

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881)
John L. Nitti (State Bar #330752)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
jnitti@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
Nicole Noursamadi (State Bar #357246)
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com
nicole@zakaylaw.com
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for PLAINTIFF

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

JOSE RUELAS, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEA WEST SERVICES LLC, a California
limited liability company; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV038585

**DECLARATION OF JEAN-CLAUDE
LAPUYADE, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR CLASS COUNSEL AWARD
AND SERVICE AWARD**

Date: April 15, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Reservation ID:

Judge: Hon. Somnath Raj Chatterjee

Dept.: 21

1 I, Jean-Claude Lapuyade, declare as follows:

2 1. I am the managing partner of the law firm of The JCL Law Firm, APC, and co-counsel
3 of record for Plaintiff Jose Ruelas, an individual, on behalf of himself, and on behalf of all persons
4 similarly situated (“Plaintiff”) in this matter. As such, I am fully familiar with the facts, pleadings,
5 and history of the matter.

6 2. This declaration is being submitted in support of Plaintiff’s Motion Class Counsel Award
7 and Service Award.

8 **I. EXHIBITS**

9 3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit “1”** is a true and correct copy of the fully executed Stipulation
10 of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims (hereinafter “Settlement
11 Agreement”). Attached thereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Notice of Class Action
12 Settlement (“Class Notice”).

13 4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit “2”** is a true and correct copy of the JCL Law Firm, APC’s
14 “Transaction Summary” detailing the JCL Law Firm, APC’s actually incurred litigation expenses for
15 this matter as of March 20, 2025. As shown in detail in the attached transaction summary, the JCL Law
16 Firm, APC, incurred a total of \$7,889.94 in litigation costs prosecuting this action. These costs are
17 exclusive of the costs incurred by co-counsel Zakay Law Group, APLC.

18 5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit “3”** is a true and correct copy of the JCL Law Firm, APC’s
19 “Time and Billing Journal” detailing the JCL Law Firm APC’s total hours and fees for this matter as
20 of March 20, 2025. Each entry was made contemporaneously and in the ordinary course of the JCL
21 Law Firm, APC’s usual course of business. The attached Billing Journal shows that the JCL Law Firm,
22 APC billed a total of 106.7 hours for a total of \$56,740.00 successfully litigating this action.

23 6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit “4”** is a true and correct copy of the JCL Law Firm, APC’s
24 “Firm Resume” detailing the credentials and a summary of cases on which Counsel has been appointed
25 Class Counsel.

26 **II. LODESTAR**

27 7. As of March 20, 2025, The JCL Law Firm, APC incurred a total lodestar of \$56,740.00
28 for 106.7 hours worked by attorneys and staff successfully litigating this matter. I have reviewed my

1 firm's lodestar in this matter and believe the charges are reasonable and were reasonably necessary to
2 the conduct of the case. Detailed Time and Billing Journals for the JCL Law Firm, APC are attached
3 hereto as **Exhibit 3**.

4 8. Additionally, the attorneys and staff at co-counsel the Zakay Law Group, APLC, worked
5 a total of 68.60 hours successfully prosecuting this action for a lodestar of \$39,816.50. A true and
6 correct copy of the Zakay Law Group, APLC time and billing entries is attached to the Declaration of
7 Shani Zakay, Esq. filed concurrently herewith.

8 9. Collectively, Class Counsel spent a total of 175.30 hours successfully litigating this
9 matter for a total combined lodestar of \$96,556.50 and is summarized by firm below:

<u>FIRM</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Total</u>
JCL Law Firm, APC.	106.7	\$56,740.00
Zakay Law Group, APLC	68.60	\$39,816.50
Total	175.30	\$96,556.50

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 10. In assessing the reasonableness of the billing rates for the attorneys and staff at the JCL
17 Law Firm, APC, the firm refers to the "*Laffey Matrix*" to set our hourly billing rates. *See*
18 <http://www.laffeymatrix.com/>. The *Laffey Matrix* is a fee schedule used by many courts throughout
19 the United States, including some California state courts and California Federal District Courts. The
20 *Laffey Matrix* is a well-established objective source that California courts have relied on in assessing
21 hourly rates since 2005. (see *In Re HPL Technologies, Inc. Securities Litigation*, 366 F.Supp.2d 912,
22 921 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (Confirming use of the *Laffey Matrix* adjusted to account for locality pay
23 differentials); *Rubalcaba v. Albertson's, LLC*, No. BC528755, 2017 WL 4330597, at *4 (Cal. Super.
24 Ct. May 25, 2017), reversed on other grounds.)

25 11. The attorneys and staff at the JCL Law Firm, APC, have been providing extensive class
26 action services throughout state and federal courts in California for more than seventeen years. Since
27 its founding, the JCL Law Firm, APC, has recovered more than \$100 million dollars for its clients in
28 the last twenty-four months alone.

12. When comparing the billing rates for the staff and attorneys at the JCL Law Firm, APC with the *Laffey* Matrix, the attorneys and staff at the JCL Law Firm, APC, either bill at or below the rate for similarly skilled and tenured legal professionals:

Name	Laffey Matrix Fee	Actual Billing Rate
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. (Managing Attorney)	\$878	\$700
Sydney Castillo-Johnson, Esq. (Handling Attorney)	\$437	\$450
Perssia Razma, Esq. (Handling Attorney)	\$437	\$425
Tesla Stone (Managing Paralegal)	\$239	\$250
Jennifer Heming (Handling Paralegal)	\$239	\$250

13. The JCL Law Firm's rates are comparable to those judicially approved for other plaintiff's firms, such as Baron & Budd (rates ranging from \$775 for the requested partner to \$390-\$630 for non-partners), Western Comden Casselman & Essensten (rates ranging from \$670-\$750 for partners and \$300-\$500 for associates), and Blood Hurst & Rearden (\$510-\$695 for partners). *See Aarons v. BMW of North America*, No. 11-7667-PSG, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118442, *40-41 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2014). Other Southern California courts have approved hourly rates in the requested range. *See e.g., Kearney v. Hyundai Motor Am.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91636, *24 (C.D. Cal. June 28, 2013) (approving hourly rates of \$650 -\$800 for senior attorneys in consumer class action); *Parkinson v. Hyundai Motor America*, 796 F.Supp.2d 1160, 1172 (C.D. Cal. 2010)(approving hourly rates between \$445 and \$675); *Faigman v. AT&T Mobility, LLC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15825, *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2011)(Approving hourly rates of \$650 an hour for partners and \$500 for associates); *Richard v. Ameri-Force Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, No 37-2008-00096019 (San Diego Superior Court, August 27, 2010)(\$695 to \$750 an hour for partners and \$495 for associates); *Barrera v. Gamestop*, No. CV 09-1399 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 29, 2010)(\$700 for partners and \$475 for associates); *Anderson v. Nextel*

1 *Retail Stores, LLC*, No. CV 07-4480 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2010)(\$655- \$750 for partners and \$300 –
2 515 for associates); *Luquetta v. Regents of Cal.*, CGC-05-443007 (San Francisco Sup. Ct.) (approving
3 2012 partner rates between \$550 and \$850 per hour); and *Holoway v. Best Buy Co.*, C-05-5056-PJH
4 (MEJ)(N.D. Cal.)(approving 2011 partner rates between \$825 and \$700, and associates hourly rates
5 between \$355 and \$405 an hour).

6 14. Moreover, my billing rate has been approved multiple times within the last twelve months
7 by California Superior Court judges. (See generally *Klein v. RedZone Security, Inc.*, Riverside Superior
8 Court Case No. CVRI2202841 (August 15, 2024) Hon. Harold W. Hopp B. approved a \$700 billing
9 rate and appointed Jean Claude Lapuyade, Esq. of the JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel; *Galindo*
10 *v. PAQ, Inc., et al.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No: STK-CV-UOE-2022-1799 (September 17,
11 2024) Hon. Blanca A. Banuelos approved a \$700 billing rate and appointed Jean Claude Lapuyade,
12 Esq. of the JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel.)

13 15. Further, Class Counsel will be performing additional work, including finalizing the
14 motion for final approval, attending the hearing on final approval, finalizing the orders and judgment,
15 and monitoring completion of the settlement process over the course of several years. I expect this
16 additional work will result in an additional 20-30 hour of additional work and an additional lodestar
17 between \$11,000 and \$16,500.

18 16. **Therefore, the requested fee awarded as a percentage of the fund is supported by**
19 **the overall lodestar incurred with a modest multiplier of 1.02.** Again, obviously this is much lower
20 than the multiplier approved in *Laffitte* with significant work left to perform. The requested award is
21 therefore reasonably viewed by the Lodestar/Multiplier cross-check.

22 **III. INTRODUCTION**

23 17. Class Counsel successfully negotiated a Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA
24 Action Claims and Release of Claims (“Agreement”) for a Gross Settlement Amount¹ of \$294,500.00
25 on behalf of 82 Settlement Class Members. In an order dated November 18, 2024, the Court
26 preliminarily approved the Settlement Agreement and preliminarily certified the Class.² As part of the

27
28 ¹ Capitalized terms are defined in the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement is attached as Exhibit “1” to
the Declaration of Jean-Claude Lapuyade (“JCL Dec.”) at ¶ 3. All further citations to the Settlement Agreement
incorporate by this reference a citation to the JCL Dec., ¶ 3.

² The procedural history of this action, the discovery conducted, the settlement negotiations, and the risks of litigation and

1 settlement, the parties agreed to a Class Counsel Award comprised of \$98,166.67 for attorneys' fees
2 (one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount) and up to \$25,000.00 for reimbursement of actually
3 incurred litigation expenses.³ Consequently, and in accord with the parties' agreement, Class Counsel
4 hereby respectfully requests a Class Counsel Award in the amount of \$123,166.67.

5 18. The requested payment for the Class Counsel Award equal to one-third of the Gross
6 Settlement Amount is fair compensation and, respectfully, should be approved. Class Counsel
7 undertook complex, risky, and time-consuming wage and hour litigation on a contingent basis. The
8 attorneys' fee portion of the requested Class Counsel Award is within the historically recognized range
9 of attorneys' fees awarded in common fund class action settlements – between 25% and 50% – and is
10 supported by Class Counsel's lodestar cross-check with a reasonable 1.02 multiplier. That is well-
11 below the 2.13 multiplier approved by the Supreme Court in *Laffitte v. Robert Half International, Inc.*
12 (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, with additional work to be performed, and within the recognized multiplier range
13 of between 2 and 4⁴. Thus, the reasonableness of the requested Class Counsel Award is confirmed by
14 reference to the lodestar with a reasonable multiplier with significant additional work still to be
15 performed. Finally, the requested Class Counsel Award is consistent with recent fee awards granted
16 by this Court in similar litigation. (*See Stovall v. Javelin Logistics, Inc.*, Alameda County Superior
17 Court, Case No. RG-20075705, filed September 30, 2020; *Ybarra v. Helzberg Diamond Shops, LLC*,
18 Alameda Superior Court Case No. 21CV003531, filed on December 3, 2021.)

19 19. Additionally, Class Counsel and Class Representative, Jose Ruelas (hereinafter
20 "Plaintiff" or "Class Representative"), respectfully request this Court approve the Service Award in
21 the amount of \$10,000. Settlement Agreement, § I(II). The Class Representative faithfully and dutifully
22 performed his role on behalf of the Settlement Class. The Class Representative dedicated valuable time
23 and assisted in the successful prosecution of this action.

24 ///

25 _____
26 of establishing liability and damages at trial are described in Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
Settlement, scheduled for the same hearing time.

27 ³ Currently Class Counsel's actually incurred litigation expenses are \$12,964.94. Class Counsel will provide an updated
total at the time of hearing on this motion.

28 ⁴ See *Laffitte, supra*, 1 Cal. 5th at 487 (approving 1/3 fee award with 2 multiplier); *Wershba v. Apple Computer*, 91 Cal.
App. 4th 224, 255 (2001) ("multipliers can range from 2 to 4 or even higher."); *In re Sutter Health Uninsured Pricing Cases*,
171 Cal.App.4th 495, 512 (2009) (affirming multiplier of 2.52 as "fair and reasonable"); *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162
Cal.App.4th 43, 66 (2008) (affirming multiplier of 2.53 as well within the approved range of 2 to 4).

20. As discussed below, the requested Class Counsel Award meets the criteria under California law and falls well within the recognized range of reasonableness for approval. Similarly, the requested Service Award in the amount of \$10,000 to Plaintiff meets the criteria for approval. Accordingly, the Class Representative and Class Counsel respectfully request this Court grant this motion for approval of the Class Counsel Award and Service Award.

**IV. CLASS COUNSEL IS ENTITLED TO AN AWARD OF ATTORNEY’S FEES UNDER
THE COMMON FUND DOCTRINE**

A. The Requested Attorneys' Fees of One-Third of the Gross Settlement Amount is Fair and Reasonable Under the Common Fund Doctrine

21. The Agreement, preliminarily approved by this Court, provides for payment of the Class Counsel Award from the common fund. Notably, after being provided with notice of the Settlement and the requested Class Counsel Award, there are *two opt-outs and zero objections*. Every member of the Settlement Class will receive his or her Individual Settlement Payment. Now, it is only equitable that the Settlement Class also pay their pro rata share of attorneys' fees at a reasonable percentage-of-recovery rate to compensate Class Counsel for their efforts in creating the common fund. Accordingly, it is well within the Court's discretion to award fees to Class Counsel under the common fund doctrine.

22. Class Counsel requests payment of attorneys' fees in the amount of \$98,166.67, representing one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount. Class Counsel's request is consistent with many fee awards in similar wage and hour class actions that Class Counsel has received in California Superior Courts, over the past five years. Moreover, the requested one-third attorneys' fee award is in the middle of historically recognized range of attorneys' fees awarded in common fund class action settlements. *Rodriguez v. RSI*, San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2023354 (Hon. David Cohn approved Class Counsel's 33.3% attorneys' fee request in a \$1,450,000 common fund wage and hour class action settlement, which equated to Class Counsel's lodestar plus a 1.87 multiplier); *Salazar v. Frontier Auto Sales Inc., dba Frontier Toyota*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV20382 (Hon. John P. Doyle approved Settlement Class Counsel's 33.3% attorneys' fee request plus \$15,000 in litigation costs in a \$242,500 class action settlement); *Hill v. Stemak Holdings, Ltd.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2018-00000747 (Hon. Kenneth Medel approved Class Counsel's 33.3%

attorneys' fee request plus \$17,500 in actually incurred litigation costs in a \$386,500 common fund wage and hour class action settlement.); *Shachno et al., v. KT Hotels, LLC, et al*, San Diego Superior Case No. 37-2018-0043601-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack approved Class Counsel's 33.3% attorney fee request plus actually incurred litigation costs exceeding \$20,000 in a \$500,000 common fund wage and hour class action settlement.); *Moschetto v. Pillow Global, Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2017-00024031-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. John S. Meyer, approved Class Counsel's 33.3% attorney fee request plus actually incurred litigation costs exceeding \$15,000 in a \$250,000 common fund wage and hour class action settlement.); *Terrado et al., v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Gregory W. Pollack, awarded Class Counsel 33.3% fee request and \$16,000 in litigation costs in a \$2 million common fund settlement, which equated to Class Counsel's lodestar plus at 1.62 multiplier.); *Macaspac v. San Antonio Regional Hospital*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS1512625, (Hon. Thomas Garza awarded Class Counsel 33.3% fee request and more than \$17,000 in litigation costs on a \$1.75 million common fund wage and hour settlement, which equated to Class Counsel's lodestar plus a 1.67 multiplier.); *Hernandez v. Sunglass Hut Trading, LLC*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS1505181 (Hon. Bryan F. Foster awarded Class Counsel 33.3% fee request and \$22,632.93 in litigation costs and expenses on a \$1.8 million settlement, which equated at Class Counsel's lodestar plus a 1.89 multiplier.); *Engstrom v. Bender-Rosenthal, Inc.* San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2016-00012373-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Joel Wohfeil approved Class Counsel's 33.3% on a \$360,000 common fund wage and hour class action settlement, which equated to Class Counsel's lodestar plus a 1.2 multiplier.). Moreover, the requested one-third attorneys' fee award is in the middle of historically recognized range of attorneys' fees awarded in common fund class action settlements.

