John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com6
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lucy H. Nguyen (SBN 338783)
lucy.nguyen@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SAMUEL SANCHEZ, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, *Plaintiff*, v. FRANKLIN ELECTRIC CO., INC., a corporation; HEADWATER COMPANIES, LLC, a limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, *Defendants*.	Case No.: CVRI2405393 **CLASS ACTION** *[Assigned for all purposes to Harold W. Hopp, Dept. 1]* **DECLARATION OF JOHN G. YSLAS IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING Date: July 27, 2026 Time: 8:30 AM Dept.: 1 Complaint filed: September 25, 2024 FAC filed: June 5, 2025 Trial date: Not set

DECLARATION OF JOHN G. YSLAS

I, John G. Yslas, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of California. I am a senior partner at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC ("WLF"), counsel for Plaintiff Samuel Sanchez ("Plaintiff") in this matter. I am thoroughly familiar with and have personal knowledge of all of the facts set forth herein.

2. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

Procedural History

3. On September 25, 2024, Plaintiff filed this putative class action against Defendants Franklin Electric Co., Inc. and Headwater Companies, LLC (collectively "Defendants") alleging: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (2) failure to pay overtime wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (8) unfair business practices under California law.

4. On October 18, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support. Attached as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's October 18, 2024, letter to Defendants and the LWDA. The LWDA did not notify Plaintiff that it intended to investigate within 65 days of this written notice. Therefore, on June 5, 2025, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint adding a cause of action for civil penalties under PAGA.

5. On September 29, 2025, the Parties participated in a private all-day mediation with Katherine J. Edwards. The negotiations were adversarial, conducted at arm's length, and tempered by the efforts of both sides to serve the interests of their clients. The Parties reached a settlement and agreed on general settlement terms.

6. The parties negotiated the terms of the Settlement over the next several months, which was finalized in February 2026. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of

the fully executed Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement. Attached thereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Parties' proposed Class Notice.

7. On June 2, 2026, Plaintiff submitted a copy of the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA. A true and correct copy of the confirmation of submission my office received after submitting the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. The Settlement Agreement contains an escalator clause providing that if the total number of workweeks increases by more than fifteen percent (15%) over 6,000 workweeks, Defendants may elect either to increase the Gross Settlement Amount proportionally for workweeks exceeding the 15% threshold, or to cut off the end date for the Class Period and PAGA Period as of the date on which the number of workweeks reaches 6,900. Settlement Agreement at § 8. Prior to filing this Motion, Plaintiff requested that Defendants confirm whether the escalator clause was triggered, and if so, to advise of their election. Defendants confirmed that the escalator clause was not triggered.

Investigation and Exposure Analysis

8. Prior to attending mediation, Plaintiff's Counsel thoroughly investigated the claims, applicable law, and potential defenses. Plaintiff's Counsel assessed the value to the class claims using the data and documents that Defendants produced in informal discovery, including the number of Class Members, the number of workweeks in the Class Period, the number of pay periods in the PAGA Period, the average rate of pay, Plaintiff's personnel file, Defendants' employee handbooks, Defendants' written wage-and-hour policies, and a random sampling of time and payroll records. Plaintiff's Counsel engaged an expert consultant to quantify the potential exposure using the time and payroll records, and then assessed the risks associated with each claim meriting reductions in the likely success at class certification and likely recovery at trial.

9. Defendants' records show that there are approximately 60 Class Members, making joinder of all Class Members impracticable. Further, given the size and amount of each Class Member's claim, Class Members have little incentive to litigate their claims on an individual basis because the out-of-pocket expenses and personal commitment necessary to litigate each claim likely outweighs any potential recovery

10. Plaintiff has alleged that Defendants maintained common employment policies and/or practices that unlawfully deprived Class Members of wages, meal period, rest periods, reimbursements for business expenses, accurate wage statements, and timely payment of wages upon separation of employment. These allegations present common factual and legal questions of, *inter alia*, whether Defendants applied the same scheduling, timekeeping, pay, meal period, rest period, and reimbursement policies to all Class Members, whether these policies and practices resulted in Labor Code violations, whether Defendants' conduct was intentional, and whether Class Members are entitled to damages and/or penalties. These common questions could be resolved using Class Members' time records, payroll records, testimony from Defendants' designated representative(s), and Class Members' testimony.

11. Although the exposure Plaintiff's Counsel calculated is substantial, the various risks at succeeding at class certification and through trial affected the valuation of the claims for settlement purposes.

12. <u>Minimum and Overtime Wages</u>: Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages, by requiring class members to work off-the-clock. For purposes of calculating Defendants' liability based on a best-case scenario for Plaintiff and the Class, Plaintiff's Counsel estimates that Defendants' maximum potential exposure by assuming that all unpaid work time should have been paid at the overtime rate, and Plaintiff's Counsel assumed that Defendants are liable for 1 hour of unpaid worktime per workweek. This results in an estimate of approximately $200,880.00 (6,000 workweeks x $22.32 hourly rate x 1.5 overtime rate x 1.0 hour of unpaid work per workweek), but Plaintiff's Counsel applied a risk discount based on a 40% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 40% chance of succeeding at trial on the merits because liability depends on (among other things) being able to prove such unlawful conduct occurred on a regular uniform basis and potentially whether Defendants knew or should have known that class members were working off-the-clock, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $32,140.80 ($200,880.00 x 40% x 40%).

13. <u>Meal Periods:</u> Plaintiff's meal period claim was based on the allegation that Defendants failed to provide Class Members with legally compliant meal periods or pay meal

period premiums in lieu thereof. For example, Plaintiff alleged that Defendants routinely failed to provide him and other Class Members with meal periods, and when they were provided, they were late, short, or interrupted. Plaintiff's Counsel's expert analyzed Defendants' timekeeping records and found that approximately 63.3% of all meal break violations consisted of short, late, or missed meal periods. Therefore, potential liability for the meal period claim is approximately $408,089.33 (28,884 shifts over 5 hours x $22.32 average hourly rate x 63.3% violation rate). After taking into account the difficulty of certifying and proving meal period claims, as well as Defendants' contention that the claim lacks merit and a 63.3% violation rate is unrealistic, Plaintiff's Counsel discounted this figure based on a 50% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 40% chance of succeeding at trial, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $81,617.87 ($408,089.33 x 50% x 40%).

