BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.
Keaton Mendoza (SBN 321172)
kmendoza@tomorrowlaw.com
1460 Westwood Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, FREDDY JOHNSON, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated and aggrieved

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN

FREDDY JOHNSON, an individual, and on behalf of all others similarly situated and aggrieved,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE ASC CHARITABLE FOUNDATION, a California Nonprofit Corporation doing business as ANNE SIPPI CLINICS; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: BCV-25-100487

[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Thomas S. Clark, Dept. 17]

DECLARATION OF KEATON D. MENDOZA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT AND PROVISIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY

HEARING INFORMATION:

DATE: December 15, 2026
TIME: 8:30 a.m.
DEPT: 17

DECLARATION OF KEATON MENDOZA

1. I am an attorney at law, duly licensed to practice before all the Courts of the State of California and I am an attorney at Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., counsel for plaintiff Freddy Johnson ("Plaintiff"), and all others similarly situated. As such, I am familiar with the file in this matter and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following facts of my own personal knowledge.

2. On or around December 11, 2024, Plaintiff filed with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and served on defendant The ASC Charitable Foundation ("ASCCF") a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (the "PAGA Notice"), stating Plaintiff intended to serve as a proxy of the LWDA to recover civil penalties on behalf of other non-exempt, hourly paid employees for alleged Labor Code violations ("PAGA Notice"). A true and correct copy of the PAGA Notice is attached as Exhibit "2."

3. On or around February 10, 2025, Plaintiff commenced this action by filing a class action complaint against ASCCF in the Superior Court of California, County of Kern, Case No. BCV-25-100487, for: (1) failure to pay overtime wages; (2) failure to pay minimum wages; (3) failure to provide meal breaks; (4) failure to provide rest periods; (5) waiting time penalties; (6) wage statement violations; (7) failure to timely pay wages; (8) failure to indemnify; (9) Failure to Pay Interest on Deposits; (10) violation of labor code § 227.3; and (11) unfair competition. (the "Class Action"). On December 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint ("

4. On or around December 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint ("FAC") to add causes of action to the Class Action under the Private Attorney General Act of 2004 ("PAGA").

5. Plaintiff and ASCCF agreed to exchange informal discovery and attend mediation. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained, through informal discovery: (a) time and payroll records for the of putative class members through mediation; (b) wage and hour policy documents; and (c) all documents pertaining to Plaintiff available to Defendants..

6. On or around April 23, 2026, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Marc Feder. The mediation was successful, and the Parties agreed to globally resolve all class and PAGA claims asserted in the Operative Complaint.

7. As part of the Agreement, the Parties agreed to stipulate to the filing of a Second Amended Complaint ("SAC") adding defendant ASC Treatment Group ("ASTG and with ASCFF, "Defendants" and with Plaintiff, the "Parties") as a named Defendant before or concurrently with this Motion for Preliminary Approval. The SAC will be "Operative Complaint."

8. Class Counsel have conducted significant investigation of the law and facts relating to the claims asserted in the Action and the PAGA Notice, and have concluded that the Settlement set forth herein is fair, reasonable, adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, taking into account the sharply contested issues involved, the expense and time necessary to litigate the Action through trial and any appeals, the risks and costs of further litigation of the Action, the risk of an adverse outcome, the uncertainties of complex litigation, the information learned through discovery regarding Plaintiff's allegations, and the substantial benefits to be received by Settlement Class Members..

The Proposed Settlement

9. Subject to Court approval pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, rule 3.679, *et seq.*, the Parties have agreed to settle the Action by agreement upon the terms and conditions, and for the consideration set forth in the Agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1." A summary of the terms of the settlement is as follows:

Defendants will stipulate, for purpose of this settlement only, as follows:

- Certification of a class ("Settlement Class," "Settlement Class Members" or "Class Members") defined as: all persons currently or formerly employed by defendants The ASC Charitable Foundation and ASC Treatment Group (collectively, "Defendants") either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the period from February 10, 2021, through June 12, 2026 ("Class Period") in the State of California.

