BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Piya Mukherjee (State Bar #274217)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858) 551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INDEPENDENT LIVING SYSTEMS, LLC., a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-24-614434

DECLARATION OF KYLE R. NORDREHAUG IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT, ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND SERVICE AWARD

Hearing Date: December 16, 2026
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.
[*Hearing scheduled by Order dated July 21, 2026*]

Judge: Hon. A. Marisa Chun
Dept.: 302

Date Action Filed: May 6, 2024
Trial Date: Not set

I, KYLE R. NORDREHAUG, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens("Plaintiff") in this matter. As such, I am fully familiar with the facts, pleadings and history of this matter. The following facts are within my own personal knowledge, and if called as a witness, I could testify competently to the matters stated herein. This declaration is being submitted in support to the Plaintiff's motion for final approval of the class settlement, including attorneys' fees, costs and service award.

2. Over the course of the litigation, a number of attorneys in my firm have worked on this matter. Their credentials are reflected in the Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP firm resume, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit #1. Some of the major cases our firm has undertaken are also set forth in Exhibit #1. The bulk of the attorneys involved in this matter at Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP have had substantial class litigation experience in the areas of employment class actions, unfair business practices and other complex litigation. The attorneys at my firm have extensive experience in cases involving labor code violations and overtime claims. Class Counsel has litigated similar overtime cases against other employers on behalf of employees, including cases against Permanente Medical, Sharp Healthcare, Walmart, Legoland, Cigna, HealthNet, See's Candies, Securitas, Okta, Advanced Home Health, El Pollo Loco, Total Renal, Panda Express, Walt Disney Resorts, Pharmaca, Nortek Security, California Fine Wine, Solarcity, Walgreens, Space Exploration, Union Bank, Verizon, Apple, Wells Fargo, Kaiser, Universal Protection Services, and California State Automobile Association. Class Counsel have been approved as experienced class counsel during contested motions in state and federal courts throughout California. It is this level of experience which enabled the firm to undertake the instant matter and to successfully combat the resources of the defendants and their capable and experienced counsel. Class Counsel have participated in every aspect of the settlement discussions and have concluded the settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class.

3. Summary of the Proposed Settlement.

(a) A true and correct copy of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the

"Agreement") between the parties is attached hereto as Exhibit #2. Plaintiff and Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant") reached a full and final settlement of the above-captioned action, which is embodied in the Agreement filed concurrently with the Court. The Gross Settlement Amount to be paid by Defendant is Six Hundred Eighty-One Thousand Two Hundred Twenty-Eight Dollars and Twenty Cents ($681,228.20), which is an increase of $1,228.20 as a result of the escalator provision. (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.) Under the Settlement, the Gross Settlement Amount consists of the following elements: (1) payment of the Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members; (2) Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment; (3) Administration Expenses Payment; (4) the Class Representative Service Payment to the Plaintiff; and (5) the PAGA Penalties payment. (Agreement at ¶ 1.22.)

(b) The Gross Settlement Amount does not include Defendants' share of employer-side payroll taxes which will be paid separately. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.) The Gross Settlement Amount shall not revert to Defendants. (Agreement at ¶ 3.1.)

(c) Defendant shall fund the Gross Settlement Amount and the amount necessary to pay payroll taxes no later than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date. (Agreement at ¶ 4.3.) The distribution of Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members along with the other Court-approved distributions shall be made within 14 days after the Defendant funds the settlement. (Agreement at ¶ 5.1.)

(d) The amount remaining in the Gross Settlement Amount after the deduction of Court-approved amounts for Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Class Representative Service Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment (called the "Net Settlement Amount") shall be allocated to Class Members as their Individual Class Payments. (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.28 and 3.2.) From the Net Settlement Amount, the Individual Class Payment for each Participating Class Member will be calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(e).) Workweeks will initially be based on Defendant's records, however, Class Members will have the right to challenge the number of Workweeks.

(e) Class Members were sent the Court approved Class Notice using the procedure approved by the Court by mailing the notice packets after updating class members' addresses using the National Change of Address database and, for any notice packets returned as undeliverable, re-mailing such notices to any forwarding address provided or updated address located. See Declaration of Madely Nava ("Nava Decl.") at ¶ 7, Exh. A. Class Members were provided with the opportunity to exclude themselves or "opt out" if they did not want to participate in the settlement. *Id.* The Administrator received no objections and received onlytwo (2) requests for exclusion. Nava Decl. at ¶¶ 11-12. As such, 99.6% of the Class will participate in the Settlement and will be sent a settlement check. Nava Decl. at ¶¶ 14-17. All Aggrieved Employees will be paid their allocation of the PAGA Penalties and will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of their request for exclusion. (Agreement at ¶¶ 6.3 and 8.5(d).)

(f) A Participating Class Member must cash his or her Individual Class Payment check within 180 days after it is mailed. (Agreement at ¶ 5.2.) Any settlement checks not cashed within 180 days will be voided and any funds represented by such checks sent to a Court-approved nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy Pres Recipient"). The Parties propose Children's Advocay Institute to be the Cy Pres Recipient and the Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipient. (Agreement at ¶ 5.4.)

(g) Apex Class Action LLC was appointed by the Court as the Administrator for the Settlement. (Agreement at ¶ 1.2.)The Administrator will be paid for settlement administration in an amount not to exceed $15,000. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(c).) Apex Class Action provided a capped estimate of $13,050 for administration expenses. The total Administration Expenses Payment, including fees and costs incurred to-date, as well as anticipated fees and costs for completion of the settlement administration is $13,050. See Declaration of Madely Nava ("Nava Decl.") at ¶ 20.

(h) Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for Class Counsel to be awarded a sum not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, as the Class Counsel Fees Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).) Class Counsel will also be allowed to apply separately for an award of Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in an amount not to exceed $25,000. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).)

Subject to Court approval, the Agreement provides for a payment of no more than $15,000 to the Plaintiff as the Class Representative Service Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(a).)In support of this separate requests for attorneys' fees, reimbursement of expenses and service award, Class Counsel is providing evidentiary support, for these requests, including lodestar.

(i) Subject to Court approval, the PAGA Penalties will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount for PAGA penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act, Cal. Labor Code Section 2698, et seq. ("PAGA"). The PAGA Penalties are $15,000, to be allocated 75% ($11,250) to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($3,750) to the Individual PAGA Payments. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(d).) The Individual PAGA Payments will be calculated by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($3,750) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(d).) As set forth in the accompanying proof of service, the LWDA has been served with this motion and the Agreement.

(j) The Settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable to the class and should be finally approved for the same reasons the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement, agreeing that the settlement is "fair, adequate and reasonable" (Preliminary Approval Order at ¶3.) In sum, the Settlement valued at $681,228.20 is an excellent result for the Class. This result is particularly favorable in light of the fact that liability and class certification in this case were far from certain in light of the defenses asserted by Defendants. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses asserted, the uncertainty of class certification, along with the uncertainties of proof at trial and appeal, the proposed settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and should be finally approved.

4. Procedural status of the settlement - In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order dated July 21, 2026 ("Preliminary Approval Order"), the approved Class Notice has been disseminated to the Class. The reaction of the Class unequivocally supports approval of the Settlement. On September 10, 2026, the Administrator mailed the Court-approved Class Notice to the Class Members, which provided each class member with the terms of the Settlement, including notice of the claims at issue and the financial terms of the settlement, including the attorneys' fees, costs, and service award that were

being sought, how individual settlement awards would be calculated, and the specific, estimated payment amount to that individual. See Declaration of Madely Nava ("Nava Decl.") at ¶ 7, Exh. A. In disseminating the notice, the Administrator followed the notice procedures authorized by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Administrator received no objections and received onlytwo (2) requests for exclusion. Nava Decl. at ¶¶ 11-12. As such, 99.6% of the Class will participate in the Settlement and will be sent a settlement check. Nava Decl. at ¶¶ 14-17.

5. Description of Plaintiff's claims - The Action generally alleges that Plaintiff and other Class Members were not properly paid all overtime wages for hours worked and at the correct rate, were not provided meal and rest periods, were not timely paid earned wages, were not provided reimbursement for required expenses, were not provided accurate itemized wage statements, were not paid all accrued and used sick pay at the correct rate of pay, and were not paid all wages at the time of termination. The Action seeks unpaid wages, penalties, attorney fees, litigation costs, and any other equitable or legal relief allegedly due and owing to Plaintiff and the other Class Members by virtue of the foregoing claims.

6. Procedural History of the Litigation

(a) On April 9, 2024, Plaintiff filed with the LWDA and served on Defendant a notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 identifying the alleged Labor Code violations to recover civil penalties on behalf of Aggrieved Employees for various Labor Code violations.

(b) On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action Complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco. This class action Complaint asserted class claims against Defendant for: (1) unfair competition in violation of Cal. Bus & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (2) failure to pay overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 & 1198; (3) failure to provide required meal periods in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; (4) failure to provide required rest periods in violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; (5) failure to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of California Labor Code § 2802; (6) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code § 226; (7) failure to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203; (8) failure to pay sick pay

wages in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201-204, 233, and 246; and, (10) failure to provide gratuities in violation of California Labor Code §351. On October 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco (the "PAGA Action"). Plaintiff's Representative Action Complaint asserted one cause of action against Defendant for Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699, et seq. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11740(14) (failure to provide seating),and the applicable Wage Order(s).

(c) As part of this Agreement, the Parties stipulated to the filing of a First Amended Class Action Complaint in the Class Action that adds the claims and allegations from the PAGA Action. The First Amended Class Action Complaint was filed October 1, 2025 and is the operative complaint in the Action (the "Operative Complaint").

(d) Over the course of litigation, the Parties engaged in the investigation of the claims, including informal discovery and the production of documents, class data, and other information, allowing for the full and complete analysis of liabilities and defenses to the claims in the Action. The information for mediation obtained by Plaintiff included: (1) data concerning the class; (2) a sampling payroll data and time punch data for the Class covering 28,648 shifts and 5,961 workweeks covering the date rage of 5/6/2020 - 11/8/2024; (3) Defendant's wage and hour policies; (4) the employment files for the Plaintiff; and, (5) samples of wage statements provided by Defendant. As such, Class Counsel received the data and information for the Class, which was sufficient for Plaintiff's expert to prepare the valuations of the claims for the Class.

(e) Class Counsel has extensive experience in litigating wage and hour class actions in California. The Parties have vigorously litigated the Action since inception. During the course of litigation, the Parties each performed analysis of the merits and value of the claims. Plaintiff and Defendant have engaged in significant research and investigation in connection with the Action. Class Counsel has thoroughly analyzed the value of the claims during the prosecution of this Action and utilized an expert

to perform an analysis of the data and valuation of the claims.

(f) Plaintiff and Defendant agreed to discuss resolution of the Action through a mediation. Prior to mediation, the Parties engaged in the above investigation and the exchange of documents and information in connection with the Action. On February 7, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Jonathan Andrews, a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. Following the mediation, the Parties agreed to settle the Action based upon a mediator's proposal which was memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. The Parties then negotiated the final terms of the settlement as set forth in the Agreement. At all times, the negotiations were arm's length and contentious.

(g) Although a settlement has been reached, Defendant denies any liability or wrongdoing of any kind associated with the claims alleged in the Action and further denies that, for any purpose other than settlement, the Action is appropriate for class and/or representative treatment. Defendant contends, among other things, that it has complied at all times with the California Labor Code, applicable Wage Order, and all other laws and regulations. Further, Defendant contends that class certification is inappropriate for any reason other than for settlement. Plaintiff contends that Defendant violated California wage and hour laws. Plaintiff further contends that the Action is appropriate for class certification on the basis that the claims meet the requisites for class certification. Without admitting that class certification is proper, Defendant has stipulated that the above Class may be certified for settlement purposes only. (Agreement at ¶ 2.6.) The Parties agree that certification for settlement purposes is not an admission that class certification is proper. Further, the Agreement is not admissible in this or any other proceeding as evidence that the Class could be certified absent a settlement. Solely for purposes of settling the Action, the Parties stipulate and agree that the requisites for establishing class certification with respect to the Class are satisfied.