14. Rest Periods: Plaintiff's rest period claim was based on the allegation that Defendants failed to provide Class Members with legally compliant rest periods or pay rest period premiums in lieu thereof. For example, Plaintiff alleged that Defendants routinely failed to provide him and other Class Members with rest periods due to the demanding workloads that Defendants placed on them. Based on Plaintiff's allegations, Plaintiff's Counsel applied a 100% violation rate to all qualifying shifts during the Class Period. Therefore, Defendants' potential liability for the rest period claim is approximately $650,851.20 (29,160 shifts of 3.5 hours or longer x $22.32 average hourly rate x 100% violation rate). However, Plaintiff's Counsel discounted this figure to account for the difficulty of certifying and proving rest period claims, particularly because rest periods do not have to be recorded (and particularly at a 100% rate), and to account for the possibility of Class Members voluntarily choosing to forego a rest period. Because this claim would have relied exclusively on Class Member testimony, Plaintiff's Counsel discounted this claim based on a 30% chance of succeeding at class certification and a 20% chance of succeeding at trial, yielding a realistic damage estimate of approximately $39,051.07 ($650,851.20 x 30% x 20%).

15. Reimbursements: Plaintiff's reimbursement claim was based on the allegation that Defendants failed to indemnify Class Members for expenses incurred as a direct result of

performing their job duties for Defendant, such as mandatory use of personal cell phones for work purposes. For purposes of calculating Defendants' liability based on a best-case scenario for Plaintiff and the Class, Plaintiff's Counsel estimated that Defendants were liable to each Class Member for $7.50 per workweek in unreimbursed expenses, for a total amount of approximately $45,000.00 for this claim. However, Defendants contended that use of personal cell phones was not required, that any such use was minimal or voluntary, and that Defendants lacked knowledge regarding any unreimbursed expenses allegedly incurred by Class Members. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counsel discounted this claim based on a 30% likelihood of succeeding at class certification and a 30% likelihood of prevailing at trial, yielding a realistic estimated exposure of approximately $4,050.00 ($45,000.00 x 30% x 30%).

16. In sum, Plaintiff's Counsel estimated that Plaintiff's maximum recovery for the off-the-clock claim, meal period violations, and rest period violations (i.e., the wage claims) is approximately $1,259,820.53. However, after factoring in the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at certification and trial, Plaintiff's Counsel estimates that Plaintiff's realistic estimated recovery for the non-penalty claims is approximately $156,859.74.

17. Derivative Penalties: Plaintiff alleged that as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all wages owed, Defendants owed waiting time penalties and wage statement penalties. With respect to Plaintiff's derivative claims for statutory penalties, Plaintiff's Counsel estimated that Defendants' realistic potential liability is approximately $24,365.53. Defendants' maximum potential liability for waiting time penalties is approximately $234,092.16 [(38 employees x $22.32 average hourly rate x 8.00 hours/day x 30 days) + (38 employees x $22.32 average hourly rate x 0.80 hours of overtime/day x 1.5 overtime rate x 30 days)] based on approximately 38 formerly employed Class Members during the 3-year statute of limitations period and an average shift length of 8.80 hours. Defendants' maximum potential liability for inaccurate wage statements is approximately $172,000.00 (43 employees x $4,000 statutory maximum) for inaccurate wage statements based on approximately 43 Class Members who worked during the 1-year statute of limitations period and approximately 1,858 pay periods in that statutory timeframe. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff's Counsel believes that it would be

unrealistic to expect the Court to award the full $406,092.16 in penalties given Defendants' defenses, the contested nature of Plaintiff's claims, the challenges of establishing willfulness as applicable, and the discretionary nature of penalties. Considering that the underlying wage claims are realistically estimated to be approximately $156,859.74, such a disproportionate award would also raise due process concerns. As such, Plaintiff's counsel discounted these figures to account for the risk and uncertainty of obtaining class certification and prevailing at trial, resulting in a realistic evaluation of approximately $14,045.53 for waiting time penalty claims ($234,092.16 x 30% x 20%), and approximately $10,320.00 for wage statement penalty claims ($172,000.00 x 30% x 20%), or approximately $24,365.53 total for statutory penalties.

18. PAGA: For the PAGA claim, Plaintiff's Counsel determined that Defendants' potential exposure could potentially reach $144,100.00, assuming the initial $100 penalty would apply for each of the 1,441 pay periods in the PAGA Period. However, even assuming success on the merits of each claim, PAGA gives the Court discretion to reduce penalties for a variety of reasons, including where to do otherwise would result in an award that is unjust, arbitrary and oppressive, or confiscatory. As such, Plaintiff's counsel discounted this figure to account for the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at trial, resulting in a realistic evaluation of approximately $14,410.00 for PAGA penalties ($144,100.00 x 10%). The settlement allocates $10,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount to PAGA, therefore the PAGA allocation amounts to 5.1% of the Gross Settlement Amount and approximately 69% of the realistic maximum damages for PAGA penalties ($10,000.00 / $14,410.00).

19. Using these estimated figures, Plaintiff predicted that the realistic maximum recovery for all claims, including penalties, would be approximately $195,635.27. This means that the $195,000 settlement figure represents approximately 99.7% of the realistic maximum recovery ($195,000 / $195,635.27). Considering the risk and uncertainty of prevailing at class certification and at trial, this is an excellent result for the Class. Indeed, because of the proposed Settlement, class members will receive timely, guaranteed relief and will avoid the risk of an unfavorable judgment.

Plaintiff's Counsel's Qualifications

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

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

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

23. I graduated from the University of California, Santa Barbara with High Honors in 1991 with Bachelor of Arts degrees in Psychology. I received my Juris Doctor from UCLA Law School in 1996.

24. Upon graduating from law school in 1996, I worked for a boutique law firm practicing general litigation which included employment law matters. Since 2000 (that is, the last 25 years) my practice has been exclusively focused on labor and employment matters including handling wage and hour class, collective and representative actions (including the California Private Attorneys General Act, or "PAGA"), including in the international law firms of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP (where I was a senior associate), Foley & Lardner LLP (where I was a partner and a national Vice Chair of the Labor and Employment Group), Norton Rose Fulbright LLP (where I was a partner) and Seyfarth Shaw LLP (where I was a partner and member of the Wage and Hour Practice Group). During my time at these law firms, I was the primary attorney or took a major leading role in defending employers on numerous wage and hour class, collective and representative actions.