23. Here, the Settlement Class will receive an average Individual Class Settlement Payment of \$1,802.85 and a high of \$5,299.97 from an estimated Net Settlement Amount of \$147,833.33. The Class Counsel Award request should be awarded based upon the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with *Laffitte*, i.e., percentage of the fund with a lodestar cross check. As further explained

1 below, the reasonableness of the requested \$98,166.67 for the attorneys' fees portion of the Class
2 Counsel Award is further supported by the lodestar cross-check.

3 24. Because the Settlement in this case is a pure common fund case, and the percentage of
4 the fund is the comparable marketplace for fee awards in common fund cases, *Laffitte* supports an
5 award based upon the percentage of the common fund. Further, as noted above, the one-third fee
6 request is in the middle of comparable awards for common fund cases, which establishes the requested
7 award as reasonable. Moreover, Class Counsel's lodestar supports the requested attorneys' fees with a
8 multiplier well within the recognized range reasonableness, and in fact, below what the California
9 Supreme Court approved in *Laffitte*. For those reasons, and those discussed *infra*, Class Counsel
10 respectfully requests this Court approve a payment to Class Counsel in the amount of **\$123,166.67**,
11 comprised of \$98,166.67 for the attorneys' fees and up to \$25,000.00 for the attorneys' expenses.

12 25. Courts have consistently recognized that the results achieved are an important factor to
13 be considered in making a fee award. *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 436 (1983) ("most critical
14 factor is the degree of success obtained"). Here, because Class Counsel invested significant time and
15 expense successfully prosecuting Plaintiff's claims, significant monetary relief is to be provided to
16 Settlement Class and the excellent results achieved by Class Counsel through this Settlement alone
17 justify the requested fee award. As fully briefed in Plaintiff's motions for preliminary and final
18 approval, the Gross Settlement Amount of \$294,500.00 represents between 14.13% and 21.85% of
19 Defendant's liability exposure in this matter as identified by Plaintiff's expert.

20 26. The likelihood of establishing liability and recovering the full amount of damages was
21 extremely remote and the Gross Settlement Amount of \$294,500.00 from which the Settlement Class
22 will receive an estimated average payment of \$1,802.85 and a high of \$5,299.97, represents an
23 excellent recovery for the Settlement Class considering Defendant's vigorous defense and the risks of
24 continued litigation.

25 27. In reaching this Settlement, Class Counsel carefully considered the strength of the case
26 versus the amount offered in settlement, as well as the risk, expense, and complexity of maintaining
27 class certification through trial. Plaintiff is confident about the strength of his claims. Nonetheless,
28

1 Plaintiff recognizes that Defendant has factual and legal defenses that, if successful, would potentially
2 defeat or substantially impair the value of the lawsuit.

3 28. Additionally, continuing to litigate this action would require continued and extensive
4 resources coupled with significant Court time to proceed through contested certification, trial, and
5 post-trial motions, which can often take years. Furthermore, wage and hour litigation is complex and
6 expensive, as it often necessitates extensive expert testimony, particularly with regards to damages.
7 But even if Plaintiff was successful at trial, Plaintiff is acutely aware that a judgment does not end the
8 litigation. Plaintiff fully expects that Defendant would likely appeal any judgment.

9 29. Considering these issues, the Gross Settlement Amount of \$294,500.00 is an excellent
10 result for the Settlement Class. While the Gross Settlement Amount represents a discount on Plaintiff's
11 overall estimate of the damages, this reduction is an extremely reasonable compromise considering the
12 challenges of continued litigation, including but not limited to, maintaining class certification, and
13 establishing liability on all claims against Defendant. The Settlement commits Defendant to create a
14 Gross Settlement Amount, from which the Settlement Class will derive a ***significant financial***
15 ***recovery*** for their alleged damages and extinguish the risks of continued litigation, including a potential
16 bankruptcy and/or an appeal that would likely be filed following a judgment in Plaintiff's favor. Such
17 efforts would likely result in a delay of several years before this case would be resolved, with no
18 guarantee of recovery, whereas the Settlement provides for an average recovery of \$1,802.85, placing
19 it well within the range of reasonableness.

20 30. Furthermore, the Settlement Class greeted news of the Settlement with 97.62% of the
21 Settlement Class Members participating in the Settlement. The unanimous approval by the Settlement
22 Class Members evidences the positive overall result of the litigation.

23 31. Collectively, Class Counsel worked hard on this case and, expended approximately 175.3
24 hours in the prosecution of this litigation in the nearly nineteen months since it was filed for a total
25 lodestar of \$96,556.50.

26 32. Moreover, Class Counsel expects to incur an additional 20-30 hours of work attending
27 the hearing on final settlement approval, administering the settlement, filing post distribution
28 settlement declarations, and drafting an amendment judgment. Class Counsel devoted considerable

1 time and effort to achieve the benefit to the Settlement Class and the requested Class Counsel Award
2 in the amount of \$123,166.67, comprised of \$98,166.67 for attorneys' fees and up to \$25,000 for
3 attorneys' expenses is appropriate here given the excellent results achieved.

4 33. Practice in the narrow area of wage and hour class action litigation requires skill,
5 knowledge, and experience in two distinct subsets of the law. Expertise in one does not necessarily
6 translate into expertise in the other. Class Counsel must have expertise in both. The issues presented
7 in this case required more than just a general appreciation of wage and hour law and class action
8 procedure.

9 34. The legal landscape surrounding Plaintiff's central claim, meal and rest period violations,
10 is in constant flux. Nevertheless, Class Counsel successfully navigated these seismic legal changes
11 during this action in route to successfully negotiating a significant monetary compensation for the
12 Settlement Class.

13 35. The Settlement was possible only because Class Counsel was able to convince Defendant
14 that Plaintiff could potentially prevail on the contested issues regarding liability, achieve class
15 certification through trial, overcome difficulties in proof as to monetary relief and take the case to trial
16 if need be. In successfully navigating these hurdles Class Counsel displayed the necessary dual skill
17 set.

18 36. Class Counsel undertook this litigation on a contingent-fee basis, assuming a significant
19 risk that the litigation would yield no recovery after many years of work. Unlike counsel for Defendant,
20 who are paid an hourly rate and reimbursed for their expenses on a regular basis, Class Counsel has
21 not been compensated for any time or expenses to date.

22 37. Traditionally, employment litigation plaintiffs are unable to pay their attorneys on an
23 hourly basis and thus can obtain representation only if they can find counsel who are willing to accept
24 their case on a contingent basis and agree to advance either all or a significant portion of the costs.

25 38. The simple fact is that despite the most vigorous and competent efforts, success is never
26 guaranteed. Plaintiff's counsel not only must turn away other income-generating opportunities but
27 must take on a substantial risk of "never receiving compensation at all." *Amaral v. Cintas Corp.*, 163
28 Cal.App.4th 1157, 1217-18 (2008). Here, Class Counsel undertook this litigation on a purely

1 contingency basis, thereby bearing the risk that they would only receive remuneration for the
2 substantial investment of time and resources and hours and costs expended if Plaintiff was
3 unsuccessful.

4 39. Here, Class Counsel undertook this litigation on a purely contingency basis, thereby
5 bearing the risk that they would only receive remuneration for the substantial investment of time and
6 resources and hours and costs expended if Plaintiff was unsuccessful.

7 40. Additionally, in taking this case on a purely contingency basis, Class Counsel had to turn
8 away other fee generating work because the case required Class Counsel to not only devote
9 considerable time and resources to effectively prosecute and settle this action, but also wait until the
10 Settlement is fully funded before finally being made whole. Now, having overcome the obstacles
11 surrounding Plaintiff's claims and negotiated an excellent result on behalf of the Settlement Class,
12 Class Counsel should be compensated with a fee award properly reflecting these efforts.

13 41. Here, Class Counsel negotiated a one-third contingency fee arrangement, which is a
14 reasonable arrangement to obtain competent counsel in the marketplace for representation in wage and
15 hour class actions of this nature, and it is only equitable that Settlement Class who share in the excellent
16 results achieved by this Settlement bear their pro rata share of the attorney's fees award to Class
17 Counsel. Moreover, this Court recently granted a one-third fee award in similar litigation. (*See Stovall*
18 *v. Javelin Logistics, Inc., supra, Ybarra v. Helzberg Diamond Shops, LLC, supra.*) ‘

19 42. Additionally, the quality of opposing counsel is also important in evaluating the quality
20 of the work done by Class Counsel. See, e.g., *In re Equity Funding Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 438 F. Supp.
21 1303, 1337 (C.D. Cal. 1977). Class Counsel were opposed in this litigation by counsel at O'Hagan
22 Meyer, who vigorously advocated on behalf of Defendant. In the face of such experienced opposition,
23 Class Counsel was able to develop an effective case strategy to combat Defendant's defenses and
24 negotiate with counsel for Defendant to settle the case for an amount that provides real benefit to the
25 Settlement Class with reasonable hours expended.

26
27
28 ///

1 **B. JCL LAW FIRM EXPERIENCE**

2 43. Class Counsel in this matter has extensive class action experience in multiple fields and
3 has represented tens-of-thousands of persons in class actions. Counsel has previously litigated similar
4 wage and hour class actions involving similar meal and rest period violations. Class Counsel has been
5 approved as class counsel in similar wage and hour class actions throughout the State of California,
6 including in the Superior Court for the County of Alameda. As such, courts throughout California have
7 deemed Class Counsel experienced and knowledgeable in this area of law. Class Counsel has
8 participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and has concluded the settlement is fair,
9 adequate, and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class.

10 44. Plaintiff is represented by competent and experienced counsel to pursue his claims. I
11 established the JCL Law Firm, APC (“Firm”), in 2010. The Firm is a boutique plaintiff firm
12 representing aggrieved employees and consumers throughout California in wage and hour class actions
13 and complex multi-party product liability matters. The Firm currently consists of myself, Jean-Claude
14 Lapuyade, Esq. (Partner/Owner), Sydney Castillo-Johnson, Esq. (Associate Attorney), John L. Nitti
15 (Associate Attorney), Perssia P. Razma (Associate Attorney), Tesla Stone (Senior Paralegal and Office
16 Manager), Jennifer Heming (Paralegal), Andrew Ward (Law Clerk), and Libia Ramirez (Secretary).

17 45. I have represented consumers and employees in California class actions, and complex
18 multi-party product liability actions exclusively for more than 17 years. I have been in practice as a
19 plaintiffs’ civil litigation attorney since April 2007.

20 46. I am qualified to represent the Plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved
21 Employees. I have extensive experience with wage and hour class and representative actions litigation
22 like this matter, and employment matters in general. My credentials are reflected in the JCL Law Firm,
23 APC, Firm Resume, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit “4.”** Some of the
24 major cases the Firm has undertaken are also set forth in **Exhibit “4.”**

25 47. Since 2010, I have successfully tried two (2) cases to conclusion, each resulting in a
26 favorable verdict for the firm’s clients.

27
28 ///

1 48. Finally, I have published appellate experience in *William Blanchette et al., v. The*
2 *Superior Court of Imperial County, (GHA Enterprises)*, 8 Cal.App.5th 521, *Duran v. EmployBridge*
3 *Holding Co. LLC* (2023) 92 Cal.App.5th 59.

4 49. Consequently, I was named to the prestigious Thomson Reuters, Super Lawyers, Rising
5 Star in 2015, 2016, 2017 and, again, in 2018. According to Thomson Reuters, the Super Lawyers, Rising
6 Star list recognizes the top 2.5% of eligible attorneys. (see
7 https://www.superlawyers.com/about/selection_process.html.)

8 50. Class Counsel were opposed in this litigation by counsel at Berger Kahn, A Law
9 Corporation, who vigorously advocated on behalf of Defendant. In the face of such experienced
10 opposition, Class Counsel was able to develop an effective case strategy to combat Defendant's
11 defenses and negotiate with counsel for Defendant to settle the case for an amount that provides real
12 benefit to the Settlement Class with reasonable hours expended.

13 C. COSTS

14 51. As of the filing of the Motion for Final Approval and Motion for Award of Class Counsel
15 Award and Service Award, collectively Class Counsel expended \$12,964.94 prosecuting this action.
16 The JCL Law Firm's costs are reflected in the attached **Exhibit "2"**. The Zakay Law Group, APLC's
17 costs are attached to the Declaration of Shani Zakay filed concurrently herewith.

18 52. All of Class Counsel's out-of-pocket expenses are the types of expenses normally charged
19 to paying clients including the following: filing fees; copying; telephone; postage; factual and legal
20 research charges; mediation fees; and expert costs, which were all incurred during, and were necessary
21 for the successful prosecution of the litigation and, thus, should be reimbursed.

22 53. Consequently, Class Counsel incurred a total of \$12,964.94 in expenses and costs
23 successfully prosecuting this action. Class Counsel now requests reimbursement for those incurred
24 litigation expenses and costs in the amount up to \$25,000.00 as provided for in the Agreement and
25 based upon Class Counsel's billing records.

26
27
28 ///

1 **D. PLAINTIFF’S SERVICE AWARD**

2 54. Regarding the amount of the requested award, courts frequently approve awards of
3 \$5,000.00 each or more. See *In re Cellphone*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 1380 (2010) (upholding \$10,000.00
4 service award to each of the four class representatives). The amount of the requested Service Award
5 to Plaintiff for \$10,000 is reasonable by reference to the amounts that California courts (both federal
6 and state) have repeatedly awarded in similar class action settlements. See *Baker v. LA. Fitness Int’l,*
7 *LLC*, No. BC438654 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Dec. 12, 2012) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement
8 payments to three of the named plaintiffs); *Blue v. Codwell Banker Residential Brokerage Co.*, No.
9 BC417335 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Mar. 21, 2011) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment);
10 *Buckmire v. Jo-Ann Stores, Inc.*, No. BC394795 (L.A. County Super. Ct. June 11, 2010) (awarding
11 \$10,000 enhancement payments to the named plaintiff); *Coleman v. Estes Express Lines, Inc.*, No.
12 BC429042 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Oct. 3, 2013) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Ethridge*
13 *v. Universal Health Services, Inc.*, No. BC391958 (L.A. County Super. Ct. May 27, 2011) (awarding
14 \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Hickson v. South Coast Auto Insurance Marketing, Inc.*, No.
15 BC390395 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Mar. 27, 2012) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Hill v.*
16 *Sunglass Hut Int’l, Inc.*, No. BC422934 (L.A. County Super. Ct. July 2, 2012) (awarding \$10,000
17 enhancement payments to the named plaintiffs); *Kabamba v. Victoria’s Secret Stores. LLC*, No.
18 BC368528 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Aug. 19, 2011) (awarding enhancement payments of \$ 10,000 to
19 the named plaintiffs along with additional compensation for their general release of claims); *Magee v.*
20 *American Residential Services, LLC*, No. BC423798 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Apr. 21, 2011) (awarding
21 \$15,000 enhancement payment); *Mares v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC*, No. BC375967
22 (L.A. County Super. Ct. June 24, 2010) (awarding \$15,000 enhancement payments to the named
23 plaintiffs); *Nevarez v. Trader Joe’s Co.*, No. BC373910 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Jan. 29, 2010)
24 (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Ordaz v. Rose Hills Mortuary, LP.*, No. BC386500 (L.A.
25 County Super. Ct. Mar. 19, 2010) (awarding 10,000 enhancement payments to the named plaintiffs);
26 *Sheldon v. AHMC Monterey Park Hospital LP*, No. BC440282 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Feb. 22, 2013)
27 (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Silva v. Catholic Moray Services, Inc.*, No. BC408054
28 (L.A. County Super. Ct. Feb. 8, 2011) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payments to the named

1 plaintiffs); *Weisbarth v. Banc West Investment Services, Inc.*, No. BC422202 (L.A. County Super. Ct.
2 May 24, 2013) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty LLC*,
3 No. BC360026 (LA. County Super. Ct. Mar. 7, 2013) (awarding \$25,000 enhancement payments to
4 the named plaintiffs); *Acheson v. Express, LLC*, No. 109CV135335 (Santa Clara County Super. Ct.
5 Sep. 13, 2011) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Aguiar v. Cingular Wireless. LLC*, No. CV
6 06-8197 DDP (AJWx) (C.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2011) (awarding \$14,767 enhancement payment); *Bejarano*
7 *v. Amerisave Mortgage Corp.*, No. EDCV 08-00599 SGL (Opx) (C.D. Cal. June 22, 2010) (awarding
8 \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Carbajal v. Sally Beauty Supply LLC*, No. CIVVS 1004307 (San
9 Bernardino Super. Ct. Aug. 6, 2012) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payments to the named
10 Plaintiffs); *Contreras v. Serco Inc.*, No. 10-cv-04526-CAS-JEMx (CD. Cal. Sep. 10, 2012) (awarding
11 \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Guerrero v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, No. RIC 10005196
12 (Riverside Super. Ct July 16, 2013) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); *Kisliuk v. ADT*
13 *Security Services, Inc.*, No. CV08-0324 DSF (RZx) (C.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2011) (awarding \$10,000
14 enhancement payment); *Morales v. BCBG Maxaria Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, No. JCCP 4582 (Orange
15 County Super. Ct Jan. 24, 2013) (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment); and *Barrett v. Doyon*
16 *Security Services, LLC*, Nos. BS900199, BS900517 (San Bernardino County Super. Ct. Apr. 23, 2010)
17 (awarding \$10,000 enhancement payment).