- Defendants will pay $420,000.00 ("Gross Settlement Amount" or "GSA") to resolve the matter.
- Defendants represent that there are no more than 21,000 workweeks during the Class Period. In the event the number of workweeks during the Class Period increases by more than 10%, or 2,100 additional workweeks, for a total of 23,100 workweeks, then the GSA shall be increased proportionally by the workweeks in excess of 23,100 multiplied by the workweek value. The workweek value shall be calculated by dividing the GSA by 21,000. The Parties agree that the workweek value amounts to $20.00 per workweek ($420,000 divided by 21,000 workweeks). Thus, for example, should there be 24,000 workweeks in the Class Period, then the GSA shall be increased by $18,000.00. ((24,000 workweeks 23,100 workweeks) x $20.00/workweek.).
- Defendants will pay the employer's share of taxes separate and apart from the Gross Settlement Amount.
- This is a non-reversionary settlement.
- Class Members will be paid their *pro rata* share of the class action settlement based on the total number of Workweeks[1] worked during the Class Period.
- The Settlement Administration costs, estimated not to exceed $5,420.00, will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- Class Counsel, comprised of David D. Bibiyan and Sarah Cohen of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., may apply for, and Defendants will not oppose, attorneys' fees of not more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless escalated pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, amounts to $147,000.00, and actual costs, not to exceed $30,000.00, all of which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.

[1] "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendant, for at least one day during the Class Period, based on hire dates, re-hire dates (as applicable), and termination dates (as applicable).

- Class Counsel hereby apply for, and Defendants will not oppose, a service award of not more than $7,500.00 to Plaintiff, which will be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount.
- "Aggrieved Employees" means all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendants, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the period December 11, 2023, through June 12, 2026 ("PAGA Period") in the State of California.
- Defendants have agreed to pay $42,000.00 as PAGA penalties, seventy-five percent (75%) or $31,500.00 of which will be paid to the LWDA out of the Gross Settlement Amount, and twenty-five percent (25%) or $10,500.00 of which will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees.
- Class Members' and Aggrieved Employees' checks shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of their issuance. Thereafter, checks for such payments shall be canceled and funds associated with such checks shall be transmitted to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member and Aggrieved Employee.

Settlement Agreement and Accompanying Documents

10. Attached hereto as Exhibit "1" is a true and correct copy of the Agreement fully executed by the Parties.

11. Attached to the Agreement as Exhibit "A" thereto is the proposed Notice of Proposed Settlement ("Class Notice") to be distributed to Class Members in English and Spanish.

12. The Parties have agreed to use Apex Class Action LLC, an experienced settlement administrator, to administer the settlement.

13. On or about November 13, 2026, my office submitted a copy of the Settlement Agreement to the LWDA in compliance with Labor Code section 2699 subdivision (1)(2). A true and correct copy of the confirmation from the LWDA is attached hereto as Exhibit "3."

///

The Settlement was Negotiated at Arms-Length and not Collusive

14. The Settlement that has been reached, subject to this Court's approval, is a product of substantial efforts by the Parties and their counsel. The Settlement was reached after extensive factual and legal investigation and research; the exchange of informal discovery; substantial negotiation regarding the scope of informal discovery; exchange of documents and information that included review of time and pay records and analysis thereof with the aid of Plaintiff and expert consultants; analysis of shifts and Workweeks worked by Class Members in the Class Period, analysis of the number of pay periods and number of Aggrieved Employees in the PAGA Period for calculating PAGA penalties, number of Class Members eligible for wage statement penalties and waiting time penalties; an analysis of Plaintiff's employment records; extensive correspondence and communication between counsel; a review of pleadings, evidence and rulings in similar actions litigated elsewhere in the state; a review of similar cases in the same industry elsewhere in the country; and preparation for and attendance at a full-day mediation, followed by further discussions and coordination to finalize the terms and conditions of the general settlement parameters agreed to by the Parties.