25. In late June 2022 I left Seyfarth Shaw LLP and joined my current firm, Wilshire Law Firm, PLC, to represent plaintiff employees. I have been and am handling many wage and

hour class and representative actions litigating such matters on behalf of plaintiff employees in numerous Superior Courts and District Courts. From matters representing both plaintiffs and defendants, I have successfully mediated the resolution of many wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions. Just since starting to settle cases in late April 2023 I have already successfully mediated matters in which I have been counsel or co-counsel resulting in **well over $275 million** in settlements and verdicts which are in the process of being finalized, and with numerous upcoming mediations scheduled. In those and numerous other matters, I have managed and assisted with the litigation and settlement of many wage and hour PAGA and class actions. In those actions, I performed similar tasks as those performed in the course of prosecuting this action. Indeed, I recently tried and prevailed in achieving a jury verdict in a certified wage and hour class action in the matter of *Aguilar-Flores v. Javier's – CC LLC*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV36438 (settled after verdict).

26. I have received numerous awards for my legal work. For example, from 2015 to 2018, I was listed in Los Angeles Super Lawyers for Employment Litigation (Thomson Reuters). I have also served on numerous prominent boards and in other leadership positions, including serving as Southern California Regional President for the Hispanic National Bar Association and on the board of directors of the Mexican American Bar Foundation. I also previously served on the 5-member Los Angeles Civil Service Commission, which generally oversees the personnel decisions for the City of Los Angeles.

27. I have also published numerous blogs on labor and employment issues including on wage and hour issues. For example, I published "Headline News: Wal-Mart v. Dukes-Impact on Class Action Litigation" (while a partner with Foley & Lardner LLP) and "Are You Really Protected From Wage-and-Hour Successor Liability in an Asset Purchase" (while a partner with Seyfarth Shaw LLP). I have also been a presenter at numerous conferences, including being a presenter involving the "Employment Law Update" at a National Employment Law Council conference.

28. Eugene Zinovyev is a Junior Partner at WLF. He graduated from the University of California Berkeley with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Economy of Industrial Societies, and

received his Juris Doctor from the University of California, San Francisco School of Law in 2009. He has practiced employment and wage and hour law since on both the plaintiff and defense sides. Mr. Zinovyev has tried multiple jury cases to verdict as well as numerous bench trials. He has also briefed published appellate court decisions in both state and federal court. Mr. Zinovyev is admitted to practice before all Federal District Courts in California as well as the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. He is also a member of the California Employment Lawyers Association. He has mediated and settled dozens of class and representative actions as well as individual civil matters.

29. John Brown is an Associate Attorney at WLF. He was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2004. Mr. Brown graduated from UC Berkeley with a Bachelor of Arts and received his Juris Doctor from UCLA School of Law. His current practice has been focused on class action employment law. Mr. Brown has participated in dozens of settlements totaling tens of millions of dollars, from the memorandum of understanding and settlement agreement drafting stage through to final approvals from the court.

30. Gabriella Solé is an Associate Attorney at Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. She was admitted to practice law in the State of California in 2022. Ms. Solé graduated from University of California, Los Angeles with a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology. She received her Juris Doctor from University of San Francisco, School of Law. During law school, she was a First Year Moot Court Director on the Moot Court Board. Since graduating, her practice has been mainly focused on wage and hour class action litigation.

31. Lucy H. Nguyen, is an attorney licensed to practice before all courts in the State of California and is employed as an attorney with Wilshire Law Firm, PLC. Ms. Nguyen earned her law degree in 2021 from John F. Kennedy School of Law, after previously obtaining a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from San Francisco State University. Prior to practicing employment law, Ms. Nguyen practiced family law, where she developed substantial litigation, negotiation, client counseling, and case management experience that she has since applied to complex wage-and-hour class and representative actions. Ms. Nguyen has successfully served as counsel in numerous wage-and-hour class and representative actions that resulted in court-approved settlements on behalf of California employees. Through her work on this matter,

including her review of the pleadings, informal discovery, payroll and timekeeping data, mediation materials, and applicable law, Ms. Nguyen became familiar with the facts and legal issues involved in this action and the risks associated with continued litigation. Based on her investigation and analysis, Ms. Nguyen believes the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the Parties' respective positions and the risks and expense of continued litigation.

Conflicts

32. WLF has no actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members or the proposed Administrator, Apex Class Action Administration.

33. WLF is not aware of any pending matter or action against Defendants that may be extinguished or adversely affected by this Settlement.

34. I am not aware of any class, representative or other collective action in any other court in this or any other jurisdiction that asserts claims similar to those asserted in this action on behalf of a class or group of individuals some or all of whom would also be members of the class defined in this action. My office made a reasonable inquiry to be made of other members of WLF to determine whether those individuals are aware of any such similar actions.

Selection of Proposed Administrator

35. WLF sought bids from three (3) administrators to administer this Settlement. The Parties selected the administrator with the lowest bid, Apex Class Action Administration.

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

Executed on July 16, 2026 at Los Angeles, California.

John Yslas

John G. Yslas

EXHIBIT 1

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

Bobby Saadian, Esq. JD/MBA

Sean Paisan, Esq.
H. Gavin Long, Esq.
Colin M. Jones, Esq.
Justin F. Marquez, Esq.
John Yslas, Esq.
Jennifer Burkes, Esq.
Tae Kim, Esq.
Jon Teller, Esq.
Daniel DeSantis, Esq.
Mary Caruso, Esq.
Nicol E. Hajjar, Esq.
Thiago M. Coelho, Esq.
Fawn Bekam, Esq.

Benjamin Haber, Esq.
Arsiné Grigoryan, Esq.
Arrash T. Fattahi, Esq.
Daniel Kramer, Esq.
Dorota James, Esq.
Chase Stern, Esq.
Maxim Gorbunov, Esq.
Bradford Smith, Esq.
Arman A. Salehi, Esq.

October 18, 2024

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

Headwater Companies, LLC
1150 E. Lincoln St.
Banning, CA 92220
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 47

Franklin Electric Co., Inc.
9255 Coverdale Road
Fort Wayne, IN 46809
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 23

Headwater Companies, LLC
5265 S. Rio Grande Street, Suite A
Littleton, CO 82120
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2694 65

CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent of Service for Process for
Franklin Electric Co., Inc.
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 30

Corporation Service Company
Agent for Service of Process for
Headwater Companies, LLC
135 North Pennsylvania Street, Suite 1610
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2694 72

Re: ***Samuel Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc., et al.***
Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Samuel Sanchez ("Plaintiff") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employers, Franklin Electric Co., Inc. and Headwater Companies, LLC (collectively as "Defendants"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendants' Aggrieved Employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue this action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of all other persons who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

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

Plaintiff's Employment with Defendants

Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Riverside County. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Plaintiff is a resident of California who worked for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 2022 to approximately June 2024. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff mostly worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

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

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

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

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

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

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock", uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to . Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

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

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

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

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

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

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

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

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

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

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

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

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

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

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

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

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

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

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

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

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, costs related to personal cell phone usage and work attire. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

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

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

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

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain

accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;

6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

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

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

Sincerely,

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

Justin F. Marquez, Esq.