(h) Class Counsel has conducted an investigation into the facts of the class action. Informal discovery was obtained, which included the production of relevant documents and data. Class Counsel engaged in a thorough review and analysis of the relevant documents and data with the assistance of an expert. Accordingly, the agreement to settle did not occur until Class Counsel possessed sufficient

information to make an informed judgment regarding the likelihood of success on the merits and the results that could be obtained through further litigation. In addition, Class Counsel previously negotiated settlements with other employers in actions involving nearly identical issues and analogous defenses. Based on the foregoing data and their own independent investigation, evaluation and experience, Class Counsel believes that the settlement with Defendant on the terms set forth in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay, defenses asserted by Defendant, and potential appellate issues.

7. History of Settlement Discussions

(a) This settlement is the result of extensive and hard-fought litigation as well as negotiations before an experienced and well-respected mediator. Defendant has expressly denied and continues to deny any wrongdoing or legal liability arising out of the conduct alleged in the Action. Plaintiff and Class Counsel have determined that it is desirable and beneficial to the Class to resolve the Released Class Claims of the Class in accordance with this Settlement, based upon the experience of Class Counsel who has previously litigated similar claims against other employers.

(b) The Parties attended an arms-length mediation session with Jonathan Andrews, a respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions, in order to reach this Settlement. In preparation for the mediation, Defendant provided Class Counsel with payroll, time and employment data, along with other information regarding the Class Members, various internal documents, and other compensation and employment-related materials. Class Counsel analyzed the data with the assistance of damages expert Berger Consulting and prepared and submitted a mediation brief to the mediator. The final settlement terms were negotiated and set forth in the Agreement now presented for this Court's approval.

(c) From April of 2025 to July of 2025, the settlement agreement and exhibits thereto were finalized and executed. On July 21, 2026, the Court granted the Motion for Preliminary Approval, and entered the Order granting preliminary approval of the settlement as fair and reasonable to the Class.

(d) Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that this settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate. In my judgment as experienced Class Counsel, this Settlement should be finally approved.

8. The outcome of this case would have been uncertain and fraught with risks.

(a) Here, a number of defenses asserted by Defendant present serious threats to the claims of the Plaintiff and the other Class Members. Defendant asserted that Defendant's practices complied with all applicable Labor laws. Defendant argued that Class Members were paid for all time worked and that work time was properly recorded. Defendant maintained there was no miscalculation of the regular rate when paying wages to the Plaintiff and the Class. Defendant contends that its meal and rest period policies fully complied with California law and that Defendant did not fail to provide the opportunity for legally required meal and rest breaks. Defendant could argue that the payment of significant meal period premiums which covered all possible violations was evidence of their lawful practices. Defendant contends that there was no failure to pay for business expenses and any cell phone usage was merely convenient and voluntary such that reimbursement was not legally required. Defendant contends that there was no failure to provide suitable seating as legally required. Finally, Defendant has an argument that the Supreme Court decision in *Brinker v. Superior Court,* 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012), weakened Plaintiff's claims, on liability, value, and class certifiability as to the meal and rest period claims. Defendant also argues that based on its facially lawful practices, Defendant acted in good faith and without willfulness, which if accepted would negate the claims for waiting time penalties and/or inaccurate wage statements. See e.g. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065 (2024) ("if an employer reasonably and in good faith believed it was providing a complete and accurate wage statement in compliance with the requirements of section 226, then it has not knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with the wage statement law.") If successful, Defendant's defenses could eliminate or substantially reduce any recovery to the Class. While Plaintiff believes that these defenses could be overcome, Defendant maintains these defenses have merit and therefore present a serious risk to recovery by the Class.

(b) There was also a significant risk that, if the Action was not settled, Plaintiff would be

unable to obtain a certified class and maintain the certified class through trial, and thereby not recover on behalf of any employees other than herself. At the time of the mediation, Defendant forcefully opposed the propriety of class certification, arguing that individual issues precluded class certification. Further, as demonstrated by the California Supreme Court decision in *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Assn.*, 59 Cal. 4th 1 (2014), there are significant hurdles to overcome for a class-wide recovery even where the class has been certified. While other cases have approved class certification in wage and hour claims, class certification in this action was hotly disputed and the maintenance of a certified class through trial was by no means a foregone conclusion.

(c)As demonstrated by the decision in *Duran*, the complexities and duration of further litigation cannot be overstated. There is little doubt that Defendants would post a bond and appeal in the event of an adverse judgment. A post-judgment appeal by Defendants would have required many more years to resolve, assuming the judgment was affirmed. If the judgment was not affirmed in total, then the case could have dragged on for years after the appeal. The benefits of a guaranteed recovery today outweigh an uncertain result three or more years in the future Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize the expense and length of a trial against Defendants through possible appeals which could take at least another two or three years. Class Counsel also have taken into account the uncertain outcome, the risk of litigation, especially in complex actions such as this one. Class Counsel are also mindful of and recognize the inherent problems of proof under, and alleged defenses to, the claims asserted in the Action. Moreover, post-trial motions and appeals would have been inevitable. Costs would have mounted and recovery would have been delayed if not denied, thereby reducing the benefits of an ultimate victory. The Settlement confers substantial benefits upon the Class. Based upon their evaluation, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have determined that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is in the best interest of the Class.

(d) The Settlement in this case is fair, reasonable and adequate considering Defendant's defenses to Plaintiff's claims. As set forth in the Declaration of Nordrehaug in support of preliminary approval which discussed the value of the class claims in detail, the Gross Settlement Amount compares favorably to the value of the claims. Based upon 476 Participating Class Members who worked an 29,708 workweeks, the Gross Settlement Amount provides an average value of $1,431 per Class Member and

$22.93 per workweek and after deductions the Net Settlement Amount provides an average recovery of $807.04 per Class Member and a recovery of $12.93 per workweek. The calculations to compensate for the amount due for the Class at the time of the mediation were calculated by Berger Consulting, Plaintiff's damage expert. As to the Class whose claims are at issue in this Action, Plaintiff used the expert to analyze the data and determine the potential unpaid wages for the employees. The maximum potential damages were calculated to be $1,069,076 for the alleged unpaid wages for off-the-clock work at one hour per week, $2,767 for the alleged underpaid overtime due to the miscalculation of the regular rate, $940,760 for the alleged missed meal periods based on a 27.3% potential violation rate observed in the time records, $940,760 for alleged rest period damages based upon the same 27.3% potential violation rate observed for meal period records, $33,065 for alleged unreimbursed cell-phone expenses at $5 per month. As a result, the total damage valuation was calculated such that Defendant was subject to a maximum damage claim in the amount of $2,986,428. As to potential penalties, Plaintiff calculated that potential waiting time penalties were a maximum of $1,675,444, and potential maximum wage statement penalties were $485,950.[1] Defendant vigorously disputed Plaintiff's calculations and exposure theories. Consequently, the Gross Settlement Amount of $681,228.20 represents more than 22% of the maximum value of the alleged damages at issue in this case at the time this Settlement was negotiated.[2] Importantly, the recent decision that good faith belief of compliance by the employer in *Naranjo v. Spectrum Sec. Servs., Inc.*, 15 Cal. 5th 1056, 1065 (2024), could completely negate the claims for waiting time and wage statement penalties, even if wages were owed to the Class. The above maximum

[1] While Plaintiff alleged claims for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code Sections 203 and 226, at mediation Plaintiff recognized that these claims were subject to additional, separate defenses asserted by Defendant, including, a good faith dispute defense as to whether any premium wages for meal or rest periods or other wages were owed given Defendant's position that Plaintiff and Class Members were properly compensated. *See Nordstrom Commission Cases*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 576, 584 (2010) ("There is no willful failure to pay wages if the employer and employee have a good faith dispute as to whether and when the wages were due.").

[2] Because the PAGA claim is not a class claim and primarily is paid to the State of California, Plaintiff has not included the PAGA claim in this discussion of the value of the class claims. The PAGA claim was addressed in the Motion for Preliminary Approval in the Declaration of Nordrehaug at ¶33.

calculations should then be realistically risk-adjusted in consideration for both the risk of class certification and the risk of establishing class-wide liability on all claims. Given the amount of the settlement as compared to the potential value of claims in this case and the defenses asserted by Defendant, this settlement is fair and reasonable.[3] Clearly, the goal of this litigation has been met.

(e) In sum, the Settlement is a fair and reasonable result, and provides the Class with a significant recovery, particularly when viewed in light of the fact that the Defendants asserted serious and substantial defenses both to liability and to class certification. Currently, the maximum and average class member allocation are $811.14 and $3,366.11, respectively. *See* Nava Decl. ¶ 17. Given the complexities of this case, the defenses, along with the uncertainties of proof and appeal, the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and should be finally approved.

(f) It is impossible to predict with certainty whether, under the facts of this case, Plaintiff would prevail against the Defendant's factual and legal defenses. While Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe in the merits of the claims, Defendant has asserted real and substantial defenses to these claims and to class certification. Settlement in this case clearly benefits the Class when measuring the strengths of Plaintiff's case and the risk of establishing class wide liability and damages.

ATTORNEYS' FEES, LITIGATION EXPENSES AND SERVICE AWARD

9. The Agreement For The Payment of Fees and Expenses Is Appropriate And Should Be Enforced

(a) Class Counsel successfully negotiated a class action settlement which provides for a common fund settlement to be paid by Defendants to the Class in the amount of One Million Nine Hundred Fifty

[3] See *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476 (N.D. Cal. 2007) (approving a settlement where the settlement amount constituted approximately 25% of the estimated overtime damages for the class); *Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78671, at *12 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (granting final approval where "the proposed Total Settlement Amount represents approximately 10% of what class might have been awarded had they succeeded at trial."); *Viceral v. Mistras Grp., Inc.*, 2016 WL 5907869 (N.D. Cal. 2016) (approving wage and hour class action settlement amounting to 8.1% of full value); *Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2472316, (C.D. Cal. 2014) (approving wage and hour class action settlement worth "somewhere between 9% and 18%" of maximum valuation).

Thousand Dollars ($1,150,000). (Agreement at ¶¶ 1.22 and 3.1.) As part of the settlement, the parties agreed to an award of attorneys' fees equal to one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount as the Class Counsel Fees Payment. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(b).) By this motion, Class Counsel respectfully requests approval of the Class Counsel Fees Payment in an amount equal to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount.

(b) In the class action context, that means "attempting to award the fee that informed private bargaining, if it were truly possible, might have reached." Here, informed arms-length bargaining between experienced counsel and Defendants resulted in Defendants negotiating the fee award to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount. Such bargaining is obviously the best measure of the market for fees. Moreover, fee awards in common fund settlements as this one have resulted in a percentage of fees in an equivalent percentage to the sum sought by Class Counsel herein, further reflecting the accurate market value of the award requested.

(c) The requested fee award, agreed to by the parties as part of the Settlement, should be approved. The requested fee award was bargained for during arms' length adversarial bargaining by counsel for each of the parties as part of the Settlement.

10. The Class Counsel Fee Award Is Properly Calculated as a Percentage of the Total Value Created for the Benefit of the Class

(a) As part of the settlement, the Parties agreed to an award of attorneys' fees equal to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount of $681,228.20, which equals $226,076 for attorneys' fees. As part of the Agreement, Defendants also agreed that Class Counsel will also be paid reasonable litigations expenses incurred as per Class Counsel's billing statement in an amount not to exceed $25,000. Finally, Defendant also agreed that Plaintiff can be awarded a Class Representative Service Payment in the amount of no more than $15,000 as his service award under the Agreement.

