the sums described in Section 3(a) above shall be made by Defendants by transmitting the Gross Settlement Amount to a qualified settlement account established by the Settlement Administrator for administration of this Settlement, within fourteen (14) calendar days of the Effective Date. The "Effective Date" is defined as (a) the last date to appeal the Order and Judgment by the Court and no appeal is filed; or (b) if an appeal is filed, reviewed, or writ is sought from the Order and Judgment, the day after the Order and Judgment is affirmed or the appeal, review, or writ is dismissed or denied, and the Order and Judgment is no longer subject to further judicial review. If the date by which payment by Defendants is due falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday in the State of California, then the due date shall be extended to the next following day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday in the State of California.

(b) Each Aggrieved Employee will be entitled to a *pro rata* share of 35% of the Net Settlement Agreement (i.e., the Employees' Portion) based upon the number of two-week pay periods they each worked during the PAGA Period ("Pay Periods"), based on Defendants' payroll records. Specifically, to calculate each Aggrieved Employee's share of the Employees' Portion ("Individual PAGA Payment"), the Settlement Administrator shall: (i) for each Aggrieved Employee, divide the number of Pay Periods the Aggrieved Employee worked by the total aggregate number of Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees, and then (ii) multiply this amount by the Employees' Portion to arrive at each Aggrieved Employee's Individual PAGA Payment.

(1) One hundred percent (100%) of all Individual PAGA Payments are to be considered penalties and the Settlement Administrator will not undertake any deductions, withholding, or remittances for local, state, or federal taxes. Aggrieved Employees' Individual PAGA Payments will be reported on an IRS Form 1099, as required.

(c) The Settlement Administrator shall distribute each Individual PAGA Payment by way of check, along with a cover letter ("Cover Letter") agreed to by the Parties and approved by the Court, in substantially the form attached hereto as "**Exhibit A**," in the following manner:

(1) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement, Defendants shall provide the Settlement Administrator with a list of all Aggrieved Employees (the "Aggrieved Employees List"), containing the following information for each Aggrieved Employee: (i) first and last name; (ii) last known address; (iii) last known telephone number; (iv) Social Security number; and (v) dates worked during the PAGA Period.

(2) The Settlement Administrator shall conduct one (1) National Change of Address ("NCOA") search for all individuals identified on the Aggrieved Employees List.

(3) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall mail the agreed-upon Cover Letter and Individual PAGA Payment checks (together, the "PAGA Settlement Package") to all Aggrieved Employees by First-Class United States mail. For each PAGA Settlement Package that is returned undeliverable within thirty (30) calendar days of the initial mailing, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly attempt to locate an alternative, updated address for the Aggrieved Employee at issue, by using a skip-trace search and shall attempt one (1) re-mailing of the PAGA Settlement Package.

(4) The Individual PAGA Payment checks issued to Aggrieved Employees shall remain valid for one hundred eighty (180) calendar days, and thereafter, shall be canceled. Funds associated with such canceled checks shall be transmitted to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Division in the name of the Aggrieved Employee(s) at issue and in the amount of their respective Individual PAGA Payment(s). If, for some reason, the Court does not approve the escheatment of uncashed funds, the Parties agree to meet and confer to identify a mutually-agreeable *cy pres* recipient(s).

(5) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall transmit the LWDA Payment to the LWDA.

(6) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall transmit the Service Award to Plaintiff.

(7) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall transmit the Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Plaintiff's Counsel.

(8) No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator receives the Aggrieved Employees List and Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall transmit the Settlement Administration Costs to itself.

6. **Release of Claims by Plaintiff, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California with Respect to the Aggrieved Employees.**

(a) Upon the date of the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement Agreement and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California with respect to Aggrieved Employees, will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged Defendants Papé Material Handling, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé

Properties, Inc.), and each of their parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, shareholders, members, agents, predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, the "Released Parties") from any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the Operative Complaint and PAGA Notice, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq*., for Defendants' alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide complaint wage statements, maintain complete and accurate payroll records, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of/seeking penalties under California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (collectively, "Released Claims").