15. While Class Counsel believes in the chance of success of certifying the claims, Class Counsel recognized the potential risk, expense and complexity posed by further litigation. Moreover, litigating Plaintiff's claims in this litigation—claims that involve approximately 82 Class Members during the Class Period—would require substantial preparation and discovery, and ultimately would involve the deposition and presentation of numerous more witnesses (including Class Members and expert witnesses), as well as the consideration, preparation and analysis of expert reports. Therefore, should litigation have progressed any further, there would have been significant expense incurred by each side (above and beyond the expense already incurred).

The Settlement Amount is Well Within the Range of Reasonableness

16. The settlement amount reached in this case provides significant recovery to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and easily falls within the range of reasonableness. Based on documents and information provided by Defendant, Class Counsel understands there are no more than 21,000 Workweeks during the Class Period.

Recovery of Damages for Failure to Pay Wages for All Time Worked

17. Class Counsel theorized, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence and documents produced by Defendants, that Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Class Members because Defendants rounded Class Members' time. Specifically, Class Counsel theorized that Defendants policy of rounding, despite technological advances, resulting in Class Members' working off the clock thereby resulting in overtime and minimum wage violations.

18. One theory advanced by Class Counsel alleged, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Defendants' rounding policy led to Class Members working off-the-clock approximately five (5) minutes each shift throughout the Class Period, without pay. Class Counsel understand, based on time and payroll records produced by Defendants and analysis thereof by expert data consultants retained by Class Counsel, that there were approximately 95,596 shifts during the Class Period, 71.4% of which were over eight (8) hours in length, and Class Members had an average hourly rate of pay of $19.33. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation resulted in Defendants' exposure for unpaid off-the-clock work in an approximate amount of $251,992 ([95,596 shifts x 0.714 shifts over eight hours x 0.083 hour x $19.33 x 1.5 overtime rate] + [95,596 shifts x 0.286 shifts under eight hours x 0.083 hour x $19.33 x 2 in liquidated damages]).

19. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendants contend that their policies specifically prohibit off-the-clock work. Defendants contend that they did not require Class Members to work off-the-clock, they were paid for all time suffered or permitted to work. Defendants contend that any allegations that Class Members were required to be under Defendants' control off-the-clock would necessitate an individualized inquiry into when and why, making this claim not subject to class treatment and any trial in this litigation unmanageable. Thus, Defendants contend that no damages can be recovered here, and, even if, arguendo, they could, an estimate of five (5) minutes of unpaid work off-the-clock of Class Members for every single shift during the Class Period is a wild exaggeration of time spent working off-the-clock if any such time was spent.

///

Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Meal Periods

20. Class Counsel theorized that Defendants' meal period practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel theorized that Defendants' meal period practices were non-compliant because, based on Plaintiff's narrative evidence, Class Members did not receive full thirty (30) minute meal periods, and meal periods were late, or missed entirely. Class Counsel also theorized that meal periods were frequently interrupted by managers. Class Counsel understand from Defendants' records, and analyzed by expert data consultants, that there are 46,705 unique facial meal period violations (*i.e.* meal periods that are missed, short, or late) in the Class Period through mediation. Class Counsel note that no meal period premiums were paid throughout the Class Period. Thus, one theory advanced by Class Counsel, based solely on facial violations, resulted in Defendants' maximum exposure for non-compliant meal periods in an amount of $1,805,615 (93,410 meal period violations x $19.33/hour).

21. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendants argued that they had compliant meal period policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full meal periods. Defendants argued that Class Members took timely and full meal periods or received the required meal period premium for each instance of meal period violations. Defendants further contends that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant meal period was voluntary, in violation of its meal period policy, would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not lend itself to a manageable trial. Thus, Defendants contend that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

Recovery of Damages for Non-Compliant Rest Periods

22. Class Counsel theorized, based on documents and information produced by Defendants and Plaintiff's narrative evidence, that Defendants' rest period practices throughout the Class Period were non-compliant. Class Counsel theorized that Defendants' practices were non-compliant for many of the reasons discussed for meal period violations, including frequent interruptions. Notably, there were no rest period premiums ever issued throughout the Class

Period.

23. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation resulted in, assuming a 40% violation rate for the 47,481 rest-eligible shifts, Defendants' exposure for failure to provide compliant rest periods in a conservative amount of $734,246 (94,962 shifts x 0.40 violation rate x $19.33/hour).

24. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendants argued that they had compliant rest break policies and practices and that its policy requires their employees to take timely and full rest breaks. Defendants argued that Class Members took timely and full rest periods. Defendants further contend that any instance of a Class Member failing to take a compliant rest break was voluntary and therefore would necessitate an individualized inquiry and would not lend itself to a manageable trial. Defendants also argued that Class Members were provided a reasonable opportunity to take uninterrupted rest breaks and the employer is not required to "police" such rest breaks. Thus, Defendants contend that *no* monies are owed for this account but, even if any amounts were due, the amount calculated by Class Counsel is excessive.

Wage Statement Violations

Class Counsel theorized that Class Members are entitled to recover penalties for Defendants' alleged failure to issue compliant wage statements under Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e), for the derivative impact of the failure to pay all wages owed on providing accurate information on wage statements. Specifically, Class Counsel theorized that penalties are owed under Labor Code section 226 due to, at minimum, Defendants' failure to pay premium wages. A non-exempt employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with Labor Code section 226, 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. Class Counsel understand from the data provided by Defendants that there were 4,405 pay periods during the relevant statutory time period for Class Members. Thus, one calculation performed by Class Counsel at mediation, based on the initial violation rate of $50 for each violation, resulted

in Defendants' exposure for wage statement violations for Class Members in the approximate amount of $202,700 (4,405 pay periods x $50/pay period).

25. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendants contend that the wage statements issued to the employees fully complied with Labor Code section 226. Defendants contend that because it believes no wages are unpaid that, thus, there can be no derivative penalties. However, Class Counsel also understand the risks inherent in this claim if the above claims were not certified. Class Counsel also had to factor in, and did factor in, the risk that the Court would find there was no injury to Class Members even if the wage statements were inaccurate or that Defendants' conduct was not intentional, both of which are requirements of Labor Code section 226 before penalties can issue. Class Counsel also note that the calculation used does not take into account the fact that all Class Members did not work all pay periods and, therefore, Class Counsels' calculation does not take into account the maximum penalty of $4,000 in Plaintiff's exposure model used at mediation.

Waiting Time Penalties

26. Based on relevant documents provided by Defendants, there were approximately 31 Class Members who were terminated or resigned during the relevant statutory period. Thus, one calculation performed at mediation by Class Counsel resulted in Defendants' exposure for waiting time penalties to be approximately $143,815 (31 separated Class Members x $19.33/hour x 8 hours x 30 days).

27. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants make the following defenses in connection with this claim: Defendants contend that there is no credence to Plaintiff's off-the-clock theory and that, thus, no waiting time penalties are owed based on that theory. Finally, Defendants contend that their actions were not "willful" and that, thus, waiting time penalties cannot be awarded. Thus, Defendants argued that no waiting time penalties are owed.

///

///

Failure to Indemnify, Failure to Pay Interest on Deposits, and Failure to Pay Vested Vacation

28. Class Counsel initially theorized that Defendants failed to indemnify Class Members for necessary business expenses, failed to pay interest on deposits, and failed to pay vested vacation pay. However, after diligent investigation and informal discovery, Class Counsel did not attribute significant value to these claims for purposes of the Settlement. Rather, the driving force behind the Settlement were the claims discussed and valued above

PAGA Penalties

29. Class Counsel understand from the time and payroll data provided by Defendants that there are approximately 63 Aggrieved Employees who collectively worked 2,254 pay periods in the PAGA Period. Plaintiff's claims in the Action under PAGA are substantially similar to those described herein. PAGA penalties include penalties for initial violations and subsequent violations. Defendants contend that only initial violation rates may be used instead of the subsequent violation rates initially used by Class Counsel. With this in mind and because Class Counsel through investigation and discovery did not come to the conclusion that Defendants at any time was notified by any governmental entity that they violated any Labor Code sections presented in the PAGA Notice and PAGA claims, Class Counsel adjusted the exposure model for Defendants to include only initial violation rates.