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 WILSHIRE BLVD. 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE CERTIFIED MAIL®

9489 0090 0027 6620 2694 72

Label 890-PB, Oct. 2015
Pitney Bowes

Corporation Service Company
Agent for Service of Process for
Headwater Companies, LLC
135 North Pennsylvania Street, Suite 1610
Indianapolis, IN 46204

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 WILSHIRE BLVD. 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE® CERTIFIED MAIL®

9489 0090 0027 6620 2694 65

Label 890-PB, Oct. 2015
Pitney Bowes

Headwater Companies, LLC
5265 S. Rio Grande Street, Suite A
Littleton, CO 82120

255203

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 WILSHIRE BLVD. 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE® CERTIFIED MAIL®

9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 47

Label 890-PB, Oct. 2015
Pitney Bowes

Headwater Companies, LLC
1150 E. Lincoln St.
Banning, CA 92220

255203

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 WILSHIRE BLVD. 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®
CERTIFIED MAIL®

9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 30

Label 890-PB, Oct. 2015
Pitney Bowes

CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent of Service for Process for
Franklin Electric Co., Inc.
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

355203

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 WILSHIRE BLVD. 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE

CERTIFIED MAIL®

9489 0090 0027 6620 2698 23

Label 890-PB, Oct. 2015
Pitney Bowes

Franklin Electric Co., Inc.
9255 Coverdale Road
Fort Wayne, IN 46809

EXHIBIT 2

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawifrm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
Eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
John.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Emily Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

Attorneys for Plaintiff

JOHN F. KUENSTLER (SBN 312983)
john.kuenstler@btlaw.com
CAROLINE C. DICKEY (SBN 301721)
caroline.dickey@btlaw.com
LUCY M. BERTINO (SBN 325254)
lucy.bertino@btlaw.com
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 300
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 284-3880
Facsimile: (310) 284-3894

Attorneys for Defendants

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

SAMUEL SANCHEZ, an individual, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FRANKLIN ELECTRIC CO., INC., a corporation; HEADWATER COMPANIES, LLC, a limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CVRI2405393

[Assigned for all purposes to Harold W. Hopp, Dept. 1]

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between Plaintiff Samuel Sanchez ("Plaintiff") and Defendants Franklin Electric Co., Inc. ("Franklin") and Headwater Companies, LLC ("Headwater") (together, "Defendants"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendants collectively as "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. **DEFINITIONS.**

1.1 "Action" means Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging class and representative action wage and hour violations against Defendants captioned *Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.*, Case No. CVRI2405393, filed on September 25, 2024, in Los Angeles County Superior Court.

1.2 "Administrator" means Apex Class Action Administration, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

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

1.4 "Aggrieved Employees" means all persons who worked for Headwater in California as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees at any time during the PAGA Period.

1.5 "Class" means all persons who worked for Headwater in California as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees at any time during the Class Period.

1.6 "Class Counsel" means John G. Yslas, Eugene Zinovyev, John Brown, Emily Borman, Lisa B. Iturriaga, and Gabriella Solé of Wilshire Law Firm, PLC.

1.7 "Class Counsel Fees Payment" means an award of attorneys' fees granted to Class Counsel and paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Parties have agreed Plaintiff will request approval from the Court of up to one-third (1/3) of the GSA (currently $65,000.00 [sixty-five thousand dollars and zero cents]).

1.8 "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" means the amount allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable expenses and costs incurred to prosecute the Action, not to exceed $15,000.00 (fifteen thousand dollars and zero cents) and paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

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

1.10 "Class Member" or "Settlement Class Member" means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non-Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee).

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

1.12 "Class Notice" means the Court approved Notice of Settlement and hearing date for Final Approval, to be mailed to Class Members in English with a Spanish translation in the form, without material variation, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.13 "Class Period" or "Class Settlement Period" means the period from September 25, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval ("Settlement Class Period").

1.14 "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff Samuel Sanchez in the Action.

1.15 "Class Representative Service Payment" or "Enhancement Award" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action.

1.16 "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside.

1.17 "Defendants" means named Defendants Franklin Electric Co., Inc. and Headwater Companies, LLC.

1.18 "Defense Counsel" means Lucy M. Bertino, Caroline C. Dickey, and John F. Kuenstler of BARNES & THORNBURG LLP.

1.19 "Effective Date" means the date by which both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no

Participating Class Member objects to the Settlement, the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members objects to the Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or (c) if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

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

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

1.22 “Final Judgment” means the Judgment entered by the Court upon granting Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.23 “Gross Settlement Amount” or “GSA” means one hundred ninety-five thousand dollars and zero cents ($195,000.00), which is the total amount Defendants agree to pay under the Settlement, except as provided in Paragraph 8 below.

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

1.25 “Individual PAGA Payment” means the Aggrieved Employee’s pro rata share of 35% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked during the PAGA Period.

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

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

1.28 “LWDA PAGA Payment” means the 65% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

1.29 “Net Settlement Amount” means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: PAGA Penalties payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Costs Payment. The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

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

1.31 “Operative Complaint” means the operative First Amended Class Action Complaint filed on June 5, 2025 in the Action.

1.32 “PAGA Pay Period” means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Headwater for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.33 “PAGA Period” means the period from October 18, 2023, through the date of preliminary approval.

1.34 “PAGA” means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).

1.35 “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiff’s October 18, 2024 letter to the LWDA and Defendants providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).

1.36 “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of $10,000.00 in PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 35% ($3,500.00) to the Aggrieved Employees and 65% ($6,500.00) to the LWDA in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.37 “Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.

1.38 “Plaintiff” means Samuel Sanchez, the named plaintiff in the Action.

1.39 “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.40 “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.2 below.

1.41 “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

1.42 “Released Parties” means Defendants, as well as any parent, subsidiary, or affiliated entity, and each of their former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, members, attorneys, representatives, insurers, predecessors, successors, and assigns.

1.43 “Request for Exclusion” means a Class Member’s submission of a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.

1.44 "Response Deadline" means forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, email, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax, email, or mail his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Notice packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional fourteen (14) calendar days beyond when the Response Deadline has expired.

1.45 “Settlement” means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.46 “Workweek” means any week during which a Class Member worked for Headwater for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. **RECITALS.**

2.1 On September 25, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Class Action Complaint alleging causes of action against Defendants for (1) Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods; (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements; (7) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures; and (8) Unfair Business Practices.