(b) Upon the date of the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement Agreement and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff, individually and on his own behalf, will be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties from any and all claims of every nature whatsoever, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, asserted or unasserted, which Plaintiff has or may have as of the date of execution of this Settlement Agreement, including but not limited to any and all claims arising out of, relating to, or resulting from Plaintiff's employment and/or separation of employment with Defendants. With respect to those claims released by Plaintiff in his individual capacity, Plaintiff acknowledges and waives any and all rights and benefits available under California Civil Code Section 1542, which provides:

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

Plaintiff understands and agrees that claims or facts in addition to or different from those which are now known or believed by him to exist may hereafter be discovered. It is Plaintiff's intention to, upon the date of the Court's order granting approval of the Settlement Agreement and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, settle fully and release all claims Plaintiff now has against the Released Parties, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected. Notwithstanding the above, the general release by Plaintiff shall not extend to claims for workers' compensation benefits, claims for unemployment benefits, or other claims that may not be released by law.

7. **Governing Law and Interpretation.**

(a) This Settlement Agreement shall be governed and conformed in accordance with the laws of the State of California. Should any non-material provision of this Settlement Agreement be declared illegal or unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction and cannot be modified to be enforceable, such provision immediately shall become null and void, leaving the remainder of this Settlement Agreement in full force and effect.

(b) In the event of a breach of any provision of this Settlement Agreement, any Party reserves the right to institute an action specifically to enforce any term or terms of this Settlement Agreement or seek damages for breach. In an action to enforce any term or terms of this Settlement Agreement or to seek damages for breach of this Settlement Agreement, the prevailing Party in that action shall be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from the non-prevailing Party.

8. **Amendment.** This Settlement Agreement may not be modified, altered, or changed except in writing and signed by both Parties' counsel, subject to approval by the Court.

9. **Confidentiality.** Plaintiff's Counsel agrees to discuss the terms of this Settlement Agreement only in filings in the Action as required to approve the Settlement and in discussions with Aggrieved Employees or the Settlement Administrator in the context of administering this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff's Counsel will not discuss the Settlement with any third parties or otherwise publicize the Settlement in any manner, including but not limited to, on any website or platform. Plaintiff's Counsel will not use any information about the identities, contact information, or other data provided about the Aggrieved Employees in the Action other than for purposes of the Action. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Plaintiff's Counsel will make any and all disclosures to the LWDA pursuant to PAGA. Additionally, nothing herein will restrict Plaintiff's Counsel from including publicly available information regarding this Settlement Agreement in future judicial submissions regarding Plaintiff's Counsel's qualifications and experience. The Parties agree that this Settlement Agreement is otherwise confidential until the settlement approval motion is filed.

10. **Miscellaneous.**

(a) The Parties agree to stay all proceedings in the Action, including with respect to California Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310, except such proceedings necessary to implement and complete the Settlement, pending approval of the Settlement.

(b) This Settlement Agreement may be signed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which, taken together shall constitute the same instrument. A signature made on a faxed or electronically transmitted copy of the Settlement Agreement or a signature transmitted by facsimile or electronic mail shall have the same effect as the original signature.

(c) The section headings used in this Settlement Agreement are intended solely for convenience of reference and shall not in any manner amplify, limit, modify, or otherwise be used in the interpretation of any of the provisions hereof.

(d) This Settlement Agreement was the result of negotiations between the Parties and their respective counsel under the auspices of mediator Brandon McKelvey, Esq. In the event of vagueness, ambiguity, or uncertainty, this Settlement Agreement shall not be construed against the Party preparing it but shall be construed as if both Parties prepared it jointly, and the

Parties may present their disputes to the mediator to resolve any vagueness, ambiguity, or uncertainty.

(e) If Plaintiff or Defendants fail to enforce this Settlement Agreement or to insist on performance of any term, that failure does not mean a waiver of that term or of the Settlement Agreement. This Settlement Agreement remains in full force and effect anyway.

HAVING ELECTED TO EXECUTE THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT, TO FULFILL THE PROMISES, AND TO RECEIVE THE CONSIDERATION SET FORTH ABOVE, PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANTS, FREELY AND KNOWINGLY, AND AFTER DUE CONSIDERATION, ENTER INTO THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto knowingly and voluntarily executed this Settlement Agreement as of the date set forth below:

PLAINTIFF COLTON RAY

Dated: 02/18/2026

CR

Colton Ray

DEFENDANT PAPÉ MACHINERY, INC.

Dated: 3/2/26

Full Name: Seth Smythe

Title: VP

On behalf of Papé Machinery, Inc.

DEFENDANT THE PAPÉ GROUP, INC.

Dated: 3/2/26

Full Name: Seth Smythe

Title: EVP + CLO

On behalf of The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.)

APPROVED AS TO FORM ONLY:

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

Dated: 02/18/2026

Jasmine Kianfard

Jonathan M. Genish
Miriam L. Schimmel
Joana Fang
Alexandra Rose
Jasmine Y. Kianfard
Attorneys for Plaintiff Colton Ray

LITTLER MENDELSON P.C.