30. a. Overtime Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations, and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $112,700 (2,254 pay periods x $50).

31. b. Minimum Wage Violations: Labor Code section 1197.1 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $250 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $225,400 (2,254 pay periods x $100).

32. c. Meal Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $112,700 (2,254 pay periods x $50).

33. d. Rest Period Violations: Labor Code section 558 prescribes penalties of $50 for an initial violation and $100 for each subsequent violation. Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single non-exempt employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $112,700 (2,254 pay periods x $50).

34. e. Wage Statement Violations: According to *Gunther v. Alaska Airlines, Inc.* (2021) 287 Cal.Rptr.3d 229, in this instance, Labor Code section 2699 would be the appropriate penalty for wage statement violations that are inaccurate, which prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation (*Id.* at 247-248). Using the initial pay period rate for all violations and a violation every single pay period for every single Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period, this amounts to a maximum exposure of $225,400 (2,254 pay periods x $100).

35. f. Waiting Time Penalties: Labor Code section 2699 prescribes penalties of $100 for an initial violation and $200 for each subsequent violation. Because this violation is merited only at separation of employment, a 100% violation rate would likely include just one violation per employee. The data produced by Defendants indicate that there were 19 Aggrieved Employees whose employment was separated during the PAGA Period. This amounts to a maximum exposure of $1,900 (19 Aggrieved Employees x $100).

36. h. Conclusion: In sum, Class Counsel calculated Defendants' total maximum exposure for PAGA violations if the Court were to find a 100% violation rate for every Aggrieved Employee every pay period and not exercise its discretion to reduce any of those penalties to be $790,800. Class Counsel understand from the mediator and the mediation process that Defendants argued the following in connection with this claim: Defendants contend that no PAGA penalties are likely to be awarded and, even if they were, the maximum exposure calculated by Class

Counsel is vastly overstated. First, Defendants defend that PAGA penalties cannot and should not be stacked. Second, Defendants assert that individualized issues predominate the PAGA claims, making the claims unmanageable for trial. Third, Defendants deny that a violation for each pay period can be established. Fourth, Defendants contend that a Court is unlikely to exercise its discretion to award civil penalties under PAGA where, as here, there is no conduct shown by Plaintiff that would show any Labor Code violation by Defendants is knowing and intentional. Defendants insist that this is especially true in this Action where class action damages are available to Class Members, rendering an award of PAGA penalties in addition to class action damages to be double recovery.

37. Class Counsel maintain that it is possible to recover the subsequent violation rate for penalties, that stacking is permissible, and that there is no manageability requirement under PAGA (citing *Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.*). As such, Class Counsel believe a 90% discount of this claim to be reasonable, resulting in a valuation of $79,080 as a reasonable estimate of the likelihood of what Plaintiff may recover at trial for PAGA penalties ($790,800 x .10). See also *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp*., 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 529 (2018) (upholding trial courts 90% reduction in maximum penalties, from $50 to $5 per initial violation).

Conclusion

38. When including derivative penalties, such as waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, and discretionary PAGA penalties, Class Counsel theorized Defendants' maximum exposure to be approximately $3,217,448. In all, Class Counsel obtained a Gross Settlement Amount of $420,000.00. Particularly in light of the risks involving obstacles to class certification, all issues and risks related to liability, the issues with manageability at trial, the discretionary nature of PAGA penalties, and considering the case law regarding fair, reasonable and adequate settlements, Class Counsel strongly believe.