2.2 On October 18, 2024, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiff gave notice to the LWDA and Defendants that Plaintiff intended to proceed with a representative action under PAGA (LWDA- CM-1057104-24). On June 5, 2025, after the 65-day statutory period passed, Plaintiff filed the Operative Complaint, adding an additional claim for penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*.

2.3 Defendants deny the allegations in the Action, deny any failure to comply with the laws identified in the Action, and deny any and all liability for the causes of action alleged in the Action.

2.4 On September 29, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by mediator Katherine J. Edwards. The Parties reached a settlement and agreed on general settlement terms. The Parties memorialized their agreement in a Memorandum of Understanding on November 18, 2025.

2.5 In advance of mediation, Class Counsel conducted a thorough investigation into the facts of, and applicable law to, the Action. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained and analyzed time and payroll data for Class Members and the necessary policy documents through informal discovery to properly evaluate the strengths and weakness of the claims and engage in meaningful settlement discussions. Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 (1996) and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 (2008) ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.6 The Court has not granted class certification because the Parties engaged in mediation before any class certification.

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

3. **MONETARY TERMS.**

3.1 Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 8 below, Defendants will pay one hundred ninety-five thousand dollars and zero cents ($195,000.00) to fully settle, resolve, and extinguish all claims asserted in the Action, including without limitation all claims asserted in the PAGA Notice. The Gross Settlement Amount is non-reversionary and does not include employer payroll taxes owed on the wage portions of the Individual Class Payments, which Defendants will pay separately.

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

3.2.1 To Plaintiff: A payment for the Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff of not more than $10,000.00 (ten thousand dollars and zero cents) in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member. Defendants will not oppose Plaintiff's request for a Class Representative Service Payment that does not exceed this amount. As part of the motion for the

Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments, Plaintiff will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payment no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Court. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating Class Members. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.

3.2.2 To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be sixty-five thousand dollars and zero cents ($65,000.00) and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment for actual costs, not to exceed $15,000.00 (fifteen thousand dollars with zero cents). Defendants will not oppose requests for these payments. Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payment no later than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered by the Court. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's counsel arising from any claim to any portion of Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendants harmless, and indemnifies Defendants, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these Payments.

3.2.3 To the Administrator: An Administrator Costs Payment not to exceed $4,490.00 (four thousand four hundred ninety dollars with zero cents) except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Costs are less or the Court approves payment of less than $4,490.00 (four thousand four hundred ninety dollars with zero cents) the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to Participating Class Members.

3.2.4 To Each Participating Class Member: An Individual Class Payment is calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each individual Participating Class Member's Workweeks.

3.2.4.1 Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. Fifty percent (50%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to the Settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portion is subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to the settlement of claims for interest, reimbursement, and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

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

3.2.5 To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of ten thousand dollars and zero cents ($10,000.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 65% ($6,500.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 35% ($3,500.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1 The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 35% share of PAGA Penalties of $3,500.00 by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period, and (b) multiplying the result by each individual Aggrieved Employee's PAGA

Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

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

4. **SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.**

4.1 Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on a review of their records, Defendants represent that as of the time of mediation, there were approximately 60 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 6,000 workweeks during the Class Period.

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

4.3 Funding of Gross Settlement Amount. Defendants shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount and the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendants' share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date.

4.4 Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Within ten (10) days after Defendants fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration

Costs Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment. Disbursement of the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment shall not precede disbursement of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments.

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

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

4.4.3 For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and canceled after the Void Date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of

California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).

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

5. **<u>RELEASES OF CLAIMS</u>**. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff, Class Members, and Class Counsel will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1 <u>Plaintiff's Release</u>. Plaintiff discharges Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences, that occurred during the Class Period, including all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained in the Operative Complaint; and claims under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the California Labor Code, and all equivalent claims under federal law ("Plaintiff's Release"). Plaintiff's Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them. Plaintiff does not release any claims in Riverside Superior Court, Case No. CVRI2501247, by virtue of signing this Agreement.

5.1.1 <u>Plaintiff's Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code Section 1542</u>. For purposes of Plaintiff's Release, Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

> A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release,

and that if known by him or her would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or Released Party.

5.2 Released Class Claims: All Participating Class Members will release all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, alleged or which could have reasonably been alleged based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint, including but not limited to: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1); (2) failure to pay overtime wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198); (3) failure to provide meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512); (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7); (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 201-203); (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226); (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 2802); and (8) unfair business practices (pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*). The enumeration of these specific claims shall neither enlarge nor narrow the scope of *res judicata* based on the claims that were asserted in the Action or could have been asserted in the Action based on the facts and circumstances alleged in the Complaint. The Released Class Claims are those that accrued during the Class Period.

5.3 Released PAGA Claims: All Aggrieved Employees will release all claims for PAGA civil penalties that are alleged or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint and in Plaintiff's October 18, 2024 PAGA Notice, including but not limited to: (1) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 510, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1197.1); (2) failure to pay overtime wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198); (3) failure to provide meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 210, 226.7 and 512); (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 210 and 226.7); (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 213(d)); (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3); (7) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 2802); (8) failure to produce requested employment records (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 432, and 1198.5); (9) failure to pay all earned wages twice per month and unlawfully withholding accrued wages (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 204, 210 and 216); (10) failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 1174, and 1174.5); (11) recordkeeping requirement violations (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.6, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1198 and 1199); (12) willful misclassification (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 226.8); (13) retaliation (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5); and (14) civil penalties for wage and hour violations (pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 558). The Released PAGA Claims are those that accrued during the PAGA Period.

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

6.1 Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk*/*Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from Plaintiff confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members, and/or the Administrator; (v) a signed declaration from Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(2)); and (vi) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, and/or the Administrator. In their Declarations, Plaintiff and Class Counsel shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.2 Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel will obtain a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval, file the Motion for Preliminary

Approval no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing, unless otherwise ordered by the Court, and deliver the Court's Preliminary Approval Order to the Administrator.

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

7. **SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.**

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

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

7.3 Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1 for the funding of the GSA. Any interest that accrues on the GSA sums paid into the QSF prior to distribution by the Administrator will become part of the NSA for distribution to Participating Class Members.

7.4 Notice to Class Members.

7.4.1 No later than five (5) calendar days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, Aggrieved Employees, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

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

7.4.3 Not later than five (5) calendar days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

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

7.4.5 If the Administrator, Defendant, or Class Counsel is contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class

Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than fourteen (14) days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, whichever are later.

7.5 Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

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

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

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

7.5.4 Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the Released PAGA Claims identified in Paragraph 5.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6 Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks. Each Class Member shall have forty-five (45) days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional fourteen (14) days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination of the challenges.