Dated: March 2, 2026

Barbara A. Blackburn
Rachel E. Simons
Attorneys for Defendants Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.)

Exhibit A

To: <<First Name>><<Last Name>>
<<Street Address>>
<<City>><<State>><<Zip>>

Re: Settlement Payment from *Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al.*,
Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV2402126

Dear <<First Name>><<Last Name>>:

Please find enclosed a check in the amount of **<<amount of payment>>** ("Individual PAGA Payment"). This check is your payment from the settlement in the lawsuit entitled *Ray v. Papé Machinery, Inc., et al.*, Humboldt County Superior Court Case No. CV2402126 ("Action").

The lawsuit was filed on November 4, 2024 and amended on ________, 2025 by Colton Ray ("Plaintiff") against his former employers Papé Machinery, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing, Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.) (together, "Defendants"), on behalf of the State of California, with respect to himself and other alleged aggrieved employees, to seek recovery of civil penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), for multiple alleged violations of the California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, including, *inter alia*, for failure to properly pay minimum and overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premiums, failure to pay wages during employment and upon termination, failure to provide compliant wage statements, failure to maintain requisite payroll records, and failure to reimburse business expenses. Prior to initiating the lawsuit, on August 27, 2024 and November 4, 2025, Plaintiff submitted letters to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), pursuant to PAGA, to provide notice of his intent to seek civil penalties under PAGA for Defendants' alleged violations of the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, thereby initiating LWDA Case Number LWDA-CM-1047759-24 (together, the "PAGA Notice").

Defendants deny all of Plaintiff's allegations and deny any wrongdoing of any kind associated with Plaintiff's allegations. A settlement was reached between Plaintiff and Defendants.

On <<Date>>, the settlement was approved by the Court, with a portion to be paid to the LWDA and a portion to be paid to all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the PAGA Period ("Aggrieved Employees"). The period August 27, 2023 to July 18, 2025 is the "PAGA Period."

You are receiving a portion of the settlement (the enclosed Individual PAGA Payment) because you have been identified as an Aggrieved Employee. Your Individual PAGA Payment is based on the total number of pay periods that you worked for Defendants in California during the PAGA Period. The Individual PAGA Payment is considered to be 100% penalties, which will be reported on an IRS Form 1099 (if applicable). You are responsible for paying any and all taxes that may be due as a result of any payment issued to you under the settlement and should consult a tax advisor regarding the tax consequences of such payment.

Under the settlement, as of <<date of Court's order granting approval of the Settlement Agreement and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount>>, the Released Parties were fully, finally, and forever released, settled, compromised, relinquished, and discharged from the Released Claims.

> "Released Parties" means Defendants Papé Material Handling, Inc. and The Papé Group, Inc. (which includes Papé Machinery, Inc.; Papé Material Handling, Inc.; Papé Trucks, Inc.; Papé D.W., Inc.; Papé Truck Leasing,

Inc.; and Papé Properties, Inc.), and each of their parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, shareholders, members, agents, predecessors, successors, and assigns.

"Released Claims" means any and all claims arising from any of the factual allegations in the Operative Complaint and PAGA Notice, arising during the PAGA Period, for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698 *et seq.*, for Defendants' alleged failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated premium payments, timely pay wages during employment and upon termination, provide complaint wage statements, maintain complete and accurate payroll records, and reimburse necessary business-related expenses in violation of/seeking penalties under California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.

The enclosed check is valid for 180 calendar days from the original date of issuance and mailing, and if it is not cashed, deposited, or otherwise negotiated within the 180-day timeframe, it will be canceled, and the funds associated with the canceled check will be transmitted to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Division in your name and in the amount of your Individual PAGA Payment.

Do not call or write the Court, Office of the Clerk of the Court, Defendants, or Defendants' counsel to ask questions about the settlement or to ask tax-related questions. If you have any such questions, you may contact [Settlement Administrator] at [toll-free phone number].

EXHIBIT 4

Outlook

Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

Desde no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>
Fecha Mié 18/03/2026 16:04
Para Lorena Bautista <lbautista@blackstonepc.com>

[External Email].