39. Moreover, $42,000.00 of the Gross Settlement Amount was attributed to PAGA penalties. This allocation was decided mutually by the Parties and the mutual decision was based on: (1) the fact that damages are available for the failure to pay wage claims while only penalties are available for the PAGA claims; (2) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to decline

to stack PAGA penalties; (3) the risk that the Court may exercise its discretion to not award the full amount of PAGA penalties available; and (4) the risk that the Court may decline to award any PAGA penalties at all in light of the fact that damages are available for Class Members and it may find any further liability against Defendants unnecessarily punitive.

The Proposed Attorneys' Fees and Costs are Reasonable

40. Class Counsel seeks an attorneys' fees award of not more than thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which, unless escalated pursuant to this Agreement, would amount to $147,000.00. Class Counsel also seeks reimbursement of costs not to exceed $30,000.00.

The Requested Enhancement Award to the Named Plaintiff and Class Representatives are Reasonable

41. I am informed and believe Defendants do not oppose the requested enhancement to Plaintiff. Class Counsel seeks a limited enhancement of $10,000.00 to Plaintiff for his service.

Conditional Certification for Settlement Purposes

Ascertainability

42. Here, the Class Members' definition (*i.e.*, all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendants, either directly or through any subsidiary, staffing agency, or professional employer organization, as non-exempt, hourly-paid employees during the Class Period in the State of California)) is derived from the operative complaint. Based solely on Defendant's payroll records, which amount to approximately 82 persons.

Numerosity

43. Class Counsel understands from documents provided that Defendant identified at least 82 Class Members.

Commonality

44. This litigation is brought to resolve common issues that include whether Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked; whether Defendant provided full, timely and un-interrupted meal and rest periods; whether Class Members are entitled to premium pay for incomplete, untimely or interrupted meal or rest periods, among other claims as set forth above.

///

Typicality

45. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of other Class Members as Plaintiff: (1) was a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee like other Class Members; (2) complains of not being paid for all time under Defendants' control or suffered and/or permitted to work for Defendants; (3) did not receive full premium pay for meal periods that were not compliant with the Labor Code; (4) did not receive premium pay for rest periods that were not provided, among others as set forth above.

Adequacy of Keaton Mendoza

46. I graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration from San Diego State University in 2011.

47. I received my Juris Doctorate from California Western School of Law in 2016.

48. From 2018 to 2022, I practiced law in the General Counsel's office for Adventist Health, handling labor and employment matters for the health system, specifically in harassment, discrimination, retaliation, and wage and hour matters.

49. From 2023 through 2026, I practiced law as an attorney for Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith handling general liability defendant-side litigation.

50. Thereafter, I joined Bibiyan Law Group, P.C., practicing law on behalf of plaintiffs in matters of employment law, and specifically on issues of unpaid wages and class action settlements. Among other tasks, I oversee and manage class action and PAGA action settlements at Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. I have led settlement negotiations and the approval process for class action and PAGA settlements, including some of those set forth in the declaration of David D. Bibiyan, filed concurrently with this declaration.

Adequacy of Plaintiff

51. Class Counsel believe no conflicts, disabling or otherwise, exists between Plaintiff and Class Members because Plaintiff alleges to have been damaged by the same alleged conduct of Defendants (*i.e.*, Plaintiff classified as non-exempt, hourly-paid employee, not paid premium pay, etc.) and thus has the incentive to fairly represent all Class Members' claims to achieve the maximum possible recovery.

Superiority of Class Action

52. Class Counsel believe this wage and hour class action is a superior vehicle for resolution of the issues it seeks to resolve. It deals with common issues that are most efficiently adjudicated together, as indicated above. Moreover, with at least 82 Class Members, presentation of all of them before this Court may be problematic, impractical, and burdensome.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct this November 13, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Keaton D. Mendoza
KEATON D. MENDOZA