7.7 Objections to Settlement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. **CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES and ESCALATOR CLAUSE.** The GSA was calculated based on the estimate that 60 Class Members worked a total of 6,000 workweeks during the Class Period. If the total number of workweeks increases by more than 15% (i.e. an increase of more than 900 workweeks), then the GSA will be increased proportionally by the number of workweeks worked in excess of 15%. For example, if the final number of total workweeks increases by 16% over 6,000 workweeks, the GSA will increase by 1%. Alternatively, Defendants, at their election,

may choose to cut off the end date for the Class Period and PAGA Period as of the date on which the number of workweeks reaches 6,900. If this provision is triggered, the Parties agree that the portion of the GSA allocated to attorneys' fees will increase proportionally such that the total amount of attorneys' fees remains one-third (1/3) of the GSA after the upward adjustment required by this provision is implemented.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. **ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To Plaintiff:

John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawifrm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
Eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
John.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Emily Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

To Defendant:

JOHN F. KUENSTLER (SBN 312983)
john.kuenstler@btlaw.com
CAROLINE C. DICKEY (SBN 301721)
caroline.dickey@btlaw.com
LUCY M. BERTINO (SBN 325254)
lucy.bertino@btlaw.com
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
2029 Century Park East, Suite 300
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 284-3880
Facsimile: (310) 284-3894

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

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

11.19 Binding Agreement. The Parties intend that this Agreement shall be fully enforceable and binding upon all Parties within the provisions of Cal. Civil Proc. § 664.6, and that it shall be admissible and subject to disclosure in any proceeding to enforce its terms pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §§ 1122(a)(1) and 1123(b), notwithstanding the confidentiality provisions that otherwise might apply under federal or state law. The Parties further agree and intend that the Riverside County Superior Court may enforce this Agreement pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

IT IS SO AGREED.

By the Parties:

DATED: 2/2/2026

Signed by:
7BBCFE6BDAA0410...

Plaintiff Samuel Sanchez

DATED: February 9, 2026

Defendant Franklin Electric Co., Inc.

By: Catherine Collins
Position: Vice President and Deputy General Counsel

DATED: February 4, 2026

Defendant Headwater Companies, LLC.

By: Kyle Lunzer
Position: Chief Financial Officer, Treasurer

Approved by counsel:

DATED: February 3, 2026

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

BY:
John G. Yslas
Eugene Zinovyev

John Brown
Emily Borman
Lisa B. Iturriaga
Gabriella Solé

Counsel for Plaintiff

DATED: 2-9-26

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

BY: Caroline Dickey

John F. Kuenstler
Caroline C. Dickey
Lucy M. Bertino

Counsel for Defendants

EXHIBIT A

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

Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.
Case No. CVRI2405393 (Riverside County Superior Court)

The Riverside County Superior Court authorized this notice.
It is not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer.
Please read it carefully! You are not being sued.

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class and a representative action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendants Franklin Electric Co., Inc. ("Franklin" and Headwater Companies, LLC ("Headwater") (together, "Defendants") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by former employee, Samuel Sanchez, and seeks payment of back wages and other relief for a class of all persons currently or formerly employed by Headwater as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees in the State of California ("Class Members") who worked for Headwater during the Class Period (September 25, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval); and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") for all Class Members who worked for Headwater during the PAGA Period (October 18, 2023, through the date of preliminary approval) ("Aggrieved Employees").

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay PAGA Penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA").

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

The above estimates are based on Defendants' records showing that **you worked ______ Workweeks during the Class Period and you worked ______ Pay Periods during the PAGA Period**. If you believe that you worked more during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or do not act. READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY. You will be deemed to have read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendants to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendants.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
DO NOTHING	Receive money. Give up rights to sue Defendants for claims released in the Settlement.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF	Receive no money from the Class settlement. You will retain the right to pursue your own legal claims against Defendants. However, even if you exclude yourself from the Class settlement, you will still receive a portion of the PAGA settlement and be bound by it if you worked during the PAGA Period.
OBJECT	Write to the Court about why you object to the Settlement. If the Settlement receives Final Approval, you will receive money and give up rights to sue Defendants for claims released in the Settlement.
CHALLENGE YOUR NUMBER OF WORKWEEKS AND/OR PAY PERIODS	Challenge your number of Workweeks or Pay Periods listed in this Notice and provide supporting evidence. If you challenge your workweeks or pay periods, you will still be part of the Settlement and will give up rights to sue Defendants for claims released in the Settlement.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. WHY AM I RECEIVING THIS NOTICE?

Defendants' records indicate that you worked for Headwater at some point(s) between September 25, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval, and are therefore a member of the Class for purposes of this Settlement.

You received this Notice because you have a right to know about a proposed Settlement of the Action, and about all of your options, before the Court decides whether to finally approve the Settlement. The Settlement will resolve all Class Members' claims, which are described below, during the Class Period. The Settlement will also resolve claims for civil penalties brought under the California Private Attorneys' General Act ("PAGA"). If you are a Class Member, you are also an "Aggrieved Employee" if you worked for Headwater during the "PAGA Period," which is October 18, 2023, through the date of preliminary approval.

If the Court grants Final Approval to the Settlement, a settlement Administrator appointed by the Court will issue the payments provided for by the Settlement to Class Members. You are encouraged to always keep your address up to date with the Administrator (the Administrator's contact information can be found in Section 12, below).

This Notice package explains the allegations and background regarding the lawsuit, the Settlement, your legal rights, what benefits are available, who is eligible for them, and how to receive those benefits.

The Court in charge of the Action is the Riverside County Superior Court, and the case is titled, *Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.*, Case No. CVRI2405393. The person who sued, Samuel Sanchez, is the Plaintiff, and the companies sued, Franklin Electric Co., Inc. and Headwater Companies, LLC, are the Defendants.

2. WHAT IS THE LAWSUIT ABOUT?

The Plaintiff in the lawsuit alleges wage and hour violations against Defendants for: (1) Failure to Pay Minimum and Straight Time Wages; (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages; (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods; (4) Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods; (5) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements; (7) Failure to Indemnify Employees for Expenditures; and (8) Unfair Business Practices. In addition, Plaintiff is seeking to recover civil penalties pursuant to PAGA ("PAGA Penalties") based on the alleged violations of the California Labor Code listed above. Defendants deny Plaintiff's claims and deny any wrongdoing.