(b) In defining a reasonable fee, the Court should mimic the marketplace for cases involving a significant contingent risk such as this one. Our legal system places unique reliance on private litigants to enforce substantive provisions of employment law through class actions. Therefore, attorneys providing these substantial benefits should be paid an award equal to the amount negotiated in private

bargaining that takes place in the legal market place.

(c) There is a substantial difference between the risk assumed by attorneys being paid by the hour and attorneys working on a contingent fee basis. The attorney being paid by the hour can go to the bank with his fee. The attorney working on a contingent basis can only log hours while working without pay towards a result that will hopefully entitle him to a marketplace contingent fee taking into account the risk and other factors of the undertaking. Otherwise, the contingent fee attorney receives nothing. In this case, the nature of the fee was wholly contingent. Class Counsel subjected themselves to this contingent fee market risk in this all or nothing contingent fee case wherein the necessity and financial burden of private enforcement makes the requested award appropriate. This case was litigated on a contingent basis for over two years, with all of the risk factors inherent in such an uncertain undertaking. Indeed, I am aware of other similar cases where the court dismissed the class allegations or denied class certification. Under such circumstances, courts have held that a risk multiplier must be applied to the fee award.

(d) Here, the contingent nature of the fee award, both from the point of view of eventual settlement and the point of view of establishing eligibility for an award, also warrant the requested fee award. A number of difficult issues, the adverse resolution of any one of which could have doomed the successful prosecution of the action, were present here. Attorneys' fees in this case were not only contingent but risky, with a very real chance that Class Counsel would receive nothing at all for their efforts, having devoted time and advanced costs. Class Counsel has previously invested in cases which resulted in no recovery, and here Class Counsel is recovering a fee award that comparable to the multiplier approved in other cases.

(e) At the time this case was brought, the result was far from certain as discussed above at paragraphs 8(a) and 8(b).

(f) The Settlement was possible only because Class Counsel was (presumably) able to convince Defendants that Plaintiff could potentially prevail on the contested issues regarding liability, maintain class certification, overcome difficulties in proof as to monetary relief and take the case to trial if need be. In successfully navigating these hurdles Class Counsel displayed the necessary skills in both wage and hour and class action litigation. The high quality of the Class Counsel's work in this case was mandated by the vigorous defense presented by counsel for Defendant. Over the last years of litigation,

Class Counsel was required to invest substantial time and resources in investigation, litigation, the determination of potential damages and communicating with and responding to opposing counsel's and class members' requests and inquiries.

(g) To represent the Class on a contingent fee basis, Class Counsel also had to forego compensable hourly work on other cases to devote the necessary time and resources to this contingent case. In so doing, Class Counsel gave up the hourly work that a firm can bank on for the risky contingent fee work in this case which could potentially have paid nothing.

(h) Class Counsel were required to advance all costs in this litigation. Especially in this type of litigation where the corporate defendant and their attorneys are well funded, this can prove to be very expensive and risky. Accordingly, because the risk of advancing costs in this type of litigation can be significant, it is therefore cost prohibitive to many attorneys. The financial burdens undertaken by Plaintiff and Class Counsel in prosecuting this action on behalf of the Class were very substantial. Class Counsel has previously litigated cases and advanced costs, but received no recovery. To date, Class Counsel advanced more than $18,000 in costs which could not have been recovered if this case had been lost. The Plaintiff also undertook the risk of liability for Defendants' costs had this case not succeeded, as well as other potential negative financial ramifications from having sued Defendants on behalf of the Class. Accordingly, the contingent nature of the fee and the financial burdens on Class Counsel and on Plaintiff also support the requested awards.

(i) In this case, the reasonableness of the requested attorneys' fee of one-third equal to $226,076 is also established by reference to Class Counsel's lodestar in this matter. **The contemporaneous billing records for Class Counsel evidence that through November 18, 2026, Class Counsel's total lodestar is $172,338.75, with significant additional fees still to be incurred to complete final approval and the settlement process.** The requested fee award is therefore currently equivalent to Class Counsel's total lodestar with a reasonable multiplier cross-check of 1.3, and there will be additional lodestar incurred by Class Counsel to complete the settlement process and manage the settlement distribution and reports. Such a lodestar cross-check is well below the range of positive multipliers approved in other cases such as *Laffitte* and *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051

(9th Cir. 2002).[4] As a result, this Court may conclude that the requested award is fair and reasonable and is justified under California law.

(j) Counsel retained on a contingency fee basis, whether in private matters or in representative litigation of this sort, is entitled to a premium beyond his standard, hourly, non-contingent fee schedule in order to compensate for both the risks and the delay in payment for the simple fact that despite the most vigorous and competent of efforts, success is never guaranteed. This is particularly true here where Class Counsel has prosecuted this case on a contingency basis for two years. Indeed, if counsel is not adequately compensated for the risks inherent in difficult class actions, competent attorneys will be discouraged from prosecuting similar cases.

11. On December 4, 2018, in *Panda Express Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4919) Judge Carolyn Kuhl awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 31, 2020, in *El Pollo Loco Wage and Hour Cases* (Orange County Superior Court Case No. JCCP 4957) Judge William Claster awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 11, 2020, in *Singh v. Total Renal Care* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-16-550847) Judge Ethan Schulman awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and hour class settlement. On April 15, 2021, in *Walker v. Brink's Global Services USA* (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. BC564369) Judge Amy Hogue awarded Class Counsel a one-third award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 2, 2021, in *Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC709666), Judge Amy D. Hogue awarded Class Counsel a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 8, 2021, in *Securitas Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. JCCP4837) Judge David Cunningham awarded a

---

[4] See *Laffitte v. Robert Half Int'l*, 1 Cal. 5th 480, 487 (2016) (approving 1/3 fee award with multiplier of 2.03 to 2.13); *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1051 (9th Cir. 2002)(3.65 multiplier approved because of substantial risk); *Pellegrino v. Robert Half Intern., Inc*., 182 Cal.App.4th 278 (2010) (in class actions reasonable multipliers of 2.0 to 4.0 are often applied and affirming 1.75 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); *Taylor v. Fedex Freight, Inc.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142202 (E.D. Cal. 2016) (30% fee justified by 2.26 multiplier).

one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 17, 2021, in *Leon v. Sierra Aluminum Company* (San Bernardino Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2010856) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On March 17, 2022, in *See's Candies Wage and Hour Cases* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. JCCP5004) Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On April 12, 2022, in *O'Donnell v, Okta, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-587665) Judge Richard Ulmer awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On June 30, 2022, in *Armstrong, et al. v. Prometric LLC* (Los Angeles Sueprior Court Case No. 20STCV29967), Judge Maren E. Nelson awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action. On July 13, 2022, in *Crum v. S&D Carwash Management LLC*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 2019-00251338), Judge Christopher E. Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On August 10, 2022, in *Spears, et al. v. Health Net of California, Inc.*, (Sacramento Superior Court Case No. 34-2017-00210560-CU-OE-GDS), Judge Christopher E. Krueger awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On September 7, 2022, in *Lucchese, et al. v. Kone, Inc.*, (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-20-588225), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On November 4, 2022, in *Infinity Energy Wage and Hour Cases* (San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP5139), Judge Keri Katz awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On February 1, 2023, in *Hogan v. AECOM Tecnical Services, Inc.* (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 19STCV40072), Judge Stuart Rice awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 28, 2023, in *Farthing v. Milestone Technologies* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-591251), Judge Richard B. Ulmer, Jr. awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class action settlement. On March 2, 2023, in *Leon v. Calaveras Materials* (Kings County Superior Court Case No. 21C-0105), Judge Melissa D'Morias awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 20, 2023, in *Gonzalez v. Pacific Western Bank* (San Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVSB2127657) Judge David Cohn awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement, On June 30, 2023, in *Aguirre v. Headlands Ventures* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2021-00297290), Judge Jill Talley approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October 16, 2023, in

Flores v. Walmart, (San Bernardino County Superior Court Case No. CIVDS2023061) Judge Joseph T. Ortiz awarded a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 17, 2023, in *Silva v. Woodward HRT* (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 21STCV42692), Judge Maren Nelson awarded a one-their fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 29, 2023, in *Ochoa-Andrade v. See's Candies* (San Mateo County Superior Court Case no. 22-CIV-02481), Judge Marie Weiner approved a one-thrid fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On September 12, 2024, in *Murdock v. Aspen Surgery Center* (Contra Costa County Superior Court Case No. MSC21-02047), Judge Charles Treat approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On October 8, 2024, in *Rattler v. Pacific Coast Container* (Alameda Superior Court Case No. 22CV015216), Judge Michael Markman approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 14, 2025, in *Curry v. United Health Care Staffing* (San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-597339), Judge Curtis Karnow approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On January 17, 2025, in *Virgen v. Curaleaf* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2022-00314655), Judge Lauri Damrell approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 7, 2025, in *Wong v. Nurse Logistics* (Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 22CV408939), Judge Theodore Zayner approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On June 27, 2025, in *Macias v. Positive Behavior* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2023-00337859), Judge Lauri Damrell approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On November 14, 2025, in *Watson v. San Diego Dialysis* (San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2024-00002851), Judge Wendy M. Behan approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. On February 26, 2026, in *Rugama-Hernandez v. P$B Intermodel Services* (Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No, 24STCV07771), Judge Timothy Patrick Dillon approved a one-third fee award in a wage and hour class settlement. A fee award equal to one-third of the common fund is therefore reasonable in light of the fees that have been awarded in other similar cases.

12. **The contemporaneous billing records for Class Counsel evidence that through November 18, 2026, Class Counsel's total lodestar is $172,338.75,** with significant additional fees still to be incurred to complete final approval and the settlement process. From March 16, 2024 to November

18, 2026, my firm worked on this matter for over 305 hours, with hourly rates for attorneys ranging from $450 to $995, resulting in a total incurred lodestar for my firm in the amount of $172,338.75. The requested fee award is therefore less than Class Counsel's current lodestar representing a reasonable multiplier cross-check of 1.3, and there will be additional lodestar incurred by Class Counsel to complete the settlement process and manage the settlement distribution and reports. A detailed breakdown of the total fees and the services performed by the firm on this case is attached hereto as Exhibit #3. In addition, Class Counsel will be performing significant additional work that is not included in this lodestar amount, including finalizing the final approval motion, attending the hearing on final approval, and monitoring completion of the settlement process. I expect this additional work will result in $10,000 to $20,000 in additional lodestar for my firm. The rates charged by my firm are in line with the prevailing rates of attorneys in the local legal community for similar work and, if this were a commercial matter, these are the charges that would be made and presented to the client. My firm's hourly rates are based upon the Laffey Matrix with the appropriate 2% increase adjustment for Southern California. A true and correct copy of the current Laffey Matrix is attached hereto as Exhibit #4. These hourly rates have been approved by Court's throughout California, including the Courts in the Superior Court of California. In fact, on August 1, 2018, District Judge Andre Birotte Jr. explicitly found that Class Counsel's "rates generally appear reasonable and 'in line with those prevailing in the [relevant] community'—the Central District of California". Finally, the reasonableness of Class Counsel's hourly rates is further confirmed by comparing such rates with the rates of comparable counsel practicing complex and class litigation as detailed in the National Law Journal Billing Survey. See e.g. *Zest IP Holdings, LLC v. Implant Direct MFG., LLC*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 167563 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (finding that "Mayer Brown's $775 average billing rate for partners" and "Mayer Brown's $543 average associate billing rate" are reasonable rates when compared within 21 other firms practicing in the Southern District of California.) This survey is useful to show that Class Counsel's rates are in line with the comparable rates of the defense counsel that opposes these types of class claims, such as Mayer Brown noted above who is defense counsel in cases currently being prosecuted by Class Counsel. In another example, Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, who is opposing counsel in many cases prosecuted by Class Counsel, in years past charged rates as high

as $875 for partners and $535 for associates. Similarly, Paul Hastings, another opposing counsel in these types of cases, historically charged between $900 and $750 for partners and $755 and $335 for associates. Thus, the rates charged by Class Counsel for comparable work are less than these examples, and are therefore undoubtedly reasonable. Therefore, the requested fee award as a percentage of the fund is supported by the currently lodestar incurred, and will be a lower multiplier by the completion of the settlement. The requested award is therefore reasonable viewed by the Lodestar/Multiplier cross-check.