03/18/2026 02:04:37 PM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 03/18/2026 02:04:37 PM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1047759-24

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

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

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

EXHIBIT 5

- *Vivian Huynh v. Technical Safety Services, LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV053505, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action
- *Connor Brown v. Bi-Rite Management Services LLC, et al.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-24-611385, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Joshua Gilmore v. Golden Bolt, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11281, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tony Jones v. Saddle Creek Corporation dba Saddle Creek Logistics Services*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2024-01379065-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Armida Burton v. Mercury Mission Systems, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV02628, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Triada Pallidou v. TJB Geary's, LLC dba Geary's Beverly Hills*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15627, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Joey Ruiz, et al. v. Southern Tire Mart, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12037, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action
- *Salomon Garcia, et al. v. Atlas Freight Forwarding, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00039724-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Chardriana Jean v. Woodruff-Sawyer & Co.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV102594, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Stephanie Leon v. Fulgent Therapeutics, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV14168, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Emma Romero v. Charles Abbott Associates, Inc.*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2322374, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Karen Hartstein v. Hyatt Corporation*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV15895, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Michael Casas, et al. v. Encorr Sheets, LLC*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2319925, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Quincy O'Neal v. Included Health, Inc., formerly known as Grand Rounds Health, Inc.*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-608391, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Javario Datrail Luna v. A-Check America, Inc., et al.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2306180, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Kevin Werner, et al. v. Greystar Management Services, LP, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV08498, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jully Mullings v. Antelope Ambulance Service*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30241, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Maria Martina Aleman v, Holding Hands OPCO LLC dba Holding Hands, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV25240, approved as counsel in

settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.

- *Jesus Herrera v. Reeve Store Equipment Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV04239, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Vanessa Vazquez v. Cliffs Resort LLC*, San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV-0025, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Javier Hernandez, Jr. v. DGDG 1, LLC, et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV416770, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Juan Manuel Munoz v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV06386, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mayra Campos Molina, et al. v. Harbor Hotels, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV10683, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Sykes, IV, et al. v. Wente Bros.*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV048758, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Padilla, et al. v. WEHO Hospitality Sunset, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV01072, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marvin Morales v. Skurka Aerospace, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV12893, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Krug, et al. v. EKC Enterprises, Inc.*, Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-23-103975, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final

settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Joseph Amyot v. Silverthorn Resort, Inc.*, Shasta County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV-0203487, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Marissa Hartman v. Napa LP Hospitality Corporation*, Napa County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV00116, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Lesly Arreguin, et al. v. Intercare Therapy, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27972, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alma Lopez, et al. v. Advanced Manufacturing and Development, Inc.*, Mendocino County Superior, Case No. 23CV000673, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Brittni Aghedo, et al. v. Villa Esperanza Services*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV27362, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Robin Jennings v. Mizuho Orthopedic Systems, Inc. dba Mizuho OSI*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV070891, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jonathan Martin v. Atlas Digital, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30498, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cynthia Molt v. Los Angeles Film School, LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV30757, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *William Ramirez v. Employer Solutions Staffing Group LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV24735, approved as counsel in final settlement of

wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Anu Verma v. SingerLewak LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV11344, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Toby Lanzarin, et al. v. Building Material Distributors, Inc.*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2022-00330343-CU-OE-GDS, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Kassandra Herndon, et al. v. Agreeya Solutions, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0002783, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Damon Siler, et al. v. Call-The-Car dba Call the Car*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07514, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Daniel Ochoa-Lopez v. CorTech West Staffing, LLC, et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV19480, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Juan Escobedo v. Block Tops, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01356309-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Antonio Quintero v. Weyerhaeuser NR Company*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV02624, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Cristo Hernandez v. Eldorado National (California), Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2201056, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rigoberto Tecaliz v. National Restaurant Inc. dba Black Bear Diner*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00046906-CU-OE-CTL, approved as

counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

- *Cecilia Estrada v. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV07184, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Alexander Davis v. JAJ Roofing dba Citadel Roofing and Solar*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV011004, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Aurelio Aguilar v. Supreme Car Wash, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV29696, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Aaron Coffey v. Catalina Channel Express, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV41396, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Djuana Shanella Hale, et al. v. Welbe Health, LLC, et al.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2023-0006866, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Mario Fosados v. Drew Chain Security Corp.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV00519, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jose Manuel Amaro Bernal v. Joseph Holt Plastering, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24STCV15637, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Brandon Geston v. FRTO LLC, et al.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG01292, approved as counsel in in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alfonso Herrera v. W.L. Butler Construction, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01335445-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final

settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

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

- *Angel Rodriguez v. American Textile Maintenance*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV17855, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Rita Ray v. Families Together of Orange County*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2023-01324555-CU-OE-CXC, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Ly Hai v. Sunroad HS Auto, Inc.*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2022-00025788-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Anabel Perez v. Eureka Specialties, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV35940, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jose Luis Galicia v. Virco, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV29425, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Rene Umana v. Columbus Technologies*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 22STCV16432, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Sitara Nayabkhil v. San Francisco SPCA (dba SFSPCA), a California 501(c)(3) non-profit organization*, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-23-609950, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Fernando Solis v. Tuff Shed, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 24VECV00368, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Tyler Emery v. Santa Cruz Bicycles, LLC*, Santa Cruz Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00244, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and

PAGA action.