3. WHY IS THIS A CLASS ACTION?

In an employment class action, one or more people called "Class Representatives" (in this case, the Plaintiff) sue on behalf of all workers who they contend have similar claims. All of these workers are a Class or Class Members. Bringing one lawsuit, as opposed to many small ones, saves money, time and court resources. The court resolves the issues for all Class Members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class.

4. WHY IS THERE A SETTLEMENT?

The Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiff or Defendants on the merits of the claims alleged in the lawsuit. Plaintiff believes Plaintiff would win at trial. Defendants think that Plaintiff's lawsuit would not proceed to a trial and/or that Plaintiff would not win at trial. However, there has been no trial. Instead, in acknowledgement of the risk that all Parties face should the case proceed, the Parties have agreed to a negotiated settlement. This way, all Parties avoid the cost of preparing for and conducting a trial, the risk of losing the right to a trial, and the workers affected by the alleged violations receive compensation. The Settlement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. The Plaintiff, as well as Plaintiff's lawyers (called "Class Counsel"), believes the Settlement is fair and reasonable and in the best interests of all Class Members.

WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

If you received this Notice, you are a Class Member for settlement purposes. The Class includes: All employees of Headwater who were classified as non-exempt and worked within the State of California at any time from September 25, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval.

6. ARE THERE EXCEPTIONS TO BEING INCLUDED?

You are not a Class Member if you already have resolved the claims asserted in this lawsuit, whether by settlement or a separate legal proceeding (i.e., another lawsuit).

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS—WHAT YOU GET

7. WHAT DOES THE SETTLEMENT PROVIDE?

Defendants have agreed to pay a Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") of $195,000.00 (one hundred ninety-five thousand dollars and zero cents) to settle the lawsuit. From the GSA, Class Counsel will apply to the Court for attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the GSA, currently $65,000.00 and up to $15,000.00 in costs; a Class Representative Service Payment of $10,000.00 to Plaintiff (for Plaintiff's work and efforts prosecuting this case); a PAGA Penalties payment of $10,000.00 to resolve the PAGA claims; and Settlement Administration Costs to Apex Class Action Administration not to exceed $4,490 (four thousand four hundred ninety dollars and zero cents). The exact amount of the Class Counsel's Fees and Litigation Expenses, Class Representative Service Payment, and Administration Costs will be determined by the Court at the Final Approval hearing. The remaining portion of the Settlement amount, the "Net Settlement Amount" or the "NSA," is currently estimated to be approximately $XXXXXXX. The NSA will be apportioned and paid out as Individual Class Payments to the Settlement Class Members, who are the Class Members that do not request to be excluded ("opt out") of the Settlement.

PAGA Penalties payment: As part of the PAGA portion of the Settlement, the Parties will ask the Court to approve a $10,000.00 PAGA Penalties payment in settlement of claims for civil penalties under PAGA. As required under PAGA, 65% of the PAGA Penalties payment, or $6,500.00, will be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency. The remaining 35% of the PAGA Penalties payment, or $3,500.00, will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as Individual PAGA Payments.

8. HOW MUCH WILL MY PAYMENT BE?

An approximation of your Individual Class Payment appears on the first page of this Notice. If you are also an Aggrieved Employee, an approximation of your Individual PAGA Payment will also appear on the first page of this Notice.

Individual Class Payment: Your Individual Class Payment is based on the number of Workweeks you worked, as represented in Defendants' records, in comparison to the total number of Workweeks worked by all Class Members during the Class Period (September 25, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval). Fifty percent (50%) of each Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be treated as a payment in settlement of the alleged claims for penalties and interest and will be reported on a Form 1099 by the Settlement Administrator, and fifty percent (50%) of each Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be treated as a payment in settlement of alleged claims for unpaid wages. The 50% allocated as unpaid wages will be reduced by applicable payroll tax withholdings and deductions and reported on a Form W-2.

Individual PAGA Payment: If you worked for Headwater from October 18, 2023, through the date of preliminary approval ("PAGA Period"), you are also an "Aggrieved Employee" and will receive an Individual PAGA Payment in addition to your Individual Class Payment. The Individual PAGA Payments are based on the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee in comparison to the total amount of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period. One hundred percent (100%) of each Aggrieved Employees' Individual PAGA Payment will be characterized as penalties and will not be reduced by payroll tax withholdings and deductions. The Individual PAGA Payment will be reported on a Form 1099 by the Settlement Administrator. An approximation of your anticipated Individual PAGA Payment appears on the first page of this Notice.

For the Class Members who are also Aggrieved Employees, their Individual Class Payment will be combined with their Individual PAGA Payment, and they will receive a single check for the combined payments. If a Class Member chooses to opt-out of the Settlement, they will still receive an Individual PAGA Payment if they are entitled to one, as Aggrieved Employees cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement under California law.

HOW YOU GET A PAYMENT

9. HOW DO I RECEIVE A PAYMENT?

You do not need to do anything to receive a payment. However, if you believe that the number of Workweeks or PAGA Pay Periods you worked is incorrect, please correct it and provide any supporting evidence to the settlement Administrator, whose contact information is listed in Section 12 below.

10. WHEN WOULD I GET MY PAYMENT?

The Court will hold a Final Fairness Hearing on ____________, to decide whether to approve the Settlement. If the Judge approves the Settlement, and anyone objects, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain when these objections and appeals can be resolved and resolving them can take time. If there is no objection, the Effective Date of the Settlement will be the date of entry of the Court's Order granting final approval.

Following the Effective Date, Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will be mailed to Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees approximately 30 days after the Court's approval of the Settlement becomes final so long as there are no appeals.

Settlement checks should be cashed promptly upon receipt. Proceeds of checks which remain uncashed after 180 days from the date of issuance will be forwarded to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b). If your settlement check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Settlement Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

For an update on the status of payments, please contact the Settlement Administrator (see Section 12).

11. WHAT AM I GIVING UP TO GET A PAYMENT?

If the Court approves this Settlement and unless you exclude yourself, you will become a Participating Class Member, and that means that you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants concerning the legal claims being resolved in this Settlement. Specifically, you will be giving up or "releasing" the Released Class Claims described below against Defendants, as well as any parent, subsidiary, or affiliated entity, and each of their former and present directors, officers, shareholders, owners, members, attorneys, representatives, insurers, predecessors, successors, and assigns ("Released Parties"). The releases become effective once the GSA is fully funded by Defendants.

<u>Released Class Claims:</u> The "Released Class Claims" are all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, in law or in equity, arising at any time during the Class Period for the claims brought by Plaintiff in the Operative Class Complaint, or that could have been brought by Plaintiff against Defendants in the Operative Class Complaint based on the facts alleged therein.