Litigation Expenses

13. As part of the Agreement at paragraph 3.2(b), that Class Counsel may seek a "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $25,000." Class Counsel requests reimbursement for incurred litigation expenses and costs in the amount of $18,127.60. Class Counsel have incurred expenses of $18,127.60 based upon counsel's billing records; therefore, this requested amount is less than the allocation in the Agreement. These litigation expenses include the expenses incurred for filing fees, mediation expenses, expert expenses (Berger Consulting), and attorney service charges (OneLegal, Knox and File & ServeXpress), all of which are costs normally billed to and paid by the client. The details of the litigation expenses incurred by my firm in this matter are set forth in Exhibit #3. These costs were reasonably incurred in the prosecution of the Action.

Service Award

14. For his service as the sole class representative, Plaintiff should be awarded the agreed service award of $15,000 in accordance with the Agreement for his time, risk and effort expended on behalf of the Class as the class representative. (Agreement at ¶ 3.2(a).) Defendant has agreed to this payment and there have been no objections to the requested service award. The Plaintiff's Declaration in support of this request is attached hereto as Exhibit #5. As the only representative of the Class, Plaintiff performed his duties to the Class admirably and without exception. Plaintiff worked extensively with Class Counsel during the course of the litigation, responding to numerous requests, searching for documents, working with counsel, and reviewing the settlement documentation. The declaration of

Plaintiff details the involvement, stress and risks he undertook as a result of this Action. The Plaintiff also assumed the serious risk that he might possibly be liable for costs and fees to Defendant, as well as the reputational risk of being "blacklisted" by other future employers for having filed a class action on behalf of fellow former employees. Without the Plaintiff's participation, cooperation and information, no other employees would be receiving any benefit. The payment of service awards to successful class representatives is appropriate and the amount of $15,000 is well within the currently awarded range for similar settlements. The requested award is also reasonable by reference to the amounts that other California courts have found to be reasonable in wage and hour class action settlements: *Andrews v. Plains All Am. Pipeline L.P.*, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172183, at *11 (C.D. Cal. 2022) (finding that the requested service awards of $15,000 each are appropriate); *Reynolds v. Direct Flow Med., Inc.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149865, at *19 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (granting request for $12,500 service award); *Mathein v. Pier 1 Imps.*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71386, 168 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (approving two service awards of $12,500 each)*; Louie v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc*., 2008 WL 4473183, *7 (S.D.Cal. Oct. 06, 2008) (awarding $25,000 service award to each of six plaintiffs in overtime class action)*; Holman v. Experian Info. Solutions, Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173698 (approving $10,000 service award where class member recovery was $375)*; Ontiveros v. Zamora*, 303 F.R.D. 356, 366 (E.D. Cal. 2014) (reducing $20,000 award to $15,000 where the plaintiff brought a class claim in lieu of bringing an individual action)*;Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476 at *51-*52 (N.D.Cal. 2007)(awarding $25,000 service award in overtime wage class action)*; Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty, LLC*, Case No. BC360036, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 7, 2013)(awarding $25,000 service award); *Aguiar v. Cingular Wireless, LLC*, Case No. CV 06-8197 DDP (AJWx)(C.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2011)(awarding $14,767 service award); *Magee v. American Residential Services, LLC*, Case No. BC423798, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Apr. 21, 2011)(awarding $15,000 service award); *Mares v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC*, Case No. BC375967, Los Angeles County Superior Court (June 24, 2010)(awarding $15,000 service award); *Baker v. L.A. Fitness Int'l, LLC*, Case No. BC438654, L.A. County Superior Court (Dec. 12, 2012)(awarding $10,000 service awards to three named plaintiffs); *Blue v. Coldwell banker Residential Brokerage Co.*, Case No. BC417335, Los Angeles

County Superior Court (Mar. 21, 2011)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Buckmire v. Jo-Ann Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC394795, Los Angeles County Superior Court (June, 11, 2010)(awarding $10,000 service awards); *Coleman v. Estes Express Lines, Inc.*, Case No. BC429042, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Oct. 3, 2013)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Ethridge v. Universal Health Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC391958, Los Angeles County Superior Court (May 27, 2011)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Hickson v. South Coast Auto Ins. Marketing, Inc.*, Case No. BC390395, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Mar. 27, 2012)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Hill v. sunglass Hut Int'l, Inc.*, Case No. BC422934, Los Angeles County Superior Court (July 2, 2012)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Kambamba v. Victoria's Secret Stores, LLC*, Case No. BC368528, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Aug. 19, 2011)(awarding $10,000 service award together with additional compensation for their general release); *Nevarez v. Trader Joe's Co.*, Case No. BC373910, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Jan. 29, 2010)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Ordaz v. Rose Hills Mortuary, L.P.*, Case No. BC386500, Los Angeles County Superior Court, (Mar. 19, 2010)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Sheldon v. AHMC Monterey Park Hosp. LP*, Case No. BC440282, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Feb. 22, 2013)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Silva v. Catholic Mortuary Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC408054, Los Angeles County Superior Court (Feb. 8, 2011)(awarding $10,000 enhancement award); *Weisbarth v. Banc West Investment Services, Inc.*, Case No. BC422202, Los Angeles County Superior Court (May 24, 2013)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Lazar v, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan*, Case No. 14-cv-273289, Santa Clara County Superior Court (Dec. 28, 2015) (awarding $10,000 service award); *Acheson v. Express, LLC*, Case No. 109CV135335, Santa Clara County Superior Court (Sept. 13, 2011)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Bejarano v. Amerisave Mortgage Corp.*, Case No. EDCV 08-00599 SGL (Opx)(C.D. Cal. June 22, 2010)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Carbajal v. Sally Beauty Supply LLC*, Case No. CIVVS 1004307, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Aug. 6, 2012)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Contreras v. Serco Inc.*, Case No. 10-cv-04526-CAS-JEMx (C.D. Cal. Sep. 10, 2012)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Guerro v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, Case No. RIC 10005196, Riverside County Superior Court (July 16, 2013)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Kisliuk v. ADT Security Services Inc.*, Case No. CV08-03241 DSF (RZx)(C.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2011)(awarding $10,000

service award); *Morales v. BCBG Maxazria Int'l Holdings, Inc.*, Case No. JCCP 4582, Orange County Superior Court (Jan. 24, 2013)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Barrett v. Doyon Security Services, LLC*, Case No. BS900199, BS900517, San Bernardino County Superior Court (Apr. 23, 2010)(awarding $10,000 service award); *Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II,* Santa Clara Superior Court Case no. 17CV313457 (July 10, 2018) (awarding $10,000 service award); *Taylor v. TIC - The Inductrial Complany*, U.S.D.C. Central District of California Case No. EDCV 16-186-VAP (Aug. 1, 2018) (awarding $10,000 service award).

15. The requested service award is also reasonable in light of the reputational risk that Plaintiff assumed in bringing this action against his former employer. Plaintiff put his future employment prospects at risk by becoming a class representative as the fact that she filed a lawsuit "is searchable on the internet and may become known to prospective employers when evaluating" them for employment. *Guippone v. BH S&B Holdings, LLC*, 2011 U.S., Dist. LEXIS 126026, *20 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2011). Employers routinely screen employee candidates to determine whether they have ever filed a suit against other employers, allowing them to screen out the litigious candidates. An entire industry exists that allows employers to run extensive background searches on potential employees. Companies who provide these services specifically highlight the fact that their services allows employers to weed out litigious employment candidates. Reliable Plant outlines ways that employers can "get a sense of whether a prospective employee is likely to sue" the employer, through background checks and other means, to screen out these employees.[5] Onicra Credit Rating Agency states: "Background screening has become a necessity in today's litigious society." Back Track Screening also represents: "In today's litigious culture, employers simply cannot afford to hire employees who will put their company at risk."[6] PreciseHire also offers employment screening and similarly warns: "with today's business climate being extremely competitive and highly litigious, conducting pre employment background checks has become

[5] www.reliableplant.com/Read/6959/a-solution-to-fear-of-hiring-litigious-employees.

[6] http://www.btscreening.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Screening-101.pdf.

a necessity."[7]

16. As a result, Class Counsel respectfully requests approval of the application for award of the Class Counsel Fees Payment equal to one-third (1/3) of the common fund, an award of litigation expenses in the amount of $18,127.60, and approval of the requested service award to the Plaintiff.

17. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, I make the following disclosure. The Class Counsel Fees Payment awarded shall be allocated 100% to Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 18th day of November 2026, at San Diego, California.



Kyle Nordrehaug

[7] https://precisehireblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/pre-employment-background-checks-have-become-a-busines-necissity/.

EXHIBIT #1

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
2255 Calle Clara, La Jolla, California 92037
Tel: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (885) 551-1232

FIRM RESUME

Areas of Practice: Employee, Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation, Business Litigation.

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

Norman B. Blumenthal
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Action, Civil Litigation, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Transactional Law
Admitted: 1973, Illinois; 1976, California
Biography: Law Clerk to Justice Thomas J. Moran, Illinois Supreme Court, 1973-1975, while on Illinois Court of Appeals. Instructor, Oil and Gas Law: California Western School of Law, 1981; University of San Diego School of Law, 1983. Sole Practitioner 1976-1987. Partner, Blumenthal & Ostroff, 1988-1995. Partner, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1995-2001. Partner, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2018. Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, 2018 - present.
Member: San Diego County, Illinois State and American Bar Associations; State Bar of California.
Educated: University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1970); Loyola University of Chicago (J.D., 1973); Summer Intern (1971) with Harvard Voluntary Defenders

Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Consumer and Securities Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions, Civil Litigation
Admitted: 1999, California
Biography: Associate, Blumenthal, Ostroff & Markham, 1999-2001. Associate, Blumenthal & Markham, 2001-2007. Partner, Blumenthal & Nordrehaug, 2007. Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017
Member: State Bar of California, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit Court of Appeals
Educated: University of California at Berkeley (B.A., 1994); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 1999)
Awards: Top Labor & Employment Attorney 2016; Top Appellate Reversal - Daily Journal 2015; Super Lawyer 2015-2018

Aparajit Bhowmik
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2006, California
Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2002); University of San Diego School of Law (J.D. 2006)
Biography: Partner, Blumenthal, Nordrehaug & Bhowmik, 2008-2017
Awards: Rising Star 2015

Nicholas J. De Blouw
Partner, Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP (2018 to present)
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California
Educated: Wayne State University (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

Piya Mukherjee
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2010, California
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.S. 2006); University of Southern California, Gould School of Law (J.D. 2010)

Victoria Rivapalacio
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Consumer Class Actions, Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California
Educated: University of California at San Diego (B.A., 2003); George Washington University Law School (J.D. 2010)

Ricardo Ehmann
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2018, California; 2004, Nevada
Educated: University of California, San Diego (B.A. 1998); Loyola Law School (J.D. 2001)

Jeffrey S. Herman
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2011, California; 2016 Arizona
Educated: University of Michigan (B.A. 2008); California Western School of Law (J.D. 2011)