18 55. Further, after administering notice of this settlement, not one of the 82 Settlement Class
19 Members objected to the requested Service Award. Again, the unanimous consent favors the Court's
20 approval of the requested Service Award.

21 56. Equally important, the time, effort, and services provided to the Settlement Class justifies
22 the requested Service Award. The Class Representative performed his duties to the Settlement Class
23 admirably. Plaintiff worked extensively with Class Counsel over the course of the nineteen months of
24 investigation and litigation. For instance, Plaintiff also assisted with the review of documents,
25 preparation of pleadings, and location of witnesses. Similarly, Plaintiff searched, located, and produced
26 several documents in connection with the litigation and assisted Class Counsel in preparation of the
27 complaint and mediation brief.

28 ///

57. Additionally, Plaintiff remained available and responsive throughout the entire litigation to address all case needs. Plaintiff willingly came forward to protect and advance the rights of the Settlement Class on an important legal dispute affecting California employees. By way of example, Plaintiff assumed the serious risk of liability for Defendant's costs and potentially fees if the case was unsuccessful. Nevertheless, Plaintiff knowingly and voluntarily undertook the risk to vindicate the rights of the Settlement Class. Plaintiff reviewed the terms of the Settlement, including the Class Counsel Award and the Service Award.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 20th day of March, 2025, at San Diego, California.

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
Sydney Castillo Johnson (State Bar #343881)
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047
shani@zakaylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jose Ruelas

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

JOSE RUELAS, an individual, on behalf of
himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEA WEST SERVICES LLC, a California
limited liability company; and DOES 1-50,
Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 23CV038585

[Complaint Filed: July 17, 2023]

**STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF
CLASS AND PAGA ACTION CLAIMS
AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS**

1 This Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims is
2 entered into by and between Plaintiff Jose Ruelas (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), an individual, on behalf
3 of himself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, and in his representative capacity on behalf
4 of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees, and Defendant Sea West Coast Guard
5 Federal Credit Union (“Defendant”):

6 **I. DEFINITIONS**

- 7 A. “Action” means the putative class action lawsuit designated *Ruelas v. Sea West*
8 *Services LLC.*, Alameda Superior Court, Case No. 23CV038585, filed July 17, 2023.
- 9 B. “Agreement” or “Settlement Agreement” means this Stipulation of Settlement of
10 Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims.
- 11 C. “Aggrieved Employees” means all non-exempt employees who are or previously
12 were employed by Defendant and performed work in California during the PAGA
13 Period.
- 14 D. “Aggrieved Employee Payment” means the twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA
15 Payment (\$2,500.00) that will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as described
16 in this Agreement.
- 17 E. “Class” or the “Class Members” means all non-exempt employees who are or
18 previously were employed by Defendant and performed work in California during the
19 Class Period.
- 20 F. “Class Counsel” means Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. of JCL Law Firm, APC, and
21 Shani O. Zakay, Esq. of Zakay Law Group, APLC.
- 22 G. “Class Counsel Award” means the award of fees and expenses that the Court
23 authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the services they have rendered to Plaintiff,
24 the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees in the Action, consisting of
25 attorneys’ fees currently not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount
26 currently estimated to be \$98,166.67 out of \$294,500.00, plus costs of up to
27 \$25,000.00. Attorneys’ fees will be divided between Class Counsel in the following
28 percentages (50% to JCL Law Firm, APC, and 50% to Zakay Law Group, APLC.)

1 H. "Class Data" means information regarding Class Members that Defendant will in
2 good faith compile from its records and provide to the Settlement Administrator. It
3 shall be formatted as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and shall include: each Class
4 Member's full name; last known address; Social Security Number; start dates and end
5 dates of employment.

6 I. "Class Period" means the period beginning July 17, 2019, through August 18, 2024.

7 J. "Class Representative" means plaintiff Jose Ruelas.

8 K. "Court" means the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Alameda
9 currently presiding over the Action.

10 L. "Defendant" means Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union.

11 M. "Effective Date" means the first date upon which all of the following events have
12 occurred:

- 13 1. this Agreement has been executed by all Parties and by Class Counsel and
14 Defense Counsel;
- 15 2. the Court has preliminarily approved the Settlement;
- 16 3. notice has been properly given to Class Members, providing them an
17 opportunity to opt out of the Class and Settlement as described in this
18 Agreement;
- 19 4. the Court has held a Final Fairness and Approval Hearing and entered the
20 Final Order and Judgment approving the Settlement; and,
- 21 5. the later of: (a) the date sixty (60) days after the entry of the Final Order and
22 Judgment, if no motions for reconsideration and no appeals or other efforts to
23 obtain review have been filed; or (b) in the event that a motion for
24 reconsideration, an appeal or other effort to obtain review of the Final Order
25 and Judgment, the date sixty (60) days after such reconsideration, appeal or
26 review has been finally concluded. In this regard, it is the intention of the
27 Parties that the Effective Date of Settlement shall not be a date before the
28 Court's order approving the Settlement has become completely final, and

there is no timely recourse by any person who seeks to object to or otherwise contest the Settlement.

N. “Funding Date” means the date by which Defendant has paid the entire Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator in accord with the terms of this Agreement. Defendant will pay the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator sixty (60) days after the final approval order.

O. “Gross Settlement Amount” means Two Hundred Ninety-Four Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$294,500.00) that Defendant must pay into the QSF in connection with this Settlement, inclusive of the sum of Settlement Administration Costs, Class Counsel Award, Service Award, and the PAGA Payment. The Gross Settlement Amount is all-in with no reversion and *exclusive* of the employer’s share of payroll tax, if any, triggered by any payment under this Settlement.

P. “Individual Settlement Payments” means the amount payable from the Net Settlement Amount to each Settlement Class Member and excludes any amounts distributed to Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

Q. “LWDA” means the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

R. “LWDA Payment” means the seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment (\$7,500.00) payable to the to the LWDA.

S. “Net Settlement Amount” or “NSA” means the Gross Settlement Amount, less Class Counsel Award, Service Award, PAGA Payment, and Settlement Administration Costs.

T. “Notice Packet” means the Class Notice to be provided to the Class Members by the Settlement Administrator in the form set forth as **Exhibit A** to this Agreement (other than formatting changes to facilitate printing by the Settlement Administrator).

U. “Operative Complaint” means the Complaint filed by Plaintiff on July 17, 2024, in the Alameda Superior Court.

V. “PAGA” means the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

- 1 W. "PAGA Payment Ratio" means the respective Pay Periods during the PAGA Period
2 for each Aggrieved Employee divided by the total Pay Periods for all Aggrieved
3 Employees during the PAGA Period.
- 4 X. "PAGA Pay Periods," for purposes of calculating the distribution of the Aggrieved
5 Employee Payment, as defined herein, means the number of pay periods of
6 employment during the PAGA Period that each Aggrieved Employee worked in
7 California.
- 8 Y. "PAGA Period" means the period beginning May 12, 2022, through August 18, 2024.
- 9 Z. "PAGA Payment" means Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) to be
10 allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of PAGA Claims asserted
11 in the Action.
- 12 AA. "Parties" means Plaintiff and Defendant, collectively, and "Party" shall mean either
13 Plaintiff or Defendant, individually.
- 14 BB. "Payment Ratio" means the respective Workweeks for each Class Member divided
15 by the total Workweeks for all Class Members.
- 16 CC. "Plaintiff" means Jose Ruelas.
- 17 DD. "QSF" means the Qualified Settlement Fund established, designated, and maintained
18 by the Settlement Administrator to fund the Gross Settlement Amount.
- 19 EE. "Released Class Claims" means all class claims alleged, or reasonably could have
20 been alleged based on the facts alleged, in the Operative Complaint in the Action
21 which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims,
22 including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance,
23 disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the
24 Class Period.
- 25 FF. "Released PAGA Claims" means all PAGA claims alleged in Plaintiff's Amended
26 PAGA Notice to the LWDA which occurred during the PAGA Period, and expressly
27 excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination,
28

unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and
PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

GG. "Released Parties" means Defendant and its officers, directors, members, managers,
agents, representatives, attorneys, insurers, partners, investors, shareholders,
administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent corporations, subsidiaries,
joint venturers and related entities.

HH. "Response Deadline" means the date forty-five (45) calendar days after the Settlement
Administrator mails Notice Packets to Class Members and the last date on which
Class Members may submit requests for exclusion or objections to the Settlement.
Neither side shall encourage any Class Member to opt out.

II. "Service Award" means an award in the amount of \$10,000 or in an amount that the
Court authorizes to be paid to the Class Representative, in addition to his Individual
Settlement Payment and his individual Aggrieved Employee Payment, in recognition
of his efforts and risks in assisting with the prosecution of the Action.

JJ. "Settlement" means the disposition of the Action pursuant to this Agreement.

KK. "Settlement Administration Costs" shall mean the amount paid to the Settlement
Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount for administering the Settlement
pursuant to this Agreement currently estimated not to exceed \$3,500.00.

LL. "Settlement Administrator" means Apex Class Action LLC, located at 18 Technology
Drive, Suite 164, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800)-355-0700. The Settlement
Administrator establishes, designates, and maintains, as a QSF under Internal
Revenue Code section 468B and Treasury Regulation section 1.468B-1, into which
the amount of the Gross Settlement Amount is deposited for the purpose of resolving
the claims of Settlement Class Members. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain
the funds until distribution in an account(s) segregated from the assets of Defendant
and any person related to Defendants. *All accrued interest shall be paid and
distributed to the Settlement Class Members as part of their respective Individual
Settlement Payment.*

1 MM. "Settlement Class Members" or "Settlement Class" means all Class Members who
2 have not submitted a timely and valid request for exclusion as provided in this
3 Agreement.

4 NN. "Workweeks," for purposes of calculating the distribution of the Net Settlement
5 Amount, means the number of weeks of employment during the Class Period that
6 each Class Member performed any work for Defendant in California.

7 **II. RECITALS**

8 A. On May 12, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Violations with the Labor and Workforce
9 Development Agency (LWDA) and served the same on Defendant Sea West Services
10 LLC.

11 B. On July 17, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Class and Representative Action complaint in the
12 Alameda Superior Court, Case No. 23CV038585 (the "Action"), alleging claims for:

- 13 1. Unfair Competition in Violation of California Business & Professions Code
14 17200;
- 15 2. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages in Violation of California Labor Code 1194,
16 1197, & 1197.1;
- 17 3. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages in Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510,
18 *et seq*;
- 19 4. Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods in Violation of California Labor
20 Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order;
- 21 5. Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods In Violation Of Cal. Lab. Code §§
22 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order);
- 23 6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements in Violation of California
24 Labor Code 226;
- 25 7. Failure To Provide Wages When Due In Violation Of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201,
26 202 And 203;
- 27 8. Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses in Violation of
28 California Labor Code 2802;

1 9. Unpaid Sick Pay in Violation of California Labor Code 246;

2 10. Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act of Labor Code 2698.

3 C. On January 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Amended Notice of Violations with the LWDA
4 to add Defendant Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union as an additional
5 defendant.

6 D. On January 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amendment to the Class and Representative
7 Action complaint to add Defendant Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union as a
8 DOE Defendant.

9 E. The Class Representative believes he has claims based on alleged violations of the
10 California Labor Code, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and
11 that class certification is appropriate because the prerequisites for class certification
12 can be satisfied in the Action, and this action is manageable as a PAGA representative
13 action.

14 F. Defendant denies any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims
15 alleged in the Action, disputes any wages, damages and penalties claimed by the Class
16 Representative, alleged in the Operative Complaint, and/or alleged in the Class
17 Representative's PAGA notice to the LWDA are owed, and further contends that, for
18 any purpose other than settlement, the Action is not appropriate for class or
19 representative action treatment. Defendant contends, among other things, that at all
20 times it complied with the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare
21 Commission Wage Orders.

22 G. The Class Representative is represented by Class Counsel. Class Counsel investigated
23 the facts relevant to the Action, including conducting an independent investigation as
24 to the allegations, reviewing documents and information exchanged through informal
25 discovery, and reviewing documents and information provided by Defendant
26 pursuant to informal requests for information to prepare for mediation. Defendant
27 produced for the purpose of settlement negotiations certain employment data
28 concerning the Class, which Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed with the assistance

1 of an expert. Based on their own independent investigation and evaluation, Class
2 Counsel are of the opinion that the Settlement with Defendant is fair, reasonable, and
3 adequate, and is in the best interest of the Class considering all known facts and
4 circumstances, including the risks of significant delay, defenses asserted by
5 Defendant, uncertainties regarding class certification, and numerous potential
6 appellate issues. Although it denies any liability, Defendant agrees to this Settlement
7 solely to avoid the inconveniences and cost of further litigation. The Parties and their
8 counsel have agreed to settle the claims on the terms set forth in this Agreement.

9 H. On June 4, 2024, the Parties participated in mediation presided over by Brandon
10 McKelvey, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions.
11 The mediation concluded without a settlement. However, following the mediation,
12 each side, represented by its respective counsel, continued settlement negotiations,
13 with the assistance of Mediator McKelvey, until they agreed to settle the Action based
14 on Mediator McKelvey's settlement proposal, which was memorialized in the form
15 of a Memorandum of Understanding("MOU").

16 I. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any
17 other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties. This
18 Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims.
19 Nothing in this Agreement is intended or will be construed as an admission by
20 Defendant that the claims in the Action of Plaintiff or the Class Members have merit
21 or that Defendant bears any liability to Plaintiff or the Class on those claims or any
22 other claims, or as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Action
23 have merit.

24 J. The Parties believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The
25 Settlement was arrived at through arm's-length negotiations, considering all relevant
26 factors. The Parties recognize the uncertainty, risk, expense, and delay attendant to
27 continuing the Action through trial and any appeal. Accordingly, the Parties desire to
28

1 settle, compromise and discharge all disputes and claims arising from or relating to
2 the Action fully, finally, and forever.

3 K. The Parties agree to certification of the Class for purposes of this Settlement only. If
4 for any reason the settlement does not become effective, Defendant reserves the right
5 to contest certification of any class for any reason and reserve all available defenses
6 to the claims in the Action. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties'
7 willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on and will not be admissible in
8 connection with any litigation.

9 Based on these Recitals that are a part of this Agreement, the Parties agree as follows:

10 **III. TERMS OF AGREEMENT**

11 A. Settlement Consideration and Settlement Payments by Defendant.

12 1. Settlement Consideration. In full and complete settlement of the Action, and
13 in exchange for the releases set forth below, Defendant will pay the sum of
14 the Individual Settlement Payments, the Service Award, the Class Counsel
15 Award, PAGA Payment, and the Settlement Administration Costs, as
16 specified in this Agreement, equal to the Gross Settlement Amount of Two
17 Hundred Ninety-Four Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents
18 (\$294,500.00). The Parties agree that this is a non-reversionary Settlement and
19 that no portion of the Gross Settlement Amount shall revert to Defendant.
20 Other than the Defendant's share of employer payroll taxes and as provided
21 in Section III.A.4 below, Defendant shall not be required to pay more than the
22 Gross Settlement Amount.

23 2. Class Size. At the time of mediation, Defendant estimated that there are
24 approximately 84 Class Members who worked approximately 7,045
25 Workweeks during the Class Period. The Parties acknowledge and agree that
26 this data (and other information provided by Defendant for purposes of
27 mediation) was relied on to extrapolate and reach an arms-length negotiation
28 of Plaintiff's claims in the Action through the Class Period. Should the number

1 of workweeks increase by more than 10% of what was represented at the
2 mediation during the Class Period, the Gross Settlement Amount will increase
3 proportionally for the number of workweeks over 110% of 7,045 (i.e. the
4 number of workweeks in excess of 7,750 workweeks). For example, if the
5 total workweeks in the Class Period are 115% of 7,045, the Gross Settlement
6 Amount shall increase by 5%. Alternatively, if the total workweeks are over
7 110%, Defendant may elect to modify the Class Period end date so that the
8 total number of workweeks does not exceed 7,045.