<u>Released PAGA Claims:</u> If you are an Aggrieved Employee (i.e. if you worked for Headwater during the PAGA Period), you will also release all claims for civil penalties that were alleged or could have been alleged in the Operative PAGA Complaint and the PAGA Notice based on the facts alleged therein during the PAGA Period.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLMENT

12. HOW DO I EXCLUDE MYSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must send the Settlement Administrator a written and signed request for exclusion which must be postmarked no later than 45 days after Class Notice is Mailed. Be sure to include your name, address, and telephone number, and any other information you think would be helpful to the settlement Administrator to identify you. You can send your request for exclusion to the settlement Administrator at:

Apex Class Action Administration
Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

If you ask to be excluded from the Settlement, you will not be legally bound by anything that happens in the Action, except as it relates to settlement of the PAGA claim. If you ask to be excluded from the Settlement you will not be able to object to the Settlement and you will not receive an Individual Class Payment, but you will still receive an Individual PAGA Payment if you worked for Headwater during the PAGA Period (October 18, 2023, through the date of preliminary approval). If you ask to be excluded, you may be able to sue (or continue to sue) Defendants in the future.

13. IF I DON'T EXCLUDE MYSELF, CAN I SUE DEFENDANTS FOR THE SAME THING LATER?

No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue Defendants for the claims that this Settlement resolves. If you have a pending lawsuit, speak to your lawyer in that case immediately. You must exclude yourself from this Class to continue your own lawsuit. Remember, the exclusion deadline is 45 days after Class Notice is Mailed.

14. IF I EXCLUDE MYSELF, CAN I GET MONEY FROM THIS SETTLMENT?

No. If you exclude yourself, you will not receive any money from this Settlement. However, if you timely exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will retain the right to pursue your own legal action against Defendants, if you desire.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU IN THIS LAWSUIT

15. DO I HAVE A LAWYER IN THIS CASE?

The Court has determined that Wilshire Law Firm is qualified to represent you and the Class Members in the lawsuit. These lawyers are called Class Counsel and their contact information is listed below. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

John G. Yslas
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
Eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
John Brown (SBN 233605)
John.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
Emily Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
Lisa B. Iturriaga (SBN 339678)
lisa.iturriaga@wilshirelawfirm.com
Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
WILSHIRE LAW FIRM
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

16. HOW WILL THE LAWYERS BE PAID?

Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve up to 1/3rd of the GSA (currently $65,000.00) for attorneys' fees incurred in investigating the facts, litigating the case, and negotiating the Settlement. Class Counsel will also seek Court-approval of up to $15,000.00 in litigation expenses incurred in this matter. The Court may award Class Counsel less than what they request. Class Counsel will also ask the Court to approve payment to Plaintiff Samuel Sanchez in the amount of $10,000.00 in addition to Plaintiff's Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment for the initiative, risk, and time and energy Plaintiff has spent in service to the Class as the Class Representative. The Court may award the Class Representative less than what is requested.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

You can and have the right to tell the Court you do not agree with the Settlement or some part of it.

17. HOW DO I TELL THE COURT THAT I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

If you don't think the Settlement is fair, you can object to some or all of the Settlement. You can either object to the Settlement in person at the Final Approval Hearing or you can submit a written objection. Written objections and notices of intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked on or before ____________, at the following address:

Apex Class Action Administration

Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

The written objection should state your name and address and describe all legal and factual reasons that you object to the terms of the Settlement. You should also include or attach any documents upon which your objection is based. If the Court overrules the objection at the Final Approval hearing, the Settlement Agreement will be approved, and you will receive your payment. If you do not submit a written objection, you may still appear at the Final Approval hearing to voice your objection or to otherwise observe the proceedings.

18. WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN OBJECTING AND REQUESTING EXCLUSION?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you do not agree with something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Class.

Requesting exclusion is telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you, and you do not get any money from this Settlement. If you submit both an objection and a request to be excluded from the settlement, the request to be excluded will control and you will not get any money from this settlement.

THE COURT'S FAIRNESS HEARING

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to decide whether to approve the Settlement. You may attend and you may ask to speak, but you don't have to.

19. WHEN AND WHERE WILL THE COURT DECIDE WHETHER TO APPROVE THE SETTLEMENT?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at _______ on ______________ in Department 1 of the Riverside County Superior Court located at 4050 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92501 to determine whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. If there are objections, the Court will consider them at that time. The Court will also be asked to approve the requests for the Class Representative Service Payment and the Class Counsel Fees and Litigation Expenses Payments.

20. DO I HAVE TO COME TO THE HEARING?

No. Class Counsel will answer questions the Court may have. However, you are welcome to attend. If you send an objection, you do not have to come to the Court to talk about it. As long as you mailed your written objection to the settlement administrator on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay your own lawyer to attend, but it is not necessary.

IF YOU DO NOTHING

21. WHAT IF I DO NOTHING AT ALL?

If you do nothing, you will receive a Settlement payment, and you will be bound by the terms of Settlement, which means that you will not be able to start a lawsuit, continue a lawsuit, or be a part of any other lawsuit against Defendants about the legal issues in the Action.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

22. HOW DO I GET MORE INFORMATION?

You may contact Class Counsel at the contact information listed above in Section 15 if you have any questions about the Settlement. You may also contact the Court-appointed Settlement Administrator, Apex Class Action Administration, by calling toll free 1-800____________, or you can write to the Administrator at the following address:

Apex Class Action Administration
Sanchez v. Franklin Electric Co., Inc. et al.
XXXXX
City, State, XXXXX
Email:

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE CLAIM PROCESS. YOU MAY, HOWEVER, CALL CLASS COUNSEL OR THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR, LISTED ABOVE.

EXHIBIT 3

Outlook

Thank you for your Proposed Settlement Submission

From no-reply@formassembly.com <no-reply@formassembly.com>
Date Tue 6/2/2026 4:24 PM
To Letty Zepeda <letty.zepeda@wilshirelawfirm.com>

06/02/2026 04:24:42 PM

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

Item submitted: Proposed Settlement

On 06/02/2026 04:24:42 PM your Proposed Settlement was successfully processed for case number LWDA-CM-1057104-24

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: https://nam12.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Flabor.ca.gov%2FPrivate_Attorneys_General_Act.htm&data=05%7C02%7Cletty.zepeda%40wilshirelawfirm.com%7Caef2e47da1f3464070a408dec0fe2716%7C9ada260a4f194da187b814d372333753%7C1%7C0%7C639160394973605472%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=FhyyJpBvRlhTGW%2Bv7e0qYRO693ZERfhkAdaWdU4N%2FUI%3D&reserved=0