Charlotte James
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2016, California
Educated: San Diego State University; California Western School of Law

Christine Levu
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2012, California
Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

Andrew Ronan
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2016, California
Educated: Arizona State University; University of San Diego School of Law

Scott Blumenthal
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2020, New Mexico
Educated: University of Southern California; California Western School of Law

Sergio Julian Puche
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2013, California
Educated: University of California, Irvine; California Western School of Law

Trevor Moran
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2020, California
Educated: University of Rhode Island; California Western School of Law

Adolfo Sanchez Contreras
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2024, California; 2014, Mexico
Educated: The Juarez University

Justin Hewgill
Associate Attorney
Practice Areas: Civil Litigation; Wage and Hour Class Actions
Admitted: 2008, California,
Education: University of California, Riverside (B.A. 2005); University of California, Berkeley, School of Law (2005)

REPORTED CASES

Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail N. Am., Inc., 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir. 2015) (The panel reversed the district court's order granting Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.'s motion to compel arbitration of claims and dismissing plaintiff's first amended complaint, in a putative class action raising class employment-related claims and a non-class representative claim for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act.);
Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. v. Superior Court, 234 Cal. App. 4th 1109 (Cal. Feb. 27, 2015) (Court of Appeal concluded the trial court correctly ruled that *Iskanian* rendered the PAGA waiver within the parties' dispute resolution agreement unenforceable. However, the Court of Appeal then ruled the trial court erred by failing to invalidate the non-severable class action waiver from the agreement and remanded the entire complaint, including class action and PAGA claims, be litigated in the Superior Court);
Sussex v. United States Dist. Court for the Dist. of Nev., 781 F.3d 1065 (9th Cir. 2015) (The panel determined that the district court clearly erred in holding that its decision to intervene mid-arbitration was justified under Aerojet-General. Specifically, the panel held that the district court erred in predicting that an award issued by the arbitrator would likely be vacated because of his "evident partiality" under 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(2).);

Provost v. YourMechanic, Inc., 2020 Cal. App. Lexis 955 (Oct. 15, 2020) (Court of Appeals affirmed denial of arbitration of PAGA claim, and held in a case of first impression, that there was no additional standing rules for PAGA claim brought by independent contractor);
In re Tobacco Cases II, 41 Cal. 4th 1257 (2007); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 24 Cal. 4th 906 (2001); Rocker v. KPMG LLP, 148 P.3d 703; 122 Nev. 1185 (2006); PCO, Inc. v. Christensen, Miller, Fink, Jacobs, Glaser, Weil & Shapiro, LLP, 150 Cal. App. 4th 384 (2007); Hall v. County of Los Angeles, 148 Cal. App. 4th 318 (2007); Coshow v. City of Escondido, 132 Cal. App. 4th 687 (2005); Daniels v. Philip Morris, 18 F.Supp 2d 1110 (S.D. Cal.1998); Gibson v. World Savings & Loan Asso., 103 Cal. App. 4th 1291 (2003); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 75 Cal. App. 4th 445 (1999); Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles, 100 Cal.App. 4th 431 (2002); Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court, 72 Cal.App.4th 214 (1999); Hildago v. Diversified Transp. Sya, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 3207 (9th Cir. 1998); Kensington Capital Mgal. v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist LEXIS 385; Fed.Sec.L.Rep. (CCH) P90, 411 (1999 C.D. Cal.); Lister v. Oakley, Inc., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 384; Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P90,409 (C.D Cal. 1999); Olszewski v. Scripps Health, 30 Cal. 4th 798 (2003); Steroid Hormone Product Cases, 181 Cal. App. 4th 145 (2010); Owen v. Macy's, Inc., 175 Cal. App. 4th 462 (2009); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 117 Cal. App. 4th 380 (2004); Taiheiyo Cement Corp. v. Superior Court, 105 Cal.App. 4th 398 (2003); McMeans v. Scripps Health, Inc., 100 Cal. App. 4th 507 (2002); Ramos v. Countrywide Home Loans, 82 Cal.App. 4th 615 (2000); Tevssier v. City of San Diego, 81 Cal.App. 4th 685 (2000); Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court, 70 Cal. App. 4th 299 (1999); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 514 F.3d 1001 (9th Cir. 2008); Silvas v. E*Trade Mortg. Corp., 421 F. Supp. 2d 1315 (S.D. Cal. 2006); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26544 (S.D. Cal. 2009); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 251 F.R.D. 514 (S.D. Cal. 2008); McPhail v. First Command Fin. Planning, Inc., 247 F.R.D. 598 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17118 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27365 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Wise v. Cubic Def. Applications, Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11225 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Gabisan v. Pelican Prods., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1391 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 630 F. Supp. 2d 1222 (S.D. Cal. 2009); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102380 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Louie v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78314 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20521 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Weltman v. Ortho Mattress, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60344 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Curry v. CTB McGraw-Hill, LLC, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5920; 97 A.F.T.R.2d (RIA) 1888; 37 Employee Benefits Cas. (BNA) 2390 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Reynov v. ADP Claims Servs. Group, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94332 (N.D. Cal. 2006); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 248 (9th Cir. 2010); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38889 (S.D. Cal. 2008); Kennedy v. Natural Balance Pet Foods, Inc., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 57766 (S.D. Cal. 2007); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29503 (D. Nev. 2009); Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 256 F.R.D. 651 (D. Nev. 2009); Tull v. Stewart Title of Cal., Inc., 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14171 (S.D. Cal. 2009); Keshishzadeh v. Gallagher, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 46805 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 116380 (S.D. Cal. 2010); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL Docket No. 1850 (All Cases), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94603 (D.N.J. 2008); In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig., 629 F.3d 333 (3rd. Cir. 2010); Puentes v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc., 160 Cal. App. 4th 638 (2008); Rezec v. Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., 116 Cal. App. 4th 135 (2004); Badillo v. Am. Tobacco Co., 202 F.R.D. 261 (D. Nev. 2001); La Jolla Friends of the Seals v. Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin., 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 23025 (9th Cir. 2010); Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 36650 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 25422 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Weitzke v. Costar Realty Info., Inc., 2011 U.S. Dist Lexis 20605 (S.D. Cal. 2011); Goodman v. Platinum Condo. Dev., LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36044 (D. Nev. 2011); Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand

Towers, LLC, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14502 (D. Nev 2011); Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., 2010 U.S. Dist. Lexis 117869 (S.D. Cal. 2010); Dobrosky v. Arthur J. Gallagher Serv. Co., *LLC*, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (SPx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106345 (C.D. Cal. July 30, 2014); Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC, No. EDCV 16-1133 JGB (KKx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 73656 (C.D. Cal. May 1, 2017); Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51104 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2015); Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23179 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2017); Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc., 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012)

CLASS ACTION & REPRESENTATIVE CASES

4G Wireless Wage Cases, Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4736; Classic Party Rentals Wage & Hour Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. JCCP No. 4672; Abu-Arafeh v. Norco Delivery Service, Inc.,San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-540601; Aburto v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 11-cv-0088; Adkins v. Washington Mutual Bank, Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC819546; Agah v. CompUSA,U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV05-1087 DOC (Anx); Akers v. The San Diego Union Tribune, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00088571; Altman v. SolarCity Corporation, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00023450-CU-OE-CTL; Aquino v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00395420; Baker v. Advanced Disability Management, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00160711; Barcia v. Contain-A-Way, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07 cv 0938; Bates v. Verengo, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00619985-CU-OE-CXC; Battle v. Charming Charlie Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00005608; Behar v. Union Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00317275; Bell v. John Stweart Company, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14728792; Bennett v. Custom Built Personal Training Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. M127596; Bermant v. Bank of America, Investment Services, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC342505; Bethley v. Raytheon Company, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01741; Betorina v. Randstad US, L.P. , U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:15-cv-03646-MEJ; Beverage v. Edcoa Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 2013-00138279; Bova v. Washington Mutual Bank / JP Morgan Chase, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 07-cv-2410; Bowden v. Sunset Parking Services, LLC & LAZ Parking California, LLC - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101751-CU-OE-CTL; Briseno v. American Savings Bank, Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 774773; Brueske v. Welk Resorts, San Diego Superior Court, Case No 37-2010-00086460; Bueche v. Fidelity National Management Services, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-01114; Bunch v. Pinnacle Travel Services, LLC, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC552048; Butler v. Stericycle, Inc & Appletree Answering Services of California, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180282; Cabral v. Creative Communication Tech., Class Certification Granted, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC402239; Cardoza v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 4:15-cv-01634-DMR; Castro v. Vivint Solar, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00031385-CU-OE-CTL; Cavazos v. Heartland Automotive Services, Inc., Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. PSC 1401759; Cohen v. Bosch Tool, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIC 853562; Comstock v. Washington Mutual Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Diego County Superior

Court, Case No. GIC820803; Conley v. Norwest, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. N73741; Connell v. Sun Microsystems, Alameda Superior Court, Case No. RG06252310; Corrente v. Luxe Valet, Inc., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-15-545961; Cruz v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-05234-THE; Culley v. Lincare Inc. & Alpha Respiratory Inc., U.S. District Court eastern District of California, Case No. 2:15-cv-00081-GEB-CMK; Cunningham v. Leslie's Poolmart, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02122-CAS; Curry v. California Testing Bureau/McGraw Hill, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-05-4003 JW; Daniels, et al. v. Philip Morris,(In Re Tobacco Cases II) – Class Certification Granted, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4042; Davis v. Genex Holdings Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-cv-240830; Davis v. Clear Connection, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00035173-CU-OE-CTL; Day v. WDC Exploration, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00433770; Dedrick v. Hollandia Diary, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00004311-Cu-OE-CTL; Delmare v. Sungard Higher Education - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 07-cv-1801; Del Rio v. Tumi Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00022008-CU-OE-CTL; Dewane v. Prudential, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SA CV 05-1031; Diesel v. Wells Fargo Bank, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2011-00441368; Dirienzo v. Dunbar Armored, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2745; Dobrosky v.Arthur J. Gallagher Service Company, LLC, Class certification Granted, No. EDCV 13-0646 JGB (Spx); Dodds v. Zaven Tootikian, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC494402; Drumheller v. Radioshack Corporation, United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV11-355; Enger v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1670; Escobar v. Silicon Valley Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv272514; Fierro v. Chase Manhattan - Class Certification Granted, Settled San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIN033490; Figueroa v. Circle K Stores, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101193-CU-OE-CTL; Finch v. Lamps Plus, (Lamps Plus Credit Transaction Cases), San Diego Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4532; Fletcher v. Verizon, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1736; Francisco v. Diebold, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-1889; Friend v. Wellpoint, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC345147; Frudakis v. Merck Sharp & Dohme, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 11-00146; Fulcher v. Olan Mills, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-cv-1821; Gabisan v. Pelican Products, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1361; Galindo v. Sunrun Installation Services Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00008350-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. Legacy Partners Commercial, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-221688; Ghattas v. Footlocker Retail, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. CV 13-0001678 PA; Gibson v. World Savings, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 762321; Goerzen v. Interstate Realty Management, Co., Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. 679545; Gomez v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02373; Gordon v. Wells Fargo Bank, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:11-cv-00090; Grabowski v. CH Robinson, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 10-cv-1658; Gross v. ACS Compiq Corporation, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00587846-CU-OE-CXC; Gripenstraw v. Buffalo Wild Wings, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 12-CV-00233; Gruender v. First American Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06 CC 00197; Guillen v. Univision Television Group, Inc. & Univision Management Co., San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-526445; Gujjar v. Consultancy Services Limited, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00365905; Gutierrez v. Five Guys Operations, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00086185-CU-OE-CTL; Handler v. Oppenheimer, Los Angeles Superior Court, Civil Action No. BC343542; Harley v. Tavistock Freebirds, LLC,

Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2014-00173010; Harrington v. Corinthian Colleges – Class Certification Granted, Orange Superior Court; United States Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware; Harvey v. PQ Operations, Inc., Los Angles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; Henshaw v. Home Depot U.S.A., United States District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV10-01392; Heithold v. United Education Institute, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00623416-CU-OE-CXC; Hibler v. Coca Cola Bottling, Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 11cv0298; Hildebrandt v. TWC Administration LLC & Time Warner NY Cable, LLC , U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. ED-cv-13-02276-JGB; Hopkins v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Los Angeles, United states District Court, Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Howard v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC586369; Hughes v. Parexel International, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485950; Hurley v. Comcast of California/Colorado/Texas/Washington, Inc., Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-253801; Irving v. Solarcity Corporation, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV525975; Jacobs v. Nu Horizons - Settled Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv194797; Jefferson v. Bottling Group LLC (Pepsi) - Class Certification Granted, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-0018010; Jones v. E*Trade Mortgage, U.S. District Court, Southern District California Case No. 02-CV-1123 L (JAH); Kennedy v. Natural Balance - Dismissal Reversed on Appeal, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00066201; Keshishzadeh v. Arthur J. Gallagher Service Co., U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Kinney v. AIG Domestic Claims / Chartis, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 8:10-cv-00399; Kizer v. Tristar Risk Management, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707394-CU-OE-CXC; Kleinberg v. Reeve Trucking Company, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00001601-CU-OE-CTL; Kove v. Old Republic Title, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09477437; Krellcom v. Medley Communications, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00050245-CU-OE-CTL; Ladd v. Extreme Recovery, LP, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC11-02790; Langille v. EMC, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0168; Lawson v. Marquee Staffing, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00103717-CU-OE-CTL; Lazar v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273289; Lemmons v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00125488; Levine v. Groeniger, Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG09476193; Linder v. OCWEN (In re Ocwen Federal Bank FSB Servicing Litig.) U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv501, U.S. District Court, Northern Dist. Illinois, Case No. MDL 1604; Litton v. Diebold, Incorporated, San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV524776; Lohn v. Sodexo, Inc. & SDH Services West, LLC, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 2:15-CV-05409; Lopez v. K-Mart, Ventura County Superior Court, Case No. BC351983; Louie / Stringer v. Kaiser, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0795; Lucero v. Sears, U.S. District Court Southern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-01620-AJB; Lucero v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00075933-CU-OE-CTL; Magallanes v. TSA Stores, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-283586; Magana v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00613901-CU-OE-CXC; Maitland v. Marriott, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. SACV 10-00374; Mann v. NEC Electronics America, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 109CV132089; Martinez v. Hydro-Scape Products, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00029157-CU-OE-CTL; Mathies v. Union Bank - Class Certification Granted, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-10-498077; McDermott v. Catalina Restaurant Group Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2012-00574113-CU-OE-CXC; McPhail v. First Command, United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Case No.05CV0179 IEG (JMA); Medina v. Universal Protection Service, LP, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. BC572848; Meierdiercks v. 8x8, Inc., Santa Clara

County Superior Court, Case No. 110CV162413; Metrow v. Liberty Mut. Managed Care LLC - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-1133 JGB (Kkx); Meyer v. Thinktank Learning, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-15-cv-282698; Morales v. Wells Fargo Insurance Services USA, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-03867-EDL; Morse v. Marie Callender Pie Shop, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-1305; Moynihan v. Escalante Golf, Inc. & Troon Golf, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083250-CU-OE-CTL; Muntz v. Lowe's HIW, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. GIC880932; Najarian v. Macy's West Stores, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418401; Nelson v. Avon Products, Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court for The Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02276-BLF; Nguyen v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 05 CC 00116; Ochoa v. Eisai, Inc.,U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 3:11-cv-01349; Ogans v. Nationwide Credit, Inc., Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2012-00121054; Ohayon v. Hertz, United States District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 11-1662; Olvera v. El Pollo Loco, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2014-00707367-CU-OE-CXC; Orozco v. Illinois Tool Works Inc., Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 14-cv-02113-MCE; Ortega v. Prime Healthcare Paradise Valley, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2014-00011240-CU-OE-CTL; Patel v. Nike Retail Services, Inc.,U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:14-cv-04781-RS; Patelski v. The Boeing Company,United States District Court, Southern District of New York; transferred to United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri; Pearlman v. Bank of America, San Diego Superior Court; Perry v. AT&T, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 11-cv 01488; Picus v. Wal-Mart Stores, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:07-CV-00682; Pittard v. Salus Homecare, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08 cv 1398; Port v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2007-00067538; Postema v. Lawyers Title Ins. Corp., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00418901; Pratt v. Verizon, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00430447; Proctor v. Ameriquest. Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 06CC00108; Ramirez v. Estenson Logistics, LLC, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2015-00803197-CU-OE-CXC; Ray v. Lawyers Title, Fidelity National, Commonwealth Land Title, Chicago Title, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2010-00359306; Renazco v. Unisys Technical Services, L.L.C. , San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-14-539667; Reynolds v. Marlboro/Philip Morris U.S.A., United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 08-55114, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 05 CV 1876 JAH; Rezec v. Sony, San Diego Superior Court; Rix v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-2063; Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Summary Judgment *Sua Sponte* Granted for Plaintiff, *Rieve v. Coventry Health Care, Inc.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 856 (C.D. Cal. 2012); Ritchie v. Mauran Ambulance Services, Inc., Los Angeles County, Case No. BC491206; Rivers v. Veolia Transportation Services, Class Certification Granted, Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV 255350; Roeh v. JK Hill, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00089046; Rodriguez v. Protransport-1, LLC, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-12-522733; Romero v. Central Payment Co., LLC, Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 1106277; Salas v. Evolution Hospitality, LLC, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00083240-CU-OE-CTL; Salem v. Alliance Human Services, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. CIVRS1401129; Sanchez v. Beena Beauty Holding, Inc. d/b/a Planet Beauty, Los Angeles County Superior Court, BC566065; Santone v. AT&T – Settled United States District Court, Southern District of Alabama; Santos v. Sleep Train (Sleep Train Wage and Hour Cases), Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00214586, San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4553; Saravia v. O.C. Communciations, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00180734; Sawyer v. Vivint, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 1:14-cv-08959; Sayaman v.

Baxter Healthcare, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. CV 10-1040; Schuler v. Ecolab, Inc.,U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:10-cv-02255; Schulz v. Qualxserv, LLC / Worldwide Techservices - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 09-cv-0017; Serrato v. Sociedad Textil Lonia, Corp., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00101195-CU-OE-CTL; Shrivastara v. Fry's Electonics, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 111cv192189; Sierra v. Oakley Sales Corp., Orange County Superior Court, U.S. District Court Central District of California; U.S. Court of Appeals 9th Circuit; Sirota v. Swing-N-Slide, Wisconsin District Court, County of Rock Wisconsin, Case No. 95CV726J; Small v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099011-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 08-cv-02353; Smith v. Fedex Ground Package system, Inc., Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG14734322; Sones v. World Savings / Wachovia; U.S. District Court, Norther District of California, Case No. 3:08-cv-04811; Spradlin v. Trump, U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-01428; Steele v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 07-5743; Steffan v. Fry's Electronics, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-13-CV-254011; Steroid Hormone Product Cases, Los Angeles Superior Court, JCCP4363; Strauss v. Bayer Corporation, United States District Court, District of Minnesota; Sustersic v. International Paper Co., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00331538; Sutton v. Seasons Hospice & Palliative Care of California, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC590870; Swartout v. First Alarm Security & Patrol, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-231989; Talamantez v. The Wellpoint Companies, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-cv-08058; Tan v. California State Automobile Assn. - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Central District California, Case No. 07cv1011, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00231219; Tauber v. Alaska Airlines, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court; Thai v. Staff Assistance, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC567943; Thomas v. Stanford Health Care d/b/a Stanford University Medical Center, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 1-14-cv-273362; Thomas-Byass v. Michael Kors Stores (California), Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:15-cv-00369-JGB; Trujillo v. LivHome, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2008-00100372, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP4570; Tull v. Stewart Title, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-CV-1095; Turner v. C.R. England, U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 5:14-cv-02207-PSG; Turner v. Ampac Fine Chemicals, LLC, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2015-00176993; Valadez v. Schering-Plough, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 10-CV-2595; Van Gorp v. Ameriquest Mortgage/Deutsche Bank, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. SACV05-907 CJC (Anx); Varela v. The Walking Company, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC562520; Veloz v. Ross Dress For Less, Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC485949; Vogel v. Price-Simms, Inc., Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 114CV261268; Vrab v. DNC Parks & Resorts at Tenaya, Inc., Mariposa County Superior Court, Case No. 0010225; Vultaggio-Kish v. Golden State Lumber, Inc., San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV 51661; Wadhwa v. Escrow Plus, Los Angeles Superior Court; Waldhart v. Mastec North Amercia, Inc., San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1419318; Walker v. Brink's Global Services USA, Inc. & Brinks Incorporated, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC564369; Walsh v. Apple, Inc., U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 08-04918; Weinman v. Midbar Condo Development (Las Vegas One), U.S. District Court, District of Nevada, Case No. 2:08-cv-00684; Weltman v. Ortho Mattress - Class Certification Granted, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-0840, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2009-00327802; West v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2013-00147707-CU-OE-GDS; Wheat v. Jerome's Furniture Warehouse, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00094419-CU-OE-CTL; Wietzke v. Costar Realty, U.S. District Court,

Southern District California, Case No. 09-cv-2743; Williams v. Lockheed Martin Corporation, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 3:09-cv-01669; Wilson v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc., U.S. District Court Central District of California, Case No. 8:14-cv-1021-FMO; Winston v. Lemore Transportation, Inc, Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. C-15-00897; Wise v. Cubic, U.S. District Court, Southern District California, Case No. 08-cv-2315; Witman v. Level 3 Communications, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2012-00091649-CU-OE-CTL; Yam v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, U.S. District Court, Northern District California, Case No. 10-cv-05225-SBA; Zurlo v. Mission Linen, U.S. District Court, Central District, Case No. 08cv1326; Baxt v. Scor U.S., Delaware Court of Chancery; Bronson v. Blech Securities - Settled U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York; Castro & Cardwell v. B & H Education, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC456198; Dibella v. Olympic Financial, U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota; Doyle v. Lorna Jane USA, Inc., Los Angles County Superior Court, Case No. BC526837; Estrella v. B-Per Electronic, Inc. & My Wireless, Inc., San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2013-00048951-CU-OE-CTL; Ferrari v. Read-Rite, U. S. District Court, Northern District of California; Forever 21 Wage and Hour Cases - Settled San Diego County Superior Court, JCC Proceeding No. 4745; Hart v. United States Tobacco Co., Los Angeles Superior Court; In re Bank of America Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litigation, U.S. District Court, District of Kansas, Case No. MDL 2138; In re Walgreen Co. Wage and Hour Litigation, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 11-cv-07664; Jackson v. Fresh & Easy Neighborhood Market Inc., Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC497964; U.S. Bankruptcy Court District of Delaware Case No. 13-12569 (KJC); Jordan/Ramos v. DMV -Sacramento County Superior Court; Kensington Capital v. Oakley, U. S. District Court, Southern District of California; Kensington Capital v. Vesta,U. S. District Court, Northern District of Alabama; Lopez v. Tire centers, LLC, U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 3:13-cv-05444-JCS; Miller v. Western Athletic Clubs, LLC, Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 112-cv-228670; Moffett v. WIS International, San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2011-00099909-CU-OE-CTL; Perez v. Urban Oufitters, Inc., U.S. District Court Northern District of California, Case No. 13-cv-02628-JSW; Ridgewood Capital Management v. Gensia, U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, #CV-92-1500H; Sandoval v. Redfin Corporation, U.S. District Court Northern District, Case No. 3:14-cv-04444-SC; Shurman v. Scimed, State of Minnesota District Court, Fourth District, #94-17640; Sioson v. AMP Holding, Inc., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00663825; Slatton v. G.E. Capital Mortgage Services, Camden County Superior Court, New Jersey, #CAML0256198; Somkin v. Molten Metal, U.S. District Court, District of Massachusetts, #9710325PBS; Sparks v AT&T, Illinois District Court - Madison County; Sullivan v. Lyon Management Group, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2013-00649432-CU-BT-CXC; Herencia v. Alexander's Steakhouse, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550551; Reinhardt v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. – Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-257217; DeBettencourt v. Interstate realty Management Company – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2015-0011942; Torres v. Bhandal Bros, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01555; Rodriguez v. El Toro Medical Investors Limited Partnership – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00059-JLS-KES; Velez v. Timec Specialty Services, Inc. & Transfield Services– Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC614318; Henry v. Central Freight Lines, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00280-JAM-EFB; Taylor v. TIC – The Industrial Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00186-VAP(SPX); Harvey v. Sears, Roebuck And Co. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00207556; Tapia v. Panda Express, LLC et al. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, JCCP No. 4919; Severson v. Lowe's HIW, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-00189508; Bendon v. DTG Operations, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00861-FMO-AGR; Talavera v. ACS Dataline, LP – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC617159; McHenry v. Prologix Distribution Services (West), LLC – Los Angeles County