9 3. Settlement Payment. Defendant shall deposit the Gross Settlement Amount
10 into the QSF, through the Settlement Administrator on or before the Funding
11 Date. Any interest accrued will be added to the NSA and distributed to the
12 Settlement Class Members except that if final approval is reversed on appeal,
13 then Defendants is entitled to prompt return of the principal and all interest
14 accrued.

15 4. Defendant's Share of Payroll Taxes. Defendant's share of employer side
16 payroll taxes is in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount and shall be paid
17 together with the Gross Settlement Amount on the Funding Date.

18 B. Release by Settlement Class Members. As of the Funding Date, in exchange for the
19 consideration set forth in this Agreement, Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members
20 release the Released Parties from the Released Class Claims for the Class Period.

21 C. Release by Plaintiff and the LWDA. As of the Funding Date, in exchange for the
22 consideration set forth in this Agreement, the Plaintiff, on behalf of the LWDA, and
23 the State of California, release the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims
24 for the PAGA Period.

25 D. Conditions Precedent: This Settlement will become final and effective only upon the
26 occurrence of all of the following events:

27 1. The Court enters an order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement;
28

2. The Court enters an order granting final approval of the Settlement and a Final Judgment;
3. If an objector appears at the final approval hearing, the time for appeal of the Final Judgment and Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement expires; or, if an appeal is timely filed, there is a final resolution of any appeal from the Judgment and Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement; and
4. Defendant fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount.

E. Nullification of Settlement Agreement. If the Court does not preliminarily or finally approve this Settlement Agreement, fails to become effective, or is reversed, withdrawn, or modified by the Court, or in any way prevents or prohibits Defendant from obtaining a complete resolution of the Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims, or if Defendant fails to fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount:

1. This Settlement Agreement shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative, or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural;
2. The conditional class certification (obtained for any purpose) shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative, or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural; and
3. None of the Parties to this Settlement will be deemed to have waived any claims, objections, defenses, or arguments in the Action, including with respect to the issue of class certification.

F. In the event that Defendant fails to fund the Gross Settlement Amount, Defendant shall bear the sole responsibility for any cost to issue or reissue any curative notice to the Settlement Class Members and all Settlement Administration Costs incurred to the date of nullification.

1 G. Certification of the Class. The Parties stipulate to conditional class certification of the
2 Class for the Class Period for purposes of settlement only. In the event that this
3 Settlement is not approved by the Court, fails to become effective, or is reversed,
4 withdrawn or modified by the Court, or in any way prevents or prohibits Defendant
5 from obtaining a complete resolution of the Released Class Claims and Released
6 PAGA Claims, the conditional class certification (obtained for any purpose) shall be
7 void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial,
8 administrative or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue,
9 substantive or procedural.

10 H. Tax Liability. The Parties make no representations as to the tax treatment or legal
11 effect of the payments called for, and Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees are
12 not relying on any statement or representation by the Parties in this regard. Class
13 Members and/or Aggrieved Employees understand and agree that they will be
14 responsible for the payment of any taxes and penalties assessed on the Individual
15 Settlement Payments and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved
16 Employee Payment described and will be solely responsible for any penalties or other
17 obligations resulting from their personal tax reporting of Individual Settlement
18 Payments and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee
19 Payment.

20 I. Circular 230 Disclaimer. Each Party to this Agreement (for purposes of this section,
21 the "acknowledging party" and each Party to this Agreement other than the
22 acknowledging party, an "other party") acknowledges and agrees that: (1) no provision
23 of this Agreement, and no written communication or disclosure between or among the
24 Parties or their attorneys and other advisers, is or was intended to be, nor shall any
25 such communication or disclosure constitute or be construed or be relied upon as, tax
26 advice within the meaning of United States Treasury Department circular 230 (31 CFR
27 part 10, as amended); (2) the acknowledging party (a) has relied exclusively upon his,
28 her or its own, independent legal and tax counsel for advice (including tax advice) in

1 connection with this Agreement, (b) has not entered into this Agreement based upon
2 the recommendation of any other Party or any attorney or advisor to any other Party,
3 and (c) is not entitled to rely upon any communication or disclosure by any attorney
4 or adviser to any other party to avoid any tax penalty that may be imposed on the
5 acknowledging party, and (3) no attorney or adviser to any other Party has imposed
6 any limitation that protects the confidentiality of any such attorney's or adviser's tax
7 strategies (regardless of whether such limitation is legally binding) upon disclosure by
8 the acknowledging party of the tax treatment or tax structure of any transaction,
9 including any transaction contemplated by this Agreement.

10 J. Preliminary Approval Motion. Class Counsel shall draft and file the motion for
11 preliminary approval within a reasonable time of execution of this Agreement, or
12 within the statutory timeframe as determined by the Court's setting of the preliminary
13 approval hearing, which shall include this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff will provide
14 Defendant with a draft of the Motion at least 3 business days prior to the filing of the
15 Motion to give Defendant an opportunity to propose changes or additions to the
16 Motion.

17 K. Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for:
18 establishing and administering the QSF; calculating, processing and mailing payments
19 to the Class Representative, Class Counsel, LWDA and Class Members; printing and
20 mailing the Notice Packets to the Class Members as directed by the Court; receiving
21 and reporting the objections and requests for exclusion; calculating, deducting and
22 remitting all legally required taxes from Individual Settlement Payments and
23 distributing tax forms for the Wage Portion, the Penalties Portion and the Interest
24 Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments and/or Aggrieved Employees'
25 individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment; processing and mailing tax
26 payments to the appropriate state and federal taxing authorities; providing
27 declaration(s) as necessary in support of preliminary and/or final approval of this
28 Settlement; and other tasks as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the

1 Settlement Administrator to perform. The Settlement Administrator shall keep the
2 Parties timely apprised of the performance of all Settlement Administrator
3 responsibilities by among other things, sending a weekly status report to the Parties'
4 counsel stating the date of the mailing, the of number of opt outs from the Settlement
5 it receives (including the numbers of valid and deficient), and number of objections
6 received.

7 L. Notice Procedure.

8 1. Class Data. No later than ten (10) days after Preliminary Approval is granted,
9 Defendant shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data for
10 purposes of preparing and mailing Notice Packets to the Class Members.

11 2. Notice Packets.

12 a) The Notice Packet shall contain the Notice of Class Action Settlement
13 in a form substantially similar to the form attached as **Exhibit A**. The
14 Notice of Class Action Settlement shall inform Class Members and
15 Aggrieved Employees that they need not do anything in order to
16 receive an Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved
17 Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment
18 and to keep the Settlement Administrator apprised of their current
19 mailing address, to which the Individual Settlement Payments and/or
20 Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee
21 Payment will be mailed following the Funding Date. The Notice of
22 Class Action Settlement shall set forth the release to be given by all
23 members of the Class who do not request to be excluded from the
24 Settlement Class and/or Aggrieved Employees in exchange for an
25 Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved Employees'
26 individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, the number of
27 Workweeks worked by each Class Member during the Class Period,
28 and number of PAGA Periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee

1 during the PAGA Period, if any, and the estimated amount of their
2 Individual Settlement Payment if they do not request to be excluded
3 from the Settlement and each Aggrieved Employees' share of the
4 Aggrieved Employee Payment, if any. The Settlement Administrator
5 shall use the Class Data to determine Class Members' Workweeks and
6 PAGA Pay Periods. The Notice will also advise the Aggrieved
7 Employees that they will release the Released PAGA Claims and will
8 receive their share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment regardless of
9 whether they request to be excluded from the Settlement.

10 b) The Notice Packet's mailing envelope shall include the following
11 language: "IMPORTANT LEGAL DOCUMENT- YOU MAY BE
12 ENTITLED TO PARTICIPATE IN A CLASS ACTION
13 SETTLEMENT; A PROMPT REPLY TO CORRECT YOUR
14 ADDRESS IS REQUIRED AS EXPLAINED IN THE ENCLOSED
15 NOTICE."

16 3. Notice by First Class U.S. Mail. Upon receipt of the Class Data, the Settlement
17 Administrator will perform a search based on the National Change of Address
18 Database to update and correct any known or identifiable address changes.
19 No later than twenty-one (21) calendar days after preliminary approval of the
20 Settlement, the Settlement Administrator shall mail copies of the Notice
21 Packet to all Class Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail and electronic
22 mail. The Settlement Administrator shall exercise its best judgment to
23 determine the current mailing address for each Class Member. The address
24 identified by the Settlement Administrator as the current mailing address shall
25 be presumed to be the best mailing address for each Class Member.

26 4. Undeliverable Notices. Any Notice Packets returned to the Settlement
27 Administrator as non-delivered on or before the Response Deadline shall be
28 re-mailed to any forwarding address provided within seven (7) days of

1 receiving the returned notice. If no forwarding address is provided, the
2 Settlement Administrator shall promptly attempt to determine a correct
3 address by lawful use of skip-tracing, or other search using the name, address
4 and/or Social Security number of the Class Member involved, and shall then
5 perform a re-mailing, if another mailing address is identified by the Settlement
6 Administrator. In addition, if any Notice Packets, which are addressed to Class
7 Members who are currently employed by Defendant, are returned to the
8 Settlement Administrator as non-delivered and no forwarding address is
9 provided, the Settlement Administrator shall notify Defendant. Defendant will
10 request that the currently employed Class Member provide a corrected address
11 and transmit to the Settlement Administrator any corrected address provided
12 by the Class Member. Class Members who received a re-mailed Notice
13 Packet shall have their Response Deadline extended fifteen (15) days from the
14 original Response Deadline.

15 5. Disputes Regarding Individual Settlement Payments. Class Members will
16 have the opportunity, should they disagree with Defendant's records regarding
17 the start and end dates of employment, to provide documentation and/or an
18 explanation to show contrary dates. If there is a dispute, the Settlement
19 Administrator will consult with the Parties to determine whether an
20 adjustment is warranted. The Settlement Administrator shall determine the
21 eligibility for, and the amounts of, any Individual Settlement Payments under
22 the terms of this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator's determination
23 of the eligibility for and amount of any Individual Settlement Payment shall
24 be binding upon the Class Member and the Parties.

25 6. Disputes Regarding Administration of Settlement. Any disputes not resolved
26 by the Settlement Administrator concerning the administration of the
27 Settlement will be resolved by the Court under the laws of the State of
28 California. Before any such involvement of the Court, counsel for the Parties

1 will confer in good faith to resolve the disputes without the necessity of
2 involving the Court.

- 3 7. Exclusions. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice
4 Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to exclude themselves from
5 the Settlement must submit a written request for exclusion to the Settlement
6 Administrator by the Response Deadline. The written request for exclusion
7 must state that the Class Member wishes to exclude himself or herself from
8 the Settlement and (1) must contain the name, address, and the last four digits
9 of the Social Security number of the person requesting exclusion; (2) must be
10 signed by the Class Member; (3) must be postmarked or fax stamped by the
11 Response Deadline and returned to the Settlement Administrator at the
12 specified address or fax telephone number; and (4) contain a typewritten or
13 handwritten notice stating in substance that he or she wishes to be excluded
14 from the settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled *Ruelas v Sea West*
15 *Services LLC.*, currently pending in Superior Court of Alameda, Case No.
16 23CV038585 . The request for exclusion will not be valid if it is not timely
17 submitted, if it is not signed by the Class Member, or if it does not contain the
18 name and address and last four digits of the Social Security number of the
19 Class Member. The date of the postmark on the mailing envelope or fax stamp
20 on the request for exclusion shall be the exclusive means used to determine
21 whether the request for exclusion was timely submitted. Any Class Member
22 who submits a timely request for exclusion shall be excluded from the
23 Settlement Class will not be entitled to an Individual Settlement Payment and
24 will not be otherwise bound by the terms of the Settlement or have any right
25 to object, appeal or comment thereon. However, any Class Member that
26 submits a timely request for exclusion that is also a member of the Aggrieved
27 Employees will still receive his/her pro rata share of the PAGA Payment, as
28 specified below. . Settlement Class Members who fail to submit a valid and

1 timely request for exclusion on or before the Response Deadline shall be
2 bound by all terms of the Settlement and any final judgment entered in this
3 Action if the Settlement is approved by the Court. No later than twenty-one
4 (21) calendar days after the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator
5 shall provide counsel for the Parties with a final list of the Class Members
6 who have timely submitted timely requests for exclusion. At no time shall any
7 of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage members
8 of the Class to submit requests for exclusion from the Settlement

9 8. Defendant's Right to Withdraw. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion
10 identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 15% of the total of all Class Members,
11 Defendant may, but is not obligated, elect to withdraw from the Settlement.
12 The Parties agree that, if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void
13 ab initio, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have
14 any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however,
15 Defendant will remain responsible for paying all Administration Expenses
16 incurred as of the date Defendant makes this election to withdraw. Defendant
17 must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw not later
18 than 7 days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense
19 Counsel. Invalid Requests for Exclusion will have no effect on this threshold
20 for an election.

21 9. Objections. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice
22 Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to object to the Settlement
23 may submit to the Settlement Administrator a written statement of objection
24 ("Notice of Objection") by the Response Deadline. The postmark date of
25 mailing shall be deemed the exclusive means for determining that a Notice of
26 Objection was served timely. The Notice of Objection, if in writing, must be
27 signed by the Settlement Class Member and state: (1) the case name and
28 number; (2) the name of the Settlement Class Member; (3) the address of the

1 Settlement Class Member; (4) the last four digits of the Settlement Class
2 Member's Social Security number; (5) the basis for the objection; and (6) if
3 the Settlement Class Member intends to appear at the Final
4 Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing. Settlement Class Members who fail
5 to make objections in writing in the manner specified above may still make
6 their objections orally at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing with
7 the Court's permission. Settlement Class Members will have a right to appear
8 at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing to have their objections
9 heard by the Court regardless of whether they submitted a written objection.
10 At no time shall any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise
11 encourage Class Members to file or serve written objections to the Settlement
12 or appeal from the Order and Final Judgment. Class Members who submit a
13 written request for exclusion may not object to the Settlement. Class Members
14 may not object to the PAGA Payment.

15 M. Allocation of the Gross Settlement Amount.

- 16 1. Calculation of Individual Settlement Payments. Individual Settlement
17 Payments shall be paid from the Net Settlement Amount and shall be paid
18 pursuant to the formula set forth herein. Using the Class Data, the Settlement
19 Administrator shall add up the total number of Workweeks for all Class
20 Members. The respective Workweeks for each Class Member will be divided
21 by the total Workweeks for all Class Members, resulting in the Payment Ratio
22 for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will then be
23 multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's
24 estimated Individual Settlement Payments. Each Individual Settlement
25 Payment will be reduced by any legally mandated employee tax withholdings
26 (e.g., employee payroll taxes, etc.). Individual Settlement Payments for Class
27 Members who submit valid and timely requests for exclusion will be
28 redistributed to Settlement Class Members who do not submit valid and timely

requests for exclusion on a pro rata basis based on their respective Payment Ratios.

2. Calculation of Individual Payments to the Aggrieved Employees. Using the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator shall add up the total number of PAGA Pay Periods for all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period. The respective PAGA Pay Periods for each Aggrieved Employees will be divided by the total PAGA Pay Periods for all Aggrieved Employees, resulting in the “PAGA Payment Ratio” for each Aggrieved Employee. Each Aggrieved Employee’s PAGA Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by the Aggrieved Employee Payment to calculate each Aggrieved Employee’s estimated share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment.

3. Allocation of Individual Settlement Payments. For tax purposes, Individual Settlement Payments shall be allocated and treated as 20% wages (“Wage Portion”) and 80% penalties and pre-judgment interest (“Penalties and Interest Portion.”) The Wage Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form W-2 and the Penalties and Interest Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form 1099 issued by the Settlement Agreement.

4. Allocation of Aggrieved Employee Payments. For tax purposes, Aggrieved Employee Settlement Payments shall be allocated and treated as 100% penalties and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099.