- *Odalys Montejo v. Team Nissan LLC*, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. 2023CUOE017853, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA
- *Vanessa Cortes v. Giti Tire (USA) LTD*, San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332578, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Travis Sanford v. Santa Cruz Seaside Company*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV01762, approved as counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.
- *Jered Ortega v. YMCA of San Diego County*, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2023-00043645-CU-OE-CTL, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Corina Martinez v. Stagnaro Bros. Seafood, Inc.*, Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV00082, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Alejandra Jimenez v. ClearFreight, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV28938, approved as counsel, in association with other counsel, in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Jazzmin Cortez v. Millard Mall Services, Inc.*, Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2104010, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Christa Morton, et al. v. PSI Services, LLC*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 24CECG00039, approved as counsel in settlement of representative wage and hour action pursuant to PAGA.
- *Michael Bravo v. Michels Pacific Energy, Inc.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 22CV403427, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and

hour class and PAGA action.

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

No. BCV-21-101933, approved as class counsel in final settlement of wage and hour class action.

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

Court, Case No. CIVSB2208601, approved as class counsel, in association with other counsel, in final settlement of wage and hour class and PAGA action.

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

EXHIBIT 6

Date	Type of Expense	Description of Expense	Amount
		Ray v. Pape Machinery	
6/3/2024	Other	Wizzy Marketing	$268.00
8/27/2024	Filing	LWDA: PAGA Notice	$75.00
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice to The Pape' Group, Inc.	$5.82
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice to The Pape' Group, Inc. (Agent)	$5.82
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice to Pape' Machinery, Inc.	$5.82
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice to Pape' Machinery, Inc. (Agent)	$5.82
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice & Records Request to The Pape' Group, Inc. (Agent)	$9.92
8/27/2024	Mailing	PAGA Notice & Records Request to The Pape' Group, Inc.	$9.92
8/29/2024	Filing	Steno: Class Action Complaint and Initiating Documents	$2,039.75
9/6/2024	Filing	Steno: Plaintiff's Notice of Posting of Jury Fees	$301.50
9/12/2024	Filing/Service	Steno: Personal Service of Class Action Complaint and Initiating Documents	$134.00
9/12/2024	Filing/Service	Steno: Personal Service of Class Action Complaint and Initiating Documents	$134.00
9/13/2024	Filing	Steno: Courtesy Copies to Court of Proof of Service of Summons on Defendants	$99.00
10/28/2024	Filing	Steno: Plaintiff's Motion for Complex Case Designation	$180.00
11/4/2024	Filing	Steno: PAGA Complaint and Initiating Documents	$686.25
11/27/2024	Filing	Steno: Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt [PAGA]	$99.00
12/19/2024	Filing	Steno: Plaintiff's Motion for Exemption from Humboldt County Superior Court's Delay Reduction Program	$180.00
12/19/2024	Other	Steno: Courtesy Copy to Court: Plaintiff's Motion for Exemption from Humboldt County Superior Court's Delay Reduction Program	$99.00
1/29/2025	Mediation	Mediation with Brandon McKelvey	$12,500.00
2/3/2025	Filing	Steno: Case Management Statement	$99.00
5/21/2025	Other	Damage Analysis Consultant, Berger Consulting Group	$7,830.00
6/12/2025	Filing	Steno: Case Management Statement (Class)	$99.00
6/12/2025	Filing	Steno: Case Management Statement (PAGA)	$99.00
9/12/2025	Filing	Steno: Joint OSC Re: Dismissal (Settlement) Statement	$175.00
11/4/2025	Mailing	Amended PAGA Notice to Littler Mendelson P.C.	$10.44
11/26/2025	Filing	Steno: Joint OSC Re: Dismissal (Settlement) Statement	$175.00
11/26/2025	Service	Steno: Courtesy Copy of Joint OSC Re: Dismissal (Settlement) Statement	$234.00
	Filing	Estimated Cost - Steno: Motion for Approval of PAGA Settlement and Supporting Documents	$180.00
	Filing	Estimated Cost - Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order	$99.00
		Total:	**$25,839.06**