5. No Credit Toward Benefit Plans. The Individual Settlement Payments and individual shares of the PAGA Payment made to Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees under this Settlement Agreement, as well as any other payments made pursuant to this Settlement Agreement, will not be utilized to calculate any additional benefits under any benefit plans to which any Class Members may be eligible, including, but not limited to profit-sharing plans, bonus plans, 401(k) plans, stock purchase plans, vacation plans,

1 sick leave plans, PTO plans, and any other benefit plan. Rather, it is the
2 Parties' intention that this Settlement Agreement will not affect any rights,
3 contributions, or amounts to which any Class Members may be entitled under
4 any benefit plans.

5 6. All monies received by Settlement Class Members under the Settlement which
6 are attributable to wages shall constitute income to such Settlement Class
7 Members solely in the year in which such monies are received by the Settlement
8 Class Members. It is the intent of the Parties that Individual Settlement
9 Payments and individual shares of the PAGA Payment provided for in this
10 Settlement agreement are the sole payments to be made by Defendant to
11 Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees in connection with this
12 Settlement Agreement, with the exception of Plaintiff, and that the Settlement
13 Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees are not entitled to any new or
14 additional compensation or benefits as a result of having received the Individual
15 Settlement Payments and/or their shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment.

16 7. Mailing. Individual Settlement Payments and Aggrieved Employee Payments
17 shall be mailed by regular First-Class U.S. Mail to Settlement Class Members'
18 and/or Aggrieved Employees' last known mailing address no later than fifteen
19 (15) days after the Funding Date.

20 8. Expiration. Any checks issued to Settlement Class Members and Aggrieved
21 Employees shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180)
22 days from the date of their issuance. If a Settlement Class Member and/or
23 Aggrieved Employee does not cash his or her settlement check within ninety
24 (90) days, the Settlement Administrator will send a letter to such persons,
25 advising that the check will expire after the 180th day, and invite that
26 Settlement Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee to request reissuance
27 in the event the check was destroyed, lost, or misplaced. In the event an
28 Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual

1 share of the PAGA Payment check has not been cashed within one hundred
2 and eighty (180) days, all funds represented by such uncashed checks, plus
3 any interest accrued thereon, shall be transmitted to the Children's Advocacy
4 Institute (CAI) in accordance with CCP 384.

5 9. Service Award. In addition to the Individual Settlement Payment as a
6 Settlement Class Member and his individual share of the Aggrieved Employee
7 Payment, Plaintiff will apply to the Court for an award of not more than
8 \$10,000.00, as the Service Award. Defendant will not oppose a Service
9 Award of not more than \$10,000.00 for Plaintiff. The Settlement
10 Administrator shall pay the Service Award, either in the amount stated herein
11 if approved by the Court or some other amount as approved by the Court, to
12 Plaintiff from the Gross Settlement Amount no later than fifteen (15) calendar
13 days after the Funding Date. Any portion of the requested Service Award that
14 is not awarded to the Class Representative shall be part of the Net Settlement
15 Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members as provided in
16 this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099
17 — MISC to Plaintiff for his Service Award. Plaintiff shall be solely and
18 legally responsible to pay any and all applicable taxes on his Service Award
19 and shall hold harmless the Released Parties from any claim or liability for
20 taxes, penalties, or interest arising as a result of the Service Award. Approval
21 of this Settlement shall not be conditioned on Court approval of the requested
22 amount of the Service Award. If the Court reduces or does not approve the
23 requested Service Award, Plaintiff shall not have the right to revoke the
24 Settlement, and it will remain binding.

25 10. Class Counsel Award. Defendant understands, and will not oppose, a motion
26 for Class Counsel Award not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement
27 Amount currently estimated to be Ninety-Eight Thousand One Hundred Sixty
28 Six Dollars and Sixty Seven Cents (\$98,166.67) **and** reimbursable litigation

1 expenses supported by declaration up to and not to exceed Twenty-Five
2 Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00). Any awarded Class Counsel
3 Award shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Any portion of the
4 requested Class Counsel Award that is not awarded to Class Counsel shall be
5 part of the Net Settlement Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class
6 Members as provided in this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall
7 allocate and pay the Class Counsel Award to Class Counsel from the Gross
8 Settlement Amount no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Funding
9 Date. Class Counsel shall be solely and legally responsible to pay all
10 applicable taxes on the payment made pursuant to this paragraph. The
11 Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 — MISC to Class
12 Counsel for the payments made pursuant to this paragraph. If the Court
13 reduces or does not approve the requested Class Counsel Award, Plaintiff and
14 Class Counsel shall not have the right to revoke the Settlement, or to appeal
15 such order, and the Settlement will remain binding.

- 16 11. PAGA Payment. Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00) shall be
17 allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of claims for civil
18 penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA
19 Payment”). The Settlement Administrator shall pay seventy-five percent
20 (75%) of the PAGA Payment (\$7,500) to the California Labor and Workforce
21 Development Agency no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the
22 Effective Date (hereinafter “LWDA Payment”). Twenty-five percent (25%)
23 of the PAGA Payment (\$2,500) will be distributed to the Aggrieved
24 Employees as described in this Agreement (hereinafter “Aggrieved Employee
25 Payment”). For purposes of distributing the PAGA Payment to the Aggrieved
26 Employees, each Aggrieved Employee shall receive their pro-rata share of the
27 Aggrieved Employee Payment using the PAGA Payment Ratio as defined
28 above.

12. Settlement Administration Costs. The Settlement Administrator shall be paid for the costs of administration of the Settlement from the Gross Settlement Amount. The estimate of the Settlement Administration Costs is \$3,500.00. The Settlement Administrator shall be paid the Settlement Administration Costs no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date.

N. Final Approval Motion. Class Counsel and Plaintiff shall use best efforts to file with the Court a Motion for Order Granting Final Approval and Entering Judgment, within twenty-eight (28) days following the expiration of the Response Deadline, which motion shall request final approval of the Settlement and a determination of the amounts payable for the Service Award, the Class Counsel Award, the PAGA Payment, and the Settlement Administration Costs. Plaintiff will provide Defendant with a draft of the Motion at least three (3) business days prior to the filing of the Motion to give Defendant an opportunity to propose changes or additions to the Motion.

1. Declaration by Settlement Administrator. No later than seven (7) days after the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall submit a declaration in support of Plaintiff's motion for final approval of this Settlement detailing the number of Notice Packets mailed and re-mailed to Class Members, the number of undeliverable Notice Packets, the number of timely requests for exclusion, the full names of any Class Members who opt out of the Settlement, the number of objections received, the amount of the average, lowest, and highest Individual Settlement Payments, the amount of the average, lowest, and highest Aggrieved Employee Payments, the Settlement Administration Costs, and any other information as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the Settlement Administrator to provide.

2. Final Approval Order and Judgment. Class Counsel shall present an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement to the Court for its

1 approval, and Judgment thereon, at the time Class Counsel files the Motion
2 for Final Approval.

3 N. Review of Motions for Preliminary and Final Approval. Class Counsel will provide
4 an opportunity for Counsel for Defendant to review the Motions for Preliminary and
5 Final Approval, including the Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action
6 Settlement, and Judgment at least three (3) business days in advance of filing with the
7 Court. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best
8 efforts to affect the Court's approval of the Motions for Preliminary and Final
9 Approval of the Settlement, and entry of Judgment.

10 O. Cooperation. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use
11 their best efforts to implement the Settlement.

12 P. Interim Stay of Proceedings. The Parties agree to stay all proceedings in the Action,
13 except such proceedings necessary to implement and complete the Settlement, pending
14 the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing to be conducted by the Court.

15 Q. Amendment or Modification. This Agreement may be amended or modified only by
16 a written instrument signed by counsel for all Parties or their successors-in-interest.

17 R. Entire Agreement. This Agreement and any attached Exhibit constitute the entire
18 Agreement among these Parties, and no oral or written representations, warranties or
19 inducements have been made to any Party concerning this Agreement or its Exhibit
20 other than the representations, warranties and covenants contained and memorialized
21 in this Agreement and its Exhibit.

22 S. Authorization to Enter into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and
23 represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate
24 this Agreement and to take all appropriate Action required or permitted to be taken by
25 such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other
26 documents required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The persons signing
27 this Agreement on behalf of Defendant represents and warrants that he/she is
28 authorized to sign this Agreement on behalf of Defendant. Plaintiff represents and

warrants that he is authorized to sign this Agreement and that he has not assigned any claim, or part of a claim, covered by this Settlement to a third-party.

T. No Public Comment: The Parties and their counsel agree that they will not issue any press releases, initiate any contact with the press, respond to any press inquiry, or have any communication with the press about the fact, amount, or terms of the Settlement Agreement. Class Counsel further agrees not to use the Settlement Agreement or any of its terms for any marketing or promotional purposes. Nothing herein will restrict Class Counsel from including publicly available information regarding this settlement in future judicial submissions regarding Class Counsel's qualifications and experience. Further, Class Counsel will not include, reference, or use the Settlement Agreement for any marketing or promotional purposes, either before or after the Motion for Preliminary Approval is filed.

U. Binding on Successors and Assigns. This Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors or assigns of the Parties, as previously defined.

V. California Law Governs. All terms of this Agreement and the Exhibit and any disputes shall be governed by and interpreted according to the laws of the State of California.

W. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. All executed counterparts and each of them shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument provided that counsel for the Parties to this Agreement shall exchange among themselves copies or originals of the signed counterparts.

X. This Settlement Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable. The Parties believe this Settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of this Action and have arrived at this Settlement after extensive arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, present and potential.

Y. Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that the Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to the interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the terms of this Agreement and all orders and judgments entered in connection therewith, and the Parties and their counsel submit to the jurisdiction of the Court for purposes of

1 interpreting, implementing and enforcing the settlement and all orders and judgments
2 entered in connection with this Agreement.

3 Z. Invalidity of Any Provision. Before declaring any provision of this Agreement invalid,
4 the Court shall first attempt to construe the provisions valid to the fullest extent
5 possible consistent with applicable precedents so as to define all provisions of this
6 Agreement valid and enforceable.

7 AA. Waiver of Certain Appeals. The Parties agree to waive appeals and to stipulate to class
8 certification for purposes of this settlement only.

9 BB. No Admissions by the Parties. Plaintiff has claimed and continues to claim that the
10 Released Class Claims and Released PAGA Claims have merit and give rise to liability
11 on the part of Defendant. Defendant claims that the Released Class Claims and
12 Released PAGA Claims have no merit and do not give rise to liability. This Agreement
13 is a compromise of disputed claims. Nothing contained in this Agreement and no
14 documents referred to and no action taken to carry out this Agreement may be
15 construed or used as an admission by or against the Defendant or Plaintiff or Class
16 Counsel as to the merits or lack thereof of the claims asserted. Other than as may be
17 specifically set forth herein, each Party shall be responsible for and shall bear its/his
18 own attorney's fees and costs.

1 IT IS SO AGREED, FORM AND CONTENT, BY PLAINTIFF:

2 DATED: 09/27/2024



Jose Ruelas (Sep 27, 2024 08:22 PDT)

3

4

JOSE RUELAS

5

IT IS SO AGREED, FORM AND CONTENT, BY DEFENDANT:

6

7

DATED: _____

8

SEA WEST COAST GUARD FEDERAL CREDIT
UNION

9

10

Printed Name

11

12

Title

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 IT IS SO AGREED, FORM AND CONTENT, BY PLAINTIFF:

2 DATED: 09/27/2024


Jose Ruelas (Sep 27, 2024 08:22 PDT)

3
4 JOSE RUELAS

5 IT IS SO AGREED, FORM AND CONTENT, BY DEFENDANT:

6
7 DATED: 9/27/24


SEA WEST COAST GUARD FEDERAL CREDIT
UNION

9
10
11 Printed Name

Tom Doherty
President/CEO
12 Title

1 IT IS SO AGREED AS TO FORM BY COUNSEL:
2

3 DATED: 09/27/2024

JCL LAW FIRM, A.P.C.

4 By: 
5

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class
7 Members
8

9 DATED: 09/27/2024

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

10 By: 
11

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class
13 Members
14

15
16
17 DATED: 9/27/2024

O'HAGAN MEYER

18 By: 
19

20 Anthony Oceguera. Esq.
21 Attorney for Defendant
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

**NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT
AND FINAL HEARING DATE**

(Jose Ruelas v. Sea West Services LLC, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. 23CV038585)

**YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS MAY BE AFFECTED WHETHER YOU ACT OR DO NOT ACT. PLEASE
READ THIS NOTICE CAREFULLY.**

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT:	
Do Nothing and Receive a Payment	To receive a cash payment from the Settlement, you do not have to do anything. Your estimated Individual Settlement Payment is: \$<< [REDACTED] >>. See the explanation below. After final approval by the Court, the payment will be mailed to you at the same address as this notice. If your address has changed, please notify the Settlement Administrator as explained below. In exchange for the settlement payment, you will release claims against the Defendant as detailed below.
Exclude Yourself	If you wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator as provided below. If you request exclusion, you will receive no money from the Settlement. Instructions are set forth below.
Object	You may write to the Court about why you believe the settlement should not be approved. Directions are provided below.

1. Why did I get this Notice?

A proposed class action settlement (the “Settlement”) of this lawsuit pending in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Alameda (the “Court”) has been reached between Plaintiff Jose Ruelas (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union (“Defendant”). The Court has granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. **You may be entitled to receive money from this Settlement.**

You have received this Class Notice because you have been identified as a member of the Class, which is defined as:

All non-exempt employees who are or previously were employed by Defendant and performed work in California at any time during the period from July 17, 2019, to August 18, 2024 (“Class Period”).

This Class Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights. It is important that you read this Notice carefully as your rights may be affected by the Settlement.

2. What is this class action lawsuit about?

On May 12, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Violations with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) and served the same on Defendant Sea West Services LLC. On July 17, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Class and Representative Action Complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Alameda. Plaintiff asserted claims against Defendant for: (1) Unfair Competition in Violation of California Business & Professions Code 17200; (2) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages in Violation of California Labor Code 1194, 1197 & 1197.1; (3) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages in Violation of California Labor Code 510; (4) Failure

to Provide Required Meal Periods in Violation of California Labor Code 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (5) Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods in Violation of California Labor Code 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements in Violation of California Labor Code 226; (7) Failure to Provide Wages When Due in Violation of California Labor Code 201, 202 & 203; (8) Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses in Violation of California Labor Code 2802; (9) Unpaid Sick Pay in Violation of California Labor Code 246; and (10) Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act Labor Code 2698. On January 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Amended Notice of Violations with the LWDA to add Defendant Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union as an additional defendant. On January 16, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amendment to the Class and Representative Action complaint to add Defendant Sea West Coast Guard Federal Credit Union as a DOE Defendant.

Defendant expressly denies any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action, disputes any wages, damages and penalties claimed by the Class Representative are owed, and further contends that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is not appropriate for class or representative action treatment. Defendant contends, among other things, that at all times it complied with the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders.

On June 4, 2024, the Parties participated in mediation presided over by Brandon McKelvey, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. The mediation concluded without a settlement. However, following the mediation, each side, represented by its respective counsel, continued settlement negotiations, with the assistance of Mediator McKelvey, until they agreed to settle the Action. The Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement on <<INSERT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL DATE>>. At that time, the Court also preliminarily approved the Plaintiff to serve as the Class Representative, and the law firms of JCL Law Firm, APC, and Zakay Law Group, APLC to serve as Class Counsel.

3. What are the terms of the Settlement?

Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant has agreed to pay an “all in” amount of Two Hundred Ninety-Four Thousand Five Hundred Dollars and Zero Cents (\$294,500.00) (the “Gross Settlement Amount”) to fund the settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount includes the payment of all Individual Settlement Payments, Settlement Administration Costs, Class Counsel Award, Service Award, and the PAGA Payment.

After the Judgment becomes Final, Defendant will pay the Gross Settlement Amount by depositing the money with the Settlement Administrator. “Final” means the date the Judgment is no longer subject to appeal, or if an appeal is filed, the date the appeal process is completed, and the Judgment is affirmed.

Amounts to be Paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The Settlement provides for certain payments to be made from the Gross Settlement Amount, which will be subject to final Court approval, and which will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount before settlement payments are made to Class Members, as follows:

- Settlement Administration Costs. Payment to the Settlement Administrator, estimated not to exceed \$3,500.00 for expenses, including expenses of sending this Notice, processing opt outs, and distributing settlement payments.
- Class Counsel Award. Payment to Class Counsel of an award of attorneys’ fees of no more than 1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently \$98,166.67) and actually incurred litigation expenses of not more than \$25,000 for all expenses incurred as documented in Class Counsel’s billing records, both subject to Court approval. Class Counsel have been prosecuting the Action on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and have been paying all litigation costs and expenses.

- Service Award. A Service Award of up to Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,00.00) to Plaintiff, or such lesser amount as may be approved by the Court, to compensate him for his services on behalf of the Class in initiating and prosecuting the Action, and for the risks he undertook.
- PAGA Payment. A payment of \$10,000.00 relating to Plaintiff's claim under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), \$7,500.00 of which will be paid to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the remaining \$2,500.00 will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees as part of the PAGA Payment.
- Calculation of Payments to Settlement Class Members. After all the above payments of the court-approved Class Counsel Award, the Service Award, the PAGA Payment, and the Settlement Administration Costs are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, called the "Net Settlement Amount," shall be distributed to class members who do **not** request exclusion ("Settlement Class Members"). The Individual Settlement Payment for each Settlement Class Member will be calculated by dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of workweeks for all Settlement Class Members that occurred during the Class Period and multiplying the result by each individual Settlement Class Member's workweeks that occurred during the Class Period. A "workweek" is defined as a normal seven-day week of work during the Class Period in which, according to Defendant's records, a member of the class worked at least one-day during any such workweek.
- Calculation of Aggrieved Employees Payments to Aggrieved Employees. The PAGA Payment shall be distributed to Aggrieved Employees irrespective of whether they exclude themselves or opt-out. The PAGA Payment will be divided by the total number of pay periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period, and then taking that number and multiplying it by the number of pay periods worked by each respective Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. "Aggrieved Employee" means all non-exempt employees who are of previously were employed by Defendant and performed work in California at any time during the period from May 12, 2022, to August 18, 2024 ("PAGA Period").

If the Settlement is approved by the Court, you will automatically be mailed a check for your Individual Settlement Payment to the same address as this Class Notice. You do not have to do anything to receive a payment. If your address has changed, you must contact the Settlement Administrator to inform them of your correct address to ensure you receive your payment.

Tax Matters. Twenty percent (20%) of each Individual Settlement Payment is allocated to wages. Taxes are withheld from this amount, and each Settlement Class Member will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form W-2 for such payment. Eighty percent (80%) of each Individual Settlement Payment is allocated to penalties and pre-judgment interest ("Penalties and Interest Portion"). Each Settlement Class Member will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form 1099 for the Penalties and Interest Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments. In addition, no taxes will be withheld from the PAGA Payment paid to Aggrieved Employees, and each Aggrieved Employee will be issued an Internal Revenue Service Form 1099 for such payment. Neither Class Counsel nor Defendant's counsel intend anything contained in this Settlement to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability. You may wish to consult a tax advisor concerning the tax consequences of the payments received under the Settlement.

No Credit Toward Benefit Plans. The Individual Settlement Payments and Aggrieved Employee Payments made to Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees under this Settlement Agreement, as well as any other payments made pursuant to this Settlement Agreement, will not be utilized to calculate any additional benefits under any benefit plans to which any Class Members may be eligible, including, but not limited to profit-sharing plans, bonus plans, 401(k) plans, stock purchase plans, vacation plans, sick leave plans, PTO plans, and any other benefit plan. Rather, it is the Parties' intention that this Settlement Agreement will not affect any rights, contributions, or amounts to which any Class Members may be entitled under any benefit plans.

Conditions of Settlement. This Settlement is conditioned upon the Court entering an order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering judgment.

4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?

Released Claims. Upon entry of final judgment and funding in full of the Gross Settlement Amount by Defendant, Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members shall release all Released Class Claims that occurred during the Class Period as to the Released Parties. Released Class Claims means all class claims alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged, in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the Class Period.

As of the Effective Date and upon funding of the Gross Settlement Amount by Defendant, Plaintiff, on behalf of the LWDA, and the State of California shall release all Released PAGA Claims, irrespective of whether they opted-out of the class settlement and will be bound by this PAGA Release (the "PAGA Release"). "Released PAGA Claims" means all PAGA claims alleged in Plaintiff's Amended PAGA Notice to the LWDA which occurred during the PAGA Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

This means that, if you do not timely and formally exclude yourself from the settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendant about the legal issues resolved by this Settlement. It also means that all of the Court's orders in this Action will apply to you and legally bind you.

5. How much will my payment be?

Defendant's records reflect that you have << ____ >> Workweeks worked during the Class Period (July 17, 2019, through August 18, 2024).

Based on this information, your estimated Individual Settlement Payment is << ____ >>.

Defendant's records reflect that you have << ____ >> pay periods worked during the PAGA Period (May 12, 2022, through August 18, 2024).

Based on this information, your estimated Aggrieved Employee Payment is << ____ >>.

If you wish to challenge the information set forth above, then you must submit a written, signed dispute challenging the information along with supporting documents, to the Settlement Administrator at the address provided in this Notice no later than _____ [forty-five (45) days after the Notice or fifteen (15) days after the re-mailed Notice].

6. How can I get a payment?

To get money from the settlement, you do not have to do anything. A check for your settlement payment will be mailed automatically to the same address as this Notice. If your address is incorrect or has changed, you must notify the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator is: Apex Class Action Settlement Administration.

The Court will hold a hearing on _____ to decide whether to finally approve the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement and there are no objections or appeals, payments will be mailed within a few

months after this hearing. If there are objections or appeals, resolving them can take time, perhaps more than a year. Please be patient. After entry of the Judgment, the Settlement Administrator will provide notice of the final judgment to the Class Members by posting a copy of the Judgment on the administrator's website at <https://apexclassaction.com/>.

7. What if I don't want to be a part of the Settlement?

If you do not wish to participate in the Settlement, you may exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out." **If you opt out, you will receive NO money from the Settlement, and you will not be bound by its terms, except as provided as follows.**

To opt out, you must submit to the Settlement Administrator, by First Class Mail, a written, signed and dated request for exclusion postmarked no later than _____. The address for the Settlement Administrator is 18 Technology Drive, Suite 164, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800) 355-0700. The request for exclusion must state in substance that the Class Member has read the Class Notice and that he or she wishes to be excluded from the settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled *Jose Ruelas v Sea West Services LLC*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV038585. The request for exclusion must contain your name, address, signature and the last four digits of your Social Security Number for verification purposes. The request for exclusion must be signed by you. No other person may opt out for a member of the Class.

Written requests for exclusion that are postmarked after _____, or are incomplete or unsigned will be rejected, and those Class Members will remain bound by the Settlement and the release described above.

8. How do I tell the Court that I would like to challenge the Settlement?

Any Class Member who has not opted out and believes that the Settlement should not be finally approved by the Court for any reason, may object to the proposed Settlement. Objections may be in writing and state the Class Member's name, current address, telephone number, and describe why you believe the Settlement is unfair and whether you intend to appear at the final approval hearing. All written objections or other correspondence must also state the name and number of the case, which is ***Jose Ruelas v Sea West Services LLC, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV038585***. You may also object without submitting a written objection by appearing at the final approval hearing scheduled as described in Section 9 below.

To object to the Settlement, you cannot opt out. If the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by the terms of the Settlement in the same way as Class Members who do not object. Any Class Member who does not object in the manner provided in this Class Notice shall have waived any objection to the Settlement, whether by appeal or otherwise.

Written objections must be delivered or mailed to the Settlement Administrator no later than _____. The address for the Settlement Administrator is 18 Technology Drive, Suite 164, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800) 355-0700.

The addresses for the Parties' counsel are as follows:

Class Counsel:

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
JCL Law Firm, APC
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel.: (619) 599-8292
Fax: (619) 599-2891

Class Counsel:

Shani O. Zakay, Esq.
Zakay Law Group, APLC
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel: (619) 599-8292
Fax: (619) 599-8291

E-Mail: jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

Email: shani@zakaylaw.com

Counsel for Defendant:

Anthony Oceguela, Esq.

O'Hagan Meyer

One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2100

San Francisco, CA 94111

Tel: 916-884-0752

E-Mail: aocceguela@ohaganmeyer.com

9. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at 00:00 AM/PM on _____, at the Alameda County Superior Court, Department 21, located at 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612 before Judge Noel Wise. At this hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The purpose of this hearing is for the Court to determine whether to grant final approval to the Settlement. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. The Court will listen to people who have made a timely written request to speak at the hearing or who appear at the hearing to object. This hearing may be rescheduled by the Court without further notice to you. **You are not required to attend** the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing.

10. How do I get more information about the Settlement?

You may call the Settlement Administrator at 1-800-355-0700 or write to *Jose Rsuelas v Sea West Services LLC, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 23CV038585*, Settlement Administrator, c/o Apex Class Action Settlement Administration _____.

This notice summarizes the proposed settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You may receive a copy of the Settlement Agreement, the Final Judgment or other Settlement documents by writing to JCL Law firm, APC, 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600, San Diego, CA 92121 or by visiting the administrator's website at <https://apexclassaction.com/>

PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.

IMPORTANT:

- You must inform the Settlement Administrator of any change of address to ensure receipt of your settlement payment.
- Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed. In such event, the Settlement Administrator shall pay all funds from such uncashed checks to the Children's Advocacy Institute (CAI) a Cy Pres. If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Settlement Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

EXHIBIT 2

JCL Law Firm

Transaction Report

All Dates

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	NUM	NAME	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
Ruelas v. Sea West (002-469)						
05/13/2023	Expense		LWDA		75.00	75.00
05/31/2023	Journal Entry	May 2023 Postage		Copies for May 2023	0.20	75.20
05/31/2023	Journal Entry	May 2023 Postage		Postage for May 2023	10.44	85.64
07/20/2023	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order Number: 20811268 - Filing Fee Re: Complaint, Summons, Civil Case Cover Sheet	1,497.82	1,583.46
07/31/2023	Journal Entry	July 2023 Postage		Copies for July 2023	0.10	1,583.56
08/31/2023	Journal Entry	August 2023 Postage		Copies for August 2023	0.30	1,583.86
10/04/2023	Check	3453	Knox Attorney Services, Inc.	Inv. 4412026	127.55	1,711.41
10/31/2023	Journal Entry	Oct. 2023 Postage		Postage for October 2023	13.96	1,725.37
10/31/2023	Journal Entry	Oct. 2023 Postage		Copies for October 2023	16.20	1,741.57
11/02/2023	Check	3507	Knox Attorney Services, Inc.	Inv. 4416728	127.55	1,869.12
11/06/2023	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order Number: 21574908 - Filing Fee Re: Case Management Statement	20.49	1,889.61
11/30/2023	Journal Entry	Nov. 2023 Postage		Copies for November 2023	0.30	1,889.91
11/30/2023	Journal Entry	Nov. 2023 Postage		Postage for November 2023	17.06	1,906.97
12/04/2023	Check	3549	Knox Attorney Services, Inc.	Inv. 4417831	507.55	2,414.52
12/19/2023	Expense		Alameda Court		3.00	2,417.52
12/19/2023	Expense		Alameda Court		3.00	2,420.52
12/29/2023	Expense		LWDA		75.00	2,495.52
12/31/2023	Journal Entry	Dec. 2023 Postage		Copies for December 2023	0.20	2,495.72
01/17/2024	Expense		Alameda Court		2.00	2,497.72
01/19/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order Number: 22016827 - Filing Fee Re: Amendment to Complaint, Case Management Statement, Proof of Service	22.55	2,520.27
01/31/2024	Journal Entry	Jan. 2024 Postage		Copies for January 2024	0.50	2,520.77
02/03/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order Number: 22137837 - Filing Fee Re: Stipulation and Order, Proof of Service	43.14	2,563.91
02/05/2024	Check	3669	McKelvey Resolution	Inv. 5160	3,375.00	5,938.91
02/29/2024	Journal Entry	Feb 2024 Postage		Postage for February 2024	0.64	5,939.55
04/04/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order No. 22595768 - Filing Fee Re: Case Management Statement, Proof of Service	22.55	5,962.10
04/26/2024	Expense		Alameda Court		2.00	5,964.10
04/30/2024	Journal Entry	April 2024 Postage		Copies for April 2024	0.20	5,964.30
05/03/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order No. 22800824 - Stipulation and Order, Proof of Service	43.14	6,007.44

DATE	TRANSACTION TYPE	NUM	NAME	MEMO/DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	BALANCE
05/31/2024	Journal Entry	May 2024 Postage		Copies for May 2024	0.20	6,007.64
06/25/2024	Check	3867	Berger Consulting Group	Inv. 11792	1,700.00	7,707.64
06/30/2024	Journal Entry	June 2024 Copies		June 2024 Copies	0.40	7,708.04
07/19/2024	Expense		Superior Court of Alameda		1.00	7,709.04
07/31/2024	Journal Entry	July 2024 Copies		Copies for July 2024	0.20	7,709.24
10/18/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order No. 23955412 - Filing Fee Re: Memorandum of Points & Authorities, Declaration, Order, Proof of Service	85.59	7,794.83
10/31/2024	Journal Entry	October 2024 Postage		October 2024 Postage	15.51	7,810.34
10/31/2024	Journal Entry	October 2024 Printing		October 2024 Printing	0.90	7,811.24
11/15/2024	Expense		Alameda Court		8.00	7,819.24
11/30/2024	Journal Entry	Nov 2024 Copies		November 2024 Copies	0.20	7,819.44
12/12/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order No. 24314058 - Filing Fee Re: Stipulation and Order, Proof of Service	44.29	7,863.73
12/18/2024	Expense		One Legal LLC	One Legal Order No. 24349122 - Filing Fee Re: Case Management Statement, Proof of Service	22.61	7,886.34
12/20/2024	Expense		Alameda Court		3.00	7,889.34
12/31/2024	Journal Entry	Dec 2024 Copies		December 2024 Copies	0.60	7,889.94
Total for Ruelas v. Sea West (002-469)					\$7,889.94	
TOTAL					\$7,889.94	

EXHIBIT 3

JCL Law Firm
Unbilled Time
Activity: All Dates

Activity Date	Posting	Employee	Memo/Description	Rate	Duration	Amount	Balance
Ruelas v. Sea West (002-469)							
10/31/2023	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Emails re service	450.00	0.4	180.00	180.00
11/06/2023	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Client call	450.00	0.7	315.00	495.00
11/09/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Pleadings - R&R Answer	700.00	1	700.00	1,195.00
11/28/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Fact Investigation - R&R Employee File for PLA Rosten	700.00	3	2,100.00	3,295.00
12/12/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Belaire	700.00	0.4	280.00	3,575.00
12/13/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Emails to/from OC Re Mediation	700.00	0.4	280.00	3,855.00
12/13/2023	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Discovery - review DEF SI responses and emails re Belaire and M&C	450.00	0.8	360.00	4,215.00
12/28/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Pleadings - Drafted, Revied and Edited LWDA Notice	700.00	3.5	2,450.00	6,665.00
12/28/2023	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Pleadings - review and revise compl. for add'l PLA	450.00	0.8	360.00	7,025.00
12/29/2023	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Emails to/from OC Re Mediation	700.00	0.3	210.00	7,235.00
12/29/2023	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Pleadings - emails with OC re add'l PLA	450.00	0.3	135.00	7,370.00
01/02/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re mediator and dates	450.00	0.3	135.00	7,505.00
01/03/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Emails to/from OC Re Mediation	700.00	0.4	280.00	7,785.00
01/03/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re date	450.00	0.2	90.00	7,875.00
01/05/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Emails to/from OC Re Mediation	700.00	0.4	280.00	8,155.00
01/05/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re mediator and date	450.00	0.3	135.00	8,290.00
01/11/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Pleadings- drafted DOE amendment	425.00	0.6	255.00	8,545.00
01/11/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Pleadings- drafted ICMS	425.00	0.5	212.50	8,757.50
01/11/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Pleadings- drafted amended PAGA letter	425.00	1	425.00	9,182.50
01/11/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - emails re joint ICMS, review OC additions to ICMS, review named DEF and docs	450.00	1.4	630.00	9,812.50
01/12/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - emails re PAGA and call with OC summary	450.00	0.4	180.00	9,992.50
01/16/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Emails to/from OC Re Joint CMS	700.00	0.3	210.00	10,202.50
01/16/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - emails re CMS, DOE amendments, amended PAGA	450.00	0.9	405.00	10,607.50
01/17/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - emails re CMC	450.00	0.4	180.00	10,787.50
01/25/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Stip to Stay	700.00	0.5	350.00	11,137.50
01/29/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re confirmation date	450.00	0.1	45.00	11,182.50
01/30/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Stip to Stay	700.00	0.3	210.00	11,392.50
01/30/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re stip and data demand	450.00	0.7	315.00	11,707.50
01/31/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re stip	450.00	0.1	45.00	11,752.50
02/02/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - draft and revise client update email; emails re stip	450.00	0.6	270.00	12,022.50
02/21/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel re PAGA/arb agreement	425.00	0.3	127.50	12,150.00
03/19/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Internal email re mediation data deadline	250.00	0.1	25.00	12,175.00
03/26/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Internal email re mediation	250.00	0.1	25.00	12,200.00

03/26/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re mediation data production	425.00	0.2	85.00	12,285.00
04/03/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email to OC re ICMS M&C	250.00	0.2	50.00	12,335.00
04/03/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review, finalize, file, and serve Joint ICMS.	250.00	0.8	200.00	12,535.00
04/03/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Client update.	250.00	0.5	125.00	12,660.00
04/03/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Save and serve conformed Joint CMS.	250.00	0.3	75.00	12,735.00
04/03/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re CMS draft/reviewed CMS	425.00	1	425.00	13,160.00
04/03/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - R&R joint ISCM, emails re joint ISCM	450.00	0.6	270.00	13,430.00
04/17/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email to OC re mediation data	250.00	0.1	25.00	13,455.00
04/17/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re mediation data	425.00	0.2	85.00	13,540.00
04/24/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review and save court's CMO re MCC. Serve on OC. Calendaring.	250.00	0.6	150.00	13,690.00
04/26/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re mediation data	425.00	0.3	127.50	13,817.50
04/29/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review and save Defendant's mediation data. Email to expert.	250.00	0.6	150.00	13,967.50
04/29/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/expert re mediation data	425.00	0.2	85.00	14,052.50
04/29/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re mediation data	425.00	0.5	212.50	14,265.00
04/30/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Mediation Data	700.00	0.4	280.00	14,545.00
04/30/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email to OC re stip to vacate MCC	250.00	0.3	75.00	14,620.00
04/30/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re stip to vacate	425.00	0.4	170.00	14,790.00
05/01/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Pleadings - Revised and Edited Stip to Vacate MCC	700.00	0.4	280.00	15,070.00
05/01/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review LR's. Review, finalize, file, and serve stip to vacate MCC.	250.00	0.7	175.00	15,245.00
05/08/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Check docket for confirmed order to cont. MCC	250.00	0.1	25.00	15,270.00
05/14/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review and save conformed order cont. MCC deadline. Calendaring. Serve on OC.	250.00	0.6	150.00	15,420.00
05/14/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Pleadings- reviewed stip to vacate/continue mcc	425.00	0.2	85.00	15,505.00
05/21/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC and Expert Re Data Issues	700.00	0.4	280.00	15,785.00
05/21/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with expert.	250.00	0.3	75.00	15,860.00
05/21/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re data	425.00	0.3	127.50	15,987.50
05/21/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - meeting re mediation, expert, DEF's production and brief	450.00	0.2	90.00	16,077.50
05/22/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Data Analysis Questions	700.00	0.6	420.00	16,497.50
05/23/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re demographics	450.00	0.3	135.00	16,632.50
05/24/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review and save demographics. Send to expert.	250.00	0.3	75.00	16,707.50
05/24/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel/expert re data	425.00	0.6	255.00	16,962.50
05/24/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re data	425.00	0.2	85.00	17,047.50
05/24/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re data	425.00	0.5	212.50	17,260.00
05/24/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re expert report, claims, and add'l data	450.00	1	450.00	17,710.00
05/28/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from Expert Re Data Analysis and Damage Report	700.00	0.8	560.00	18,270.00
05/28/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - Drafted, Revised and Edited Mediation Brief	700.00	3.9	2,730.00	21,000.00
05/28/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review, finalize, and submit mediation brief.	250.00	0.5	125.00	21,125.00
05/28/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- reviewed mediation brief	425.00	0.5	212.50	21,337.50
05/28/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re expert report	450.00	0.2	90.00	21,427.50
05/29/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with mediator's office.	250.00	0.2	50.00	21,477.50
06/04/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Mediation - Attended Mediation	700.00	8	5,600.00	27,077.50

06/05/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management- emails w/ co-counsel re mediation	425.00	0.3	127.50	27,205.00
06/05/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Mediation - emails re mediation summary and proposal	450.00	0.5	225.00	27,430.00
06/07/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Client update.	250.00	0.5	125.00	27,555.00
06/07/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case management - emails re client update	450.00	0.2	90.00	27,645.00
06/11/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/mediation - emails w/ co-counsel re mediation/mcc	425.00	0.2	85.00	27,730.00
06/21/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with client	250.00	0.1	25.00	27,755.00
06/25/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Revised and Edited MOU and Emails to/from OC Re Same	700.00	1	700.00	28,455.00
06/25/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- drafted MOU	425.00	0.7	297.50	28,752.50
07/01/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re MTC Extension	700.00	0.3	210.00	28,962.50
07/01/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Review calendaring. Email corres. with OC re MTC	250.00	0.2	50.00	29,012.50
07/08/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with client.	250.00	0.1	25.00	29,037.50
07/10/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- reviewed oc changes to MOU	425.00	0.3	127.50	29,165.00
07/12/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC Re MOU	700.00	0.4	280.00	29,445.00
07/12/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Client update.	250.00	0.6	150.00	29,595.00
07/12/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/settlement- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re MOU	425.00	1	425.00	30,020.00
07/12/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Case management/Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel re MOU	425.00	0.7	297.50	30,317.50
07/12/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review mediator's proposal; emails re MOU and terms of settlement	450.00	2.1	945.00	31,262.50
07/16/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC Re Terms of MOU	700.00	0.4	280.00	31,542.50
07/17/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC Re MOU	700.00	0.3	210.00	31,752.50
07/17/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with OC re MOU. Call with client.	250.00	0.4	100.00	31,852.50
07/18/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC Re MOU	700.00	0.4	280.00	32,132.50
07/18/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Calendaring.	250.00	0.8	200.00	32,332.50
07/18/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with OC re MOU.	250.00	0.2	50.00	32,382.50
07/18/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement/case management- emails w/ co-counsel/oc re MOU, MPA dates	425.00	0.7	297.50	32,680.00
07/18/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails re MOU	450.00	0.6	270.00	32,950.00
08/19/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- SAR draft	425.00	1.5	637.50	33,587.50
08/26/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review and revise SAR	450.00	1	450.00	34,037.50
08/30/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- revisions to SAR	425.00	0.5	212.50	34,250.00
09/06/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with OC re settlement agreement.	250.00	0.2	50.00	34,300.00
09/12/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Defense Revisions to SAR and Emails to/from OC Re Same	700.00	1.6	1,120.00	35,420.00
09/12/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- reviewed Def revisions to SAR	425.00	0.5	212.50	35,632.50
09/12/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review OC revisions to SAR; emails re the same	450.00	0.8	360.00	35,992.50
09/13/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement- emails w/ co-counsel re def redlines to SAR	425.00	0.7	297.50	36,290.00
09/21/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with settlement admin re declaration.	250.00	0.2	50.00	36,340.00
09/23/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Settlement emails w/ co-counsel/oc re redlines to SAR	425.00	0.6	255.00	36,595.00
09/23/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review OC revisions to SAR; emails re the same	450.00	1	450.00	37,045.00
09/27/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with OC re settlement agreement.	250.00	0.3	75.00	37,120.00
09/27/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails re SAR	450.00	0.3	135.00	37,255.00
09/30/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Email to/from OC RE SAR	700.00	0.4	280.00	37,535.00
09/30/2024	No	Jennifer Heming	Email corres. with OC re WW count & class size	250.00	0.2	50.00	37,585.00

10/02/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC RE SAR	700.00	0.3	210.00	37,795.00
10/04/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - Legal Research for MPA (Range of Reasonableness Cases)	700.00	2.1	1,470.00	39,265.00
10/08/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - emails re MPA papers	450.00	0.7	315.00	39,580.00
10/09/2024	No	Perssia Razma	Law and Motion- MPA draft	425.00	3	1,275.00	40,855.00
10/09/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - emails re MPA	450.00	0.4	180.00	41,035.00
10/10/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - Revised and Edited MPA	700.00	1	700.00	41,735.00
10/10/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - emails re MPA	450.00	0.4	180.00	41,915.00
10/30/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - emails re notice of abandonment	450.00	0.2	90.00	42,005.00
11/07/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and motion - R&R COurt's tentative Re MPA	700.00	0.5	350.00	42,355.00
11/18/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from Admin Re Timeline	700.00	0.5	350.00	42,705.00
11/18/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - Emails to/from OC Re MOPA Order	700.00	0.4	280.00	42,985.00
11/19/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from Admin Re Order and Settlement Agreement Questions	700.00	0.7	490.00	43,475.00
11/19/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails re executed SAR	450.00	0.3	135.00	43,610.00
11/21/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review SAR and admin timeline; emails approving timeline	450.00	0.4	180.00	43,790.00
11/25/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - Emails to/from OC Re Class Data to Admin	700.00	0.4	280.00	44,070.00
12/02/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - emails to/from Admin and OC Re Class Data	700.00	0.5	350.00	44,420.00
12/02/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - follow up with OC re class data	450.00	0.2	90.00	44,510.00
12/03/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review admin timeline; emails re DEF's production of class data	450.00	0.4	180.00	44,690.00
12/04/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Discovery - Emails to/from OC Re Class Data	700.00	0.5	350.00	45,040.00
12/05/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails to admin re class data	450.00	0.2	90.00	45,130.00
12/06/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails with OC re class data production	450.00	0.1	45.00	45,175.00
12/09/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - emails to OC re class data production	450.00	0.3	135.00	45,310.00
12/10/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Updated admin timeline and emails to/from admin re same	700.00	0.5	350.00	45,660.00
12/10/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - review and revise stip to vacate MCC; emails re the same	450.00	0.7	315.00	45,975.00
12/11/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - emails to OC re stip to vacate	450.00	0.2	90.00	46,065.00
12/12/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - emails re stip to vacate MCC	450.00	0.2	90.00	46,155.00
12/17/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Case Management - Drafted, Revised and Edited Joint CMS and emails to/from OC Re Same	700.00	1.1	770.00	46,925.00
12/17/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	notice	450.00	1.3	585.00	47,510.00
12/18/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review admin timeline; emails re mailing class notice	450.00	0.4	180.00	47,690.00
12/19/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - review notice of reassignment; emails re the same	450.00	0.3	135.00	47,825.00
12/23/2024	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Admin Report and Emails to/from Admin Re Same	700.00	0.2	140.00	47,965.00
12/23/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review weekly report	450.00	0.2	90.00	48,055.00
12/24/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - Review Court's order re MCC	450.00	0.2	90.00	48,145.00
12/30/2024	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review weekly admin report	450.00	0.2	90.00	48,235.00
01/06/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Admin Report and Emails to/from Admin Re Report	700.00	0.4	280.00	48,515.00
01/06/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - review weekly admin report; emails re CMC	450.00	0.3	135.00	48,650.00
01/13/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Admin Report	700.00	0.2	140.00	48,790.00
01/13/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review weekly admin report; emails re the same	450.00	0.2	90.00	48,880.00
01/20/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review weekly admin report	450.00	0.1	45.00	48,925.00
01/27/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Settlement - R&R Admin Report and emails to/from admin re non deliverable notices	700.00	0.7	490.00	49,415.00

01/27/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - Review weekly admin report	450.00	0.2	90.00	49,505.00
02/06/2025	No	Johnny Niiti	Communications -- Review and analyze email re next steps with admin.	450.00	0.1	45.00	49,550.00
02/06/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - emails re admin dec and response deadline	450.00	0.2	90.00	49,640.00
02/14/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Case Management - emails re client update	450.00	0.3	135.00	49,775.00
02/19/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Settlement - review and revise client update email	450.00	0.4	180.00	49,955.00
03/03/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Legal Research - MFA standards and requirements	450.00	1.8	810.00	50,765.00
03/03/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - draft MFA P&As, proposed order/judgement	450.00	4.5	2,025.00	52,790.00
03/07/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - Revised and edited P&As and supporting documents for MFA and drafted JCL Dec. ISO	700.00	2.5	1,750.00	54,540.00
03/10/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - revised and edited P&As ISO motion for fees and drafted JCL dec. ISO	700.00	1.8	1,260.00	55,800.00
03/12/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and Motion - emails to/from OC Re MFA	700.00	0.3	210.00	56,010.00
03/14/2025	No	Jean Claude Lapuyade	Law and motion - emails to/from OC Re MPA	700.00	0.4	280.00	56,290.00
03/14/2025	No	Sydney Castillo-Johnson	Law and Motion - review and revise motion for fees	450.00	1	450.00	56,740.00
				106.7 \$		56,740.00	

Friday, Mar 14, 2025 12:44:30 PM GMT-7

EXHIBIT 4

JCL LAW FIRM, APC
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Tel: (619) 599-8292
Fax: (619) 599-8291

FIRM RESUME

Areas of Practice: Employee Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation, and Unlawful Housing Practices.

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.
California Bar Number 248676
Founding Partner

Biography:

Mr. Lapuyade is a San Diego based labor and employment attorney representing aggrieved California employees and the victims of unlawful housing practices throughout the State of California. Mr. Lapuyade's litigation practice focuses on representing California employees in wage and hour class actions for unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, and misclassification, wrongful termination cases and tenants in unlawful housing class actions. Mr. Lapuyade prides himself on providing his clients with aggressive, attentive and result driven representation through the litigation process, trial and arbitration. Since 2007, Mr. Lapuyade successfully recovered in excess of \$200 million in monetary awards for his clients.

Mr. Lapuyade served as co-editor of the Insurance Column for Consumer Attorneys of San Diego from 2011 to 2014. As editor, Mr. Lapuyade was responsible for publishing monthly articles in the Trial Bar News periodical analyzing complex insurance coverage issues. Mr. Lapuyade is a four-time recipient of the Super Lawyers Rising Star by Thomson Reuters. To be eligible for inclusion in Rising Stars, a candidate must be either 40 years old or younger or in practice for 10 years or less. While up to 5 percent of the lawyers in a state are named to Super Lawyers, no more than 2.5 percent are named to Rising Stars.

Bar Admissions:

- California
- U.S. District Court Southern District of California
- U.S. District Court Central District of California
- U.S. District Court Eastern District of California
- U.S. District Court Northern District of California

Professional Associations:

- California Employment Lawyers Association, 2007 to Present
- Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, 2007 to 2020
- American Bar Association, Section of Litigation, Member, 2007 to 2020
- American Bar Association, Labor & Employment Section, Member, 2007 to 2020
- American Bar Association, Tort, Trial & Insurance Section, Member, 2007 to 2020
- California Bar Association, Labor & Employment Section, Member, 2007 to Present
- California Bar Association, Litigation Section, Member, 2007 to Present

Education:

- **California Western School of Law**
 - J.D. - 2006
 - Honors: Deans Merit Scholarship, California Western School of Law 2005 - 2006
- **University of Arizona**
 - B.A. - 2001
 - Major: History

Honors:

- Super Lawyers Rising Star, Thomson Reuters, 2015 - 2018
- Distinguished Advocate Award for Outstanding Oral Advocacy, 2005 - 2006

Monnett De La Torre, Esq.
California Bar Number 272884
Senior Associate

Biography:

Ms. De La Torre is a San Diego and Ventura County based labor and employment attorney representing aggrieved California employees throughout the State of California. Ms. De La Torre's litigation practice focuses on representing California employees in wage and hour class and representative actions for unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, misclassification, penalties, and wrongful termination cases. Ms. De La Torre has extensive experience handling internal workplace investigations. Ms. De La Torre has handled matters before the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Department of Labor.

Ms. De La Torre is a two-time recipient of the Super Lawyers Rising Star by Thomas Reuters. To be eligible for inclusion in Rising Stars, a candidate must be either 40 years old or younger or in practice for 10 years or less. While up to five percent of the lawyers in a state are named to Super Lawyers, no more than 2.5 percent are named to Rising Stars.

Bar Admissions:

- California
- U.S. District Court Southern District of California

Professional Associations:

- California Employment Lawyers Association, 2022 to Present
- Consumer Attorneys of San Diego, 2010-2015
- American Bar Association, Labor & Employment Section, Member, 2015 to Present
- California Bar Association, Labor & Employment Section, Member, 2015 to Present
- San Diego La Raza Lawyers Association, 2010-2015
- Ventura County Bar Association, 2015-Present
- Women Lawyers of Ventura County, 2015-Present

Education:

- **New England School of Law**
 - J.D.- 2010
 - Honors:
 - Dean's List Consecutive years
- **University of California, San Diego**
 - B.A.- 2006
 - Major: Economics
 - Minor: Latin American Studies

Honors:

- Super Lawyers Rising Star, Thomson Reuters, 2021 and 2022
- Pacific Cost Business Times, "Top 40 under 40" Award
- Daily Transcripts "Top Young Attorney: nominee, consecutive years"

Sydney Castillo-Johnson, Esq.

California Bar Number 343881

Associate Attorney

Biography:

Ms. Castillo-Johnson is a San Diego based labor and employment attorney representing California employees throughout the state of California. Ms. Castillo-Johnson's litigation practice focuses on representing current and former employees in wage and hour class actions for unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, misclassification, and wrongful termination.

Ms. Castillo-Johnson volunteered her time at California Western School of Law first as a student intern and later as a student manager with the Community Law Project which offers legal services to the low-income community of San Diego.

Education:

- **California Western School of Law**
 - J.D.- 2022
 - Honors:
 - Dean's Honor List: Spring 2021, Fall 2021
 - Public Service Honor Society Fall 2021
 - 3L Academic Merit Scholarship
 - Dean's Diversity, Service, and Leadership Scholarship
 - Activities: Community Law Project Student Manager
- **Azusa Pacific University**
 - B.A. – 2018
 - Major: Criminal Justice

Andrea Amaya, Esq.

California Bar Number 348080

Associate Attorney

Biography:

Ms. Amaya is a San Diego based labor and employment attorney representing employees throughout the state of California. Ms. Amaya represents current and former employees in wage and hour class actions for unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, misclassification, and wrongful termination.

Ms. Amaya earned a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from San Diego State University. Thereafter, Ms. Amaya earned her Juris Doctorate from California Western School of Law. While in law school, Ms. Amaya spent her time volunteering with various nonprofit organizations such as the Immigration Justice Project and Access, Inc.

Education:

- **California Western School of Law**
 - J.D. - 2021
- **San Diego State University**
 - B.A.
 - Honors: Dean's List
 - Honors: With Distinction

Perssia Razma, Esq.

California Bar Number 351398

Associate Attorney

Biography:

Ms. Razma is a San Diego based labor and employment attorney representing California employees throughout the state of California. Ms. Razma's litigation practice focuses on representing current and former employees in wage and hour class actions for unpaid wages, missed meal and rest breaks, misclassification, and wrongful termination.

Perssia was born and raised in Los Angeles, California. She earned a Bachelor of Arts in 2020 at San Diego State University in Psychology. In 2023, Perssia earned her Juris Doctor from the University of San Diego School of Law.

Education:

- **University of San Diego School of Law**
 - J.D. - 2023
- **San Diego State University**
 - B.A. – 2020
 - Major: Psychology

JCL Law Firm, APC - REPORTED CASES

- *Blanchette et al., v. Superior Court (GHA Homes)*, 8 Cal.App.5th 521 (2017).
- *Duran v. Employbridge Holding Co.*, 92 Cal.App.5th 59 (2023).

EXAMPLES OF THE JCL LAW FIRM'S REPRESENTATIVE CLASS ACTION & REPRESENTATIVE CASES

- *Ware v. Shake Shack Enterprises, LLC*, Alameda Superior Court Case No. 21CV002063 (October 19, 2023) Hon. Brad Seligman approved a \$1,330,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for violations of California wage and hour laws. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Trinh v. Precision Metal Products, Inc., et al.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2022-00000965-CU-OE-CTL (October 16, 2023) Hon. Matthew C. Braner approved a \$450,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off the clock work. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Anderson v. Barton Myers Associates, Inc., et al.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV43314 (October 12, 2023) Hon. Elihu M. Berl approved a \$900,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *DeSanctis v. Douglas Products and Packaging Company, LLC*, Contra Costa Superior Court Case No. C21-01874 (October 11, 2023) Hon. Charles S. Treat approved a \$372,500.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, failure to pay for all hours worked. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Jackson v. White Fir, LLC, et al.*, Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2021-00301656 (October 6, 2023) Hon. Lauri A. Damrell approved a \$750,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for violations of California wage and hour laws. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Kneisly v. SR Machining, Inc., et al.*, Riverside Superior Court Case No. CVRI2201491 (October 5, 2023) Hon. Harold W. Hopp approved a \$220,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Mendez v. Bondz, Inc., et al.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0007486 (September 14, 2023) Hon. George J. Abdallah, Jr. approved a \$180,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, failure to comply with piece-rate laws. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Baray v. Curation Foods, Inc., et al.*, Santa Barbara Superior Court Case No. 21CV02834 (August 29, 2023) Hon. James F. Rigali approved a \$495,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Rodriguez, et al. v. Ferma Greenbox, Inc., et al.*, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG21101104 (August 23, 2023) Hon. Evelio Grillo approved a \$200,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off-the-clock work. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *O'Quinn v. Laugh Factory, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV28155 (August 1, 2023) Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl approved a \$144,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unlawful tip pooling. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Toler v. Total Testing Solutions, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCV38452 (July 27, 2023) Hon. Elihu M. Berle approved a \$160,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Rodriguez v. EAH, Inc.*, Santa Cruz Superior Court Case No. 21CV00884 (July 25, 2023) Hon. Marjorie Carter approved a \$1,450,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, failure to compensate overtime and redeemed sick pay at the regular rate of pay. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Neutall v. Urban Alchemy*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-588622 (July 13, 2023) Hon. Richard B. Ulmer approved a \$980,000.00 class action settlement for violations of California wage and hour laws. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel.
- *Rodriguez v. RM Parks Place, Inc.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-6050 (June 7, 2023) Hon. Erin Guy Castillo approved a \$175,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter*

alia, wage statement violations. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.

- *Chrestensen v. Northeastern Rural Health Clinics* Lassen, Superior Court Case No. 63703 (April 13, 2023) Hon. Leonard J. La Casse approved a \$270,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid overtime wages. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Hernandez, et al. v. Parenting Network, Inc.*, Tulare Superior Court Case No. VCU287027 (March 14, 2023) Hon. Bret Hilman approved a \$225,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off-the-clock work. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Sarmiento v. Caduceus Healthcare Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2021-00002597 (March 10, 2023) Hon. Richard S. Whitney approved a \$315,000.00 class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off-the-clock work. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Garces, et al. v. DriverDo, LLC*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV32773 (January 24, 2023) Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl approved a \$700,000 class action and PAGA settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *De Jesus v. Guardian Angel Home Care, Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2020-00021049-CU-OE-CTL (July 29, 2022) Hon. Ronald F. Frazier approved a \$300,000 class action and PAGA settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Kaur v. Aces 2020 I, LLC, et al.*, Contra Costa Superior Court Case No. MSC20-02482 (December 22, 2022) Hon. Edward G. Weil approved a \$585,000 class action and PAGA settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Molina v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV28079 (November 23, 2022) Hon. Maren Nelson approved a \$250,000 class action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the Plaintiff.
- *Lang Jr. v. Pathways Community Services LLC*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00049969-CU-OE-CTL (September 9, 2022) Hon. James A. Mangione approved a \$160,000 class action and PAGA settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Martinello v. Century Wilshire, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV32613 (March 1, 2022) Hon. Carolyn Kuhl approved a \$550 billing rate and appointed Jean Claude Lapuyade, Esq. of the JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel.
- *Wilson v. Spreen Inc. (dba Spreen Honda)*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2119857 (April 6, 2022) Hon. David Cohn approved a \$300,000 PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC, represented the plaintiff, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Ledesma v. TVJ Sons I, Inc.; Porter and Howard, Inc.* Santa Barbara Superior Court Case No. 20CV03573 (November 10, 2021) Hon. Jed Beebe approved a \$350,000 PAGA action settlement for meal and rest period violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC represented the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Jacobs v. Rush Media Company, LLC; XLT Management Services, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 20STCV32350 (May 2, 2022) Hon. Daniel J. Buckley appointed the JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and approved a \$330,000 class action settlement for, *inter alia*, independent contractor misclassification.
- *Chavez v. HTL Conrad Domestic, LLC; HTL Conrad Domestic Employer, LLC*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2020-00016193-CU-OE-CTL (June 9, 2022) Hon. John S. Meyer approved a \$850,000 PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, failure to compensate overtime at the regular rate of pay. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Renteria v. Love's Country Stores of California*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS20164481 (June 14, 2022) Hon. David Cohn approved a \$2.2 million dollar class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid overtime and sick pay. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Lopez v. Adidas America, Inc.*, Ventura Superior Court Case No. 56-2021-005498444-CU-OE-VTA (April 4, 2022) Hon. Mark Borrell approved a \$1.5 million dollar class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, inaccurate overtime calculations, and appointed the JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel.
- *Felix v. TVI, Inc., d.b.a. Savers*, Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 21CV376407 (February 18, 2022) Hon. Sunil R. Kulkarni approved a \$1.8 million dollar class action and PAGA action settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off-the-clock work. The Court appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and as representative PAGA counsel for the State of California.
- *Munoz v. AMTCR*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIV-DS2001914 (August 24, 2021) Hon. David Cohn approved a \$1.8 million dollar class and PAGA settlement for, *inter alia*, inaccurate itemized wage

statements. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as class counsel for the settlement class and as representative PAGA counsel the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.)

- *Nunes v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2020-0011011 (October 20, 2021 – Hon. Roger Ross approved a \$1.5 million dollar class and PAGA settlement for, *inter alia*, miscalculated meal period premiums and appointed Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq, as Class Counsel.)
- *Pillsbury v. T&T Restaurants CA, Inc.*, Del Norte Superior Court Case No. CVUJ-20-1214 (December 14, 2021 – Hon. Darren McElfresh approved \$550 billing rate and appointed Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq, as Class Counsel in a wage and hour class action settlement.)
- *Latin v. OneMain General Service Corporation*, Stanislaus County Superior Court Case No. CV-20-002498 (October 22, 2021) Hon. Stacy Speiller approved a PAGA action settlement for \$700,000 wage statement violations. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as counsel for the plaintiff, the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.
- *Elias Kaser v. Aviation Consultants, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2021-01191204-CU-OE-CXC (September 22, 2021 – Hon. Peter J. Wilson approved \$550 billing rate in a representative California Labor Code Private Attorney General Act settlement).
- *Rodriguez v. RSI Home Products, Inc.*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2023354 (July 30, 2021 – Hon. David Cohn approved a \$1.45 million class and PAGA settlement for, *inter alia*, failure to comply with piece-rate laws, and appointed the JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel)
- *Jer Vang v. Bridge Property Management*, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No RG19047434 (January 8, 2021 – Hon. Winifred Smith approved a class and PAGA settlement for, *inter alia*, unpaid off the clock work. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as class counsel for the settlement class and as representative PAGA counsel the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.)
- *Johnson v. Volt Management Corp., Inc. et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV16466 (December 11, 2020 – Hon. Amy Hogue approved a PAGA Settlement negotiated on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees by the JCL Law Firm, APC.)
- *Salazar v. Frontier Auto Sales Inc., dba Frontier Toyota*, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV20382 (November 24, 2020 – Hon. John P. Doyle appointed the JCL Law Firm, APC as class counsel and approved a class and PAGA settlement for, *inter alia*, missed meal and rest periods.)
- *Villalobos v. Alterra Group, LLC et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV19448 (November 11, 2020 – Hon. Richard Fruin approved a PAGA Settlement for, *inter alia*, unreimbursed business expenses. The JCL Law Firm, APC acted as counsel for the plaintiff, the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees.)
- *Stevens et al., v. Bank of England*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00018662-CU-OE-CTL (October 16, 2020 – Hon. John Meyer appointed JCL Law Firm as Class Counsel and granted final approval of wage and hour class action for, *inter alia*, off-the-clock work.)
- *Frazier v. ASA Carlton, Inc.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00036147 (October 9, 2020 Hon. Kenneth Medel appointed the JCL Law Firm as Class Counsel and granted final approval of wage and hour class action for off-the-clock work.)
- *Krake et al., v. Central Valley Diner, Inc.*, Placer County Superior Court Case No. SCV0041645 (September 4, 2020 – Hon. Michael Jones appointed JCL Law Firm as class counsel and granted final approval of wage and hour class action for meal period violations.)
- *Conner v. Ascendant Marketing, LLC et al.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00026864-CU-OE-CTL (July 24, 2020 Hon. Joel Wohlfeil granted approval of PAGA Settlement for, among other things, off-the-clock work. JCL Law Firm, APC acted as lead counsel.)
- *Guerrero v. Estancia Operations, LLC.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2019-00028963 (August 25, 2020 – Hon. Katherine Bacal approved PAGA Settlement for, *inter alia*, missed meal and rest periods. JCL Law Firm, APC, acted as lead counsel.)
- *Moreno v. Dash Lube, et al.*, United States District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 18cv1922 DMS (AHG) (December 13, 2019 – Granted class certification of Labor Code Section 226 claim and appointed JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel.)
- *Perkins et al., v. Tahiti Enterprises, Inc., et al.*, Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2016-00863095 (October 22, 2019 – Hon. Peter Wilson appointed JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel and granted final approval for an unlawful housing class action settlement arising out of Civil Code Section 1940.1.)
- *Hill v. Stemak Holdings, Ltd.*, San Diego Superior Court Case No., 37-2018-00000747 (January 28, 2020 – Hon. Kenneth Medel appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as class counsel and granted final approval of wage and hour class action for unpaid overtime.)
- *Shachno et al., v. KT Hotels, LLC, et al.* San Diego Superior Court Case No Case No. 37-2018-00043601 (May 31, 2019 – Hon. Gregory Pollack appointed JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel and granted preliminary approval for the wage and hour class action settlement involving nearly 900 current and former employees. Final approval scheduled for October 4, 2019)
- *Almanza v. The Express Group, Inc.*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS1722542 (April 19, 2019 – Hon. David Cohn appointed the JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel and granted final approval

for a wage and hour class action settlement for *inter alia*, missed meal and rest periods and independent contractor misclassification.)

- *Moschetto v. Pillow Global, Inc.* San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00024031-CU-OE-CTL (April 5, 2019 – Hon. John S. Meyer appointed JCL LAW Firm, APC, as Class Counsel and granted final approval for a wage and hour wage class action settlement involving misclassified house cleaners.)
- *Burke v. Friendship Hotel, LLC*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2017-00022517-CU-OE-CTL (March 10, 2019 – final approval granted on for an unlawful housing class action arising under Civil Code Section 1940.2)
- *Terrado et al., v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC*, San Diego County Superior Court Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL (February 8, 2019 – Hon. Gregory W. Pollock appointed JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel and granted final approval for a wage and hour class action settlement for meal and rest period violations);
- *Macaspac v. San Antonio Regional Hospital*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS1512625, (July 27, 2018 – Hon. Thomas S. Garza appointed JCL Law Firm, APC, as Class Counsel and granted final approval for a wage and hour class action settlement involving claims for on duty meal and rest periods.);
- *Summerlin et al. v. Maplebear, Inc. dba Instacart*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC603030 (2018 - certified and settled wage and hour class action.)
- *Ortega v. Prime Healthcare*, San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2014-00011240-CU-OE-CTL (2018 – Approved PAGA only settlement for on duty meal and rest periods)
- *Engstrom v. Bender-Rosenthal, Inc.* San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2016-00012373-CU-OE-CTL (2017 - Certified and settled class action for employee misclassification);
- *Crawford v. Outlook Amusements, Inc.*, Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC617160 (2017 - Certified and settled wage and hour class action.);
- *Hernandez v. Sunglass Hut Trading, LLC*, San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS1505181 (2016 - Certified and settled wage and hour class action);
- *Burns v. Shalom, LLC*, San Diego Superior Court, Case No., 37-2013-00058356-CU-BT-CTL (2015 - certified and settled class action for unlawful housing practices arising out of Civil Code Section 1940.1);