Superior Court, Case No. BC608948; Stone v. Progistics Distribution, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, JCCP No 4881; Easton v. Handy Technologies, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00004419-CU-OE-CTL; Singh v. Total Renal Care, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-16-550847; Conners v. Rag Traders Melrose, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC591413; Saporito v. Space Explorations Technologies Corporation, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC554258; Calhoun v. Celadon Trucking Services, Inc., U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 16-CV-01351-PSG-FFM; Conners v. Mission Valley Kilt, LLC - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2015-00036888-CU-OE-CTL; Shibley v. New Prime, Inc. - U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00321-DOC; Lawrenz v. Blacktalon Enterprises, Inc. - Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. SCV-258205; Jamison v. Fitness 19 CA 121, LLC - Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS046697; Brooks v. Archer Trucking, Inc. – Mendocino County Superior Court, Case No. SCUK-CVG-16-67106; Montgomery v. New Prime, Inc. - San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1611884; Mills v. Core-Mark International, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, case No. 37-2016-00009669-CU-OE-CTL; Lopez v. Networked Insurance Agents, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00843587-CU-OE-CXC; Yberri v. Agent Provocateur, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620413; Woodard v. BKD Twenty-One Management Company, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00009682-CU-OE-CTL; Gallagher v. H.H. Restaurant, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00031247-CU-OE-CTL; San Nicolas v. West Covina Corporate Fitness, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC16304; Summerlin v. Maplebear Inc., d/b/a Instacart – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC 603030; Padilla v. Sutter West Bay Hospitals – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. CIV538977; Quagliariello v. Victory Entertainment, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC620273; Mohammad v. Tee It Up LLC – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C16-01188; Pucilowski v. Esurance Insurance Services, Inc. – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0038790; Arias v. Alamitos Enterprises, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00865183-CU-OE-CXC; Orzano v. Hazelwood Enterprises, Inc. - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00029231-CU-OE-CTL; Tejero v. Firstmed Ambulance Services, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00885355-CU-OE-CXC; Artis v. T-W Transport, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00013010-CU-OE-CTL; Searles v. Navajo Express, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1613846; Lara v. Commercial Protective Service, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC648921; Picos v. Culinart of California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 4892; Samaniego v. A&I Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV01894; Bailey v. Romanoff Floor Covering, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-00685-TLN-CMK; Aguirre v. Bitech, Inc.– Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2016-002022; Phillips v. DI Overnite LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00016800-CU-OE-CTL; Jacob v. Pride Transport, Inc. – Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 16CV1337; Bennett v. Heartland Express, Inc. of Iowa – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00015056-CU-OE-CTL; Stapf v. Mercer Health & Benefits Administration LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC643007; Armstrong v. Ruan Transport Corporation – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1605897; Geiger v. Floyd's 99-California LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2016-00874943-CU-OE-CXC; Mondrian v. Trius Trucking, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 16CECG01501; Johnson v. Fedex Office and Print Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17856291; Rios v. Pacific Western Bank - San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00038083; Sanders v. Old Dominion Freight Lines, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00030725-CU-OE-CTL; Taylor v. Gardner Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1614280; Couture v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, case No. 16-CV-02202-VC; Bertuol v.

AHMC Anaheim Regional Medical Center LP – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899024-CO-OE-CXC; Espinoza v. Prime Communications of California, LLC – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 16CIV01563; Archuletta v. Tidy Services, Inc.– Orange County Superior court, Case No. 30-2016-008611892-CU-OE-CXC; Puccini v. Earthbound Farm, LLC– Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV308643; Vikram v. First Student Management, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-04656-KAW; Blair v. Ashley Distribution Services, LTD. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01427-JAK-SP; Richardson v. Service Staffing, LLC– Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00899039-CU-OE-CXC; Coffin v. Certified Freight Logistics, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2016-00036523-CU-OE-CTL; Encarnacion v. S.A.S. Services Group, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00026726-CU-OE-CTL; Vasquez v. Golden State Overnight Delivery Service, Inc.– Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG17862924; Karr v. Tristar Managed Care, Inc. – Contra Costa Superior Court, case No. MSC17-00650; Gouveia v. Central Cal Transportation – San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2017-0001765;Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-CV-01438-JD; Spears v. Health Net of California, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2017-00210560; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01879; McComack v. Marriott Ownership Resorts, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 17CV1663 BEN WVG; Velasco v. Lemonade Restaurant Group, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC672235; Smith v. Personnel Services, Inc.– U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case NO. 17-CV-03594-SK; Gabriel v. Kuni SDA, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-000251191-CU-OE-CTL; Miller v. Mattress Firm, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313148; Provost v. Yourmechanic, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00024056-CU-OE-CTL; Zirpolo v. UAG Stevens Creek II, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV313457; Salazar v. Aids Healthcare Foundation – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00033482-CU-OE-CTL; Knipe v. Amazon.com, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2017-00029426-CU-OE-CTL; Erwin v. Caremeridian, LLC – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG03048; Davis v. Cox Communications California, LLC – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 16-CV-00989-BAS-BLM; Lara v. RMI International, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC597695; Harper v. C.R. England, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Utah Central Division, Case No. 16-CV-00906-DB; Mrazik v. C.H. Robinson Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 12-CV-02067-CAS-PLA; Horn v. Rise Medical Staffing, LLC – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Case No. 2:17-cv-01967-MCE-KJN; Pasallo v. GSG Protective Services CA Inc.– San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00037611-CU-OE-CTL; Smith v. Pacific Personnel Services, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 17-cv-03594-SK; Terrado v. Accredited Debt Relief, LLC – San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00014181-CU-OE-CTL; Escobedo v. Pacific Western Bank – Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC682686; Wade v. Automobile Club of Southern California – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2017-00960268-CU-OE-CXC; Montano v. American Automobile Association of Northern California – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC18-01539; Perez v. Summit Interconnect, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00995403-CU-OE-CXC; Wolleson v. Gosch Imports, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC170356; Banuelos v. Ortho Mattress, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161304-CU-OE-CXC; Castellanos v. Miller Automotive Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC699211; Tressler v. Spoonful Management, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71940; Delph v. Employee Retention Services, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00007885; Romero v. May Trucking Company – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 5:17-cv-02166-JGB-SHK; Miranda v. Genex Services, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1700779; Moore v. Zirx

Transportation Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566655; Sottile v. Motion Recruitment Partners – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV321677; Shahbazian v. Fast Auto Loans, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Case No. 2:18-cv-03076-ODW-KS; Salazar v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC702468; Conti v. L'Oreal USA S/D, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California, Fresno, Case No. 1:19-CV-00769-LJO-SKO; Mercado v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 17CV320059; Vikili v. Dignity Health – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-569456; Bagby v. Swissport SA, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC691058; Henry v. Motion Entertainment Group, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC18565643; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Lanuza v. AccentCare, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-565521; Thomas v. Easy Driving School, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00047639-CU-OE-CTL; Erickson v. Erickson – Contra Costa Counrt Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00307; Martin v. Menzies Aviation (USA) Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566072; Mortimer v. Healthsouth Bakersfield Rehabilitation Hospital, LLC – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-18-102761; Alcaraz v. Red Lion Hotels Corporation – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-570310; Calhoun v. Total Transportation and Distribution, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058681-CU-OE-CTL; Rataul v. Overton Security Services, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG18891882; Beltran v. Compass Bank –San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024475-CU-OE-CTL; Kirshner v. Touchstone Golf, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00028865-CU-OE-CTL; Pizarro v.The Home Depot, Inc. – U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia-Atlanta Division; Hatanaka v. Restore Rehabilitation, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00034780-CU-OE-CTL; Faria v. Carriage Funeral Holdings, Inc. – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC18-00606; Ontiveros v. Baker Concrete Construction, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV328679; Morales v. Redlands Automotive Services, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1807525; Ramirez v. Carefusion Resources, LLC –U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; Amster v. Starbucks Corporation – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1922016; Kutzman v. Derrel's Mini Storage, Inc. – U.S. District, Eastern District of California, Case No. 1:18-cv-00755-AWI-JLT; Marks v. Universal Propulsion Company, Inc.– Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS051608; Martinez v. Geil Enterprises, Inc. – Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 17CECG01480; Teniente v. Cirrus Asset Management, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV16302; Blackshear v. California Fine Wine & Spirits LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2018-00245842; Warnick v. Golden Gate America West LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC714176; Bennett v. Dnata Aviation USA, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-18-566911; George v. PF Stockton Fitness LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00261113-CU-OE-GDS; Oshana v. Farmers and Merchants Bank of Central California – Stanislaus County Superior Court, Case No. CV-19-003427; Vasquez v. Packaging Corporation of America, – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-01935-PSG-PLA; Palomino v. Zara USA Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-00992682-CU-OE-CXC; Simmons v. Joe & The Juice LA, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court; Pacia v. CIM Group, L.P. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC709666; Flores v. Plastic Express – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BC71971; Madera v. William Warren Properties, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01055704-CU-OE-CXC; Hernandez v. Quality Custom Distribution – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-01010611-CU-OE-CXC; Arango v. Schlumberger Technology Corporation –Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01056839-CU-OE-CXC; Dandoy v. West Coast Convenience, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20051121; Ramirez v. J E H Enterprises, Inc. – San Francisco County

Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-574691; Sullen v. First Service Residential California, LLC – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-19-575131; Valentino v. East Bay Tire Co, – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS053067; Murphy v. Rockler Retail Group, Inc. – Sacramento Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Shahbazian v. Onewest Bank – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV23722; Bruemmer v. Tempur Retail Stores LLC – Marin County Superior Court, Case No. CIV1803646; Antonios v. Interface Rehab, Inc. – Orange County Superior, Case No. 30-2019-01067547-CU-OE-CXC; Tavallodi v. DC Auto, Inc. – San Bernardino, Case No. CIVDS1833598; Miranda v. The Lloyd Pest Control Co. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00052510-CU-OE-CTL; Soenardi v. Magnussen Imports, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 18CV340003; Thai v. Team Industrial Services, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV21953; Castillo v. A.J. Kirkwood & Associates, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV04435; Moss v. Jabil Inc, – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG20050536; Billosillo, Jr. v. Crown Energy Services, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2018-00058254-CU-OE-CTL; Tarkington v. Freetime, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00011473-CU-OE-CTL; McIntyre v. J.J.R. Enterprises, Inc. – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00251220; Bucur v. Pharmaca Integrative Pharmacy, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00009409-CU-OE-CTL; Batin v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV347733; Terry v. McGee Air Services, Inc. – King County Superior Court of Washington, Case No. 19-2-3321-5 KNT; Weiss v. Niznik Behavioral Health Resources, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00039441-CU-OE-CTL; Cavada v. Inter-Continental Hotels Group, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Southern District of California, Case No. 3:19-cv-01675-GPC-AHG;Lesevic v. Spectraforce Technologies, Inc. – U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. 5:19-cv-03126-LHK; Mutchler v. Circle K Stores, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00016331-CU-OE-CTL, Azima v. CSI Medical Group, – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV345450; Porras v. Baypointe Enterprises, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV31015; Mitchell v. Mack Trucking, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1928334; Watts v. T.R.L. Systems, Incorporated – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01102457-CU-OE-CXC; Price v. DMSD Restaurants Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00024062-CU-OE-CTL; Jacobs v. Nortek Security & Control LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-0019735-CU-OE-CTL; Gonzalez v. Hub International Midwest – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1900463; Cisneros v. Bluepearl California, Inc. – San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. 19-CIV-05707; Garcia v. Gallagher Basset Services – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2004140; Callow v. Adventist Health System/West – Placer County Superior Court, Case No. SCV0043607; Dominguez v. Kimco Facility Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV37592; Searles v. Robert Heath Trucking, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCY30808; Rangel v. Pioneer Hi-Bred international, Inc. – Yolo County Superior C ourt, Case No. CV-19-1797; Ivon v. Sinclair Television of California, Humboldt County Superior Court, Case No. DR190699; Williams v. Henkels & McCoy, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2003888; Cano v. Larry Green Chrysler Jeep Dodge, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. BLC1900184; Lopez v. Cepheid – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 19CV358827; Hernandez v. Quick Dispense, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV29405; Lopez v. Lacoste USA, Inc. – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS1914626; Duhe v. Hospital Couriers Nevada, LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. MSC19-01377; Law v. Sequoia Equities, Incorporated – Contra Costa Superior Court, Case No. C19-01925; Dvorak v. Rockwell Collins, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2019-00064397-CU-OE-CTL; Noguera v. Metal Container Corporation – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003235; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo Superior Court, Case No. 19CV-0435; Leon v. Miller Event Management, Inc. – San Luis Obispo County Superior Court,

Case No. 19CV-0435, Camacho-Bias v. Serve U Brands Inc. – Butte County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV00603; La Pietra v. Entertainment Partners Services, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV39529; Celis v. Theatre Box - San Diego, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. ____ ; Ignacio v. Laboratory Corporation of America – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:19-cv-06079-AB-RAO; Kovnas v. Cahill Contractors LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19037852; Hersh v. Mrs. Gooch's Natural Food – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 19STCV10444; Miller v. The Permanente Medical Group – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG19045904; Vasquez v. Autoalert, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2019-01114549-CU-OE-CXC; Cavanaugh v. Morton Golf, LLC – Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2019-00270176; Coley v. Monroe Operations, LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20063188; Ramirez v. Sierra Aluminum Company – U.S. District Court, California Central District Court, Case No. 5:20-cv-00417-JGB-KK; Marrero v. Stat Med, P.C. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. HG19043214; Enriquez v. Solari Enterprises, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV11129; Craig v. Hometown Heart – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-582454; Lopez v. Hy0Lang Electric California, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00012543-CU-OE-CTL; Heuklom v. Clara Medical Group, P.C. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585918; Dominguez v. Lifesafer of Northern California – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002586; Kiseleva v. Totalmed Staffing Inc. – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 5:19-cv-06480; Vires v. Sweetgreen, Inc. – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365918; Kim v. Wireless Vision, LLC – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2000074; Senoren v. Air Canada Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV13942; Clark v. Quest Diagnostics Incorporated – San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2018707; Green v. Shipt, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV01001; Respass v. The Scion Group LLC – Sacramento County Superior County, Case No. 34-2020-00285265; Jackson v. Decathlon USA LLC – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG2003024; Avacena v. FTG Aerospace Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV28767; Perez v. Butler America, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV20218; Christensen v. Carter's Retail, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01138792-CU-OE-CXC; Astudillo v. Torrance Health Association, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV18424; Hansen v. Holiday Al Management Sub LLC – Contra Costa County Superior Court, Case No. CIVMSC20-00779; Almahdi v. Vitamin Shoppe Industries Inc – Santa Clara County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV365150; Krisinda v. Loyal Source Government Services LLC – U.S. District Court, California Southern District, Case No. 3:20-cv-879-LAB-NLS; Ettedgui v. WB Studio Enterprises Inc – U.S. District Court, California Central District, Case No. 2:20-CV-08053-MCS (MAAx); Fernandez v. Nuvision Federal Credit Union – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01161691-CU-OE-CJC; Aviles v. UPS Supply Chain Solutions, Inc. – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2000727; Alcocer v. DSV Solutions, LLC – San Bernardino Superior Court, Case No. CIVDS2010345; Wilson v. Wholesome Harvest Baking, LLC – U.S. District Court, California Northern District, Case No. 4:20-cv-05186-YGR; Gregory v. Verio Healthcare, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV37254; Rose v. Impact Group, LLC – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01141107-CU-OE-CXC; Monasterio v. Citibank, N.A. – San Mateo County Superior Court, Case No. 20-CIV-03650; Martinez-Lopez v. Medamerica, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00034393-CU-OE-CTL; Cox v. PRB Management, LLC – Solano County Superior Court, Case No. FCS055514; Nash v. K. Hovnanian Companies, LLC – Riverside County Superior Court, Case No. RIC2003319; Kyler v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00015828-CU-OE-CTL; Roberts v. Solantic Corporation – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV41117; Price v. Mistras Group, Inc. – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV22485; Macias v. ABM Electrical & Lighting Solutions, Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-

00024997-CU-OE-CTL; Basu-Kesselman v. Garuda Labs, Inc. – San Francisco County Superior Court, Case No. CGC-20-585229; Armstrong v. Prometric LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV29967; Ashlock v. Advantis Medical Staffing, LLC – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00022305-CU-OE-CTL; Wilson v. WXI Global Solutions, LLC – Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 20STCV25007; Gandhale v. Select Rehabilitation, LLC – Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV002240; Starvoice v. G4S Secure Solutions (USA) Inc. – San Diego County Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00029421-CU-OE-CTL; Mbise v. Axlehire, Inc. – Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG20067350; Points v. C&J Services, Inc. – Kern County Superior Court, Case No. BCV-20-102483; Marshall v. PHI Air Medical, LLC – Lassen County Superior Court, Case No. 62973; Jauregui v. Cyctec Egineered Materials, Inc. – Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2020-01164932-CU-OE-CXC

EXHIBIT #2

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens ("Plaintiff") and defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant"). The Agreement refers to Plaintiff and Defendant collectively as the "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. DEFINITIONS

In addition to other terms defined in this Agreement, the terms below have the following meaning in this Agreement:

1.1. "Actions" means the Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC,* Case No. CGC-24-614434, initiated on May 6, 2024 and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco and Plaintiff's lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendant captioned *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC*, Case No. CGC-24-619103 initiated on October 18, 2024 and pending in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco.

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

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

1.4. "Aggrieved Employees" means all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period.

1.5. "Class" means all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.

1.6. "Class Counsel" means Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP.

1.7. "Class Counsel Fees Payment" and "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts to be paid to Class Counsel for fees and expenses, respectively, as approved by the Court, to compensate Class Counsel for their legal work in connection with the Action, including their pre-filing investigation, their filing of the

Action, all related litigation activities, all Settlement work, all post-Settlement compliance procedures, and related litigation expenses billed in connection with the Action.

1.8. "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendant's possession including the Class Member's name, last-known mailing address, Social Security number, personal, non-ILS email address (if known and available to Defendant), and number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.

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

1.10. "Class Member Address Search" means the Administrator's investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members by use of available email addresses, phone numbers, social security numbers, credit reports, LinkedIn and Facebook.

1.11. "Class Notice" means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be mailed to Class Members in English, attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

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

1.13. "Class Period" means the period of time from May 6, 2020 to the earlier of April 27, 2025 or the date of Preliminary Approval.

1.14. "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiff in the Operative Complaint in the Action seeking Court approval to serve as a Class Representative.

1.15. "Class Representative Service Payment" means the service payment made to the Plaintiff as Class Representative in order to compensate for initiating the Action, performing work in support of the Action, undertaking the risk of liability for Defendant's expenses, and for the general release of all claims by the Plaintiff.

1.16. "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco.

1.17. "Defendant" means Independent Living Systems, LLC.

1.18. "Defense Counsel" means Jonathan P. Schmidt, Kelli M. Dreger and Rochelle N. Miller of Jackson Lewis P.C.

1.19. "Effective Date" means the date by when all of the following events have occurred: (1) the Agreement has been executed by all Parties, Class Counsel and Defendant's counsel; (2) the court has given preliminary approval to the Agreement; (3) the Class Notice has been given to the Settlement Class, providing Class Members with an opportunity to object to the terms of the Settlement or to opt out of the Released Class Claims, defined below; (4) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; (5) the Judgment is final; (6) sixty-five (65) calendar days have passed since the Court has entered the Judgment; and (7) in the event there are written objections filed prior to the Final Approval hearing which are not later withdrawn or denied, the later of the following events: (a) five business days after the period for filing any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding opposing the Court's final order approving the Agreement has elapsed without any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding having been filed; or, (b) if any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding opposing the Court's final order approving the Agreement has been filed, five (5) business days after any appeal, writ or other appellate proceedings opposing the Agreement has been finally and conclusively dismissed with no right to pursue further remedies or relief. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no appeal is filed, the expiration date of the time for the filing or noticing of any appeal from, or other challenge to, the Court's Judgment (this time period shall not be less than 60 calendar days after the court's Judgment is entered); (b) the date affirmance of an appeal of the Judgment because final under the Federal Rules; or (c) the date of final dismissal of any appeal from the Judgment or the final dismissal of any proceeding on review of any court of appeal decision relating to the Judgment.

1.20. "Final Approval" means the Court's order granting final approval of the Settlement substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.21. "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement to determine whether to approve finally and implement the terms of this Agreement and enter the Judgment.

1.22. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Six Hundred and Eighty Thousand Dollars ($680,000) which is the total amount to be paid by Defendant as provided by this Agreement except as provided in Paragraph 9 below. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment and the Administration Expenses Payment. This Gross Settlement Amount is an all-in amount without any reversion to Defendant, and excludes any employer payroll taxes, if any, due on the

portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall not be paid from the Gross Settlement and shall be the separate additional obligation of Defendant.

1.23. "Individual Class Payment" means the Participating Class Member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Workweeks a Class Member worked during the Class Period.

1.24. "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of PAGA Pay Periods an Aggrieved Employee worked during the PAGA Period.

1.25. "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon Final Approval substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C to this Agreement and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

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

1.27. "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

1.28. "Net Settlement Amount" means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. The Net Settlement Amount is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

1.29. "Non-Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who opts out of the Class Settlement by submitting a valid and timely Request for Exclusion to the Administrator.

1.30. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.31. "PAGA Period" means the period of time from April 9, 2023 to the earlier of April 27, 2025 or the date of Preliminary Approval.

1.32. "PAGA" means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).

1.33. "PAGA Notice" means Plaintiff's April 9, 2024 and April 18, 2025 letters to Defendant and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).

1.34. "PAGA Penalties" means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees ($3,750) and the 75% to LWDA ($11,250) in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.35. "Participating Class Member" means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

1.36. "Plaintiff" means Samuel Gallagher-Stevens, the named plaintiff in the Actions.

1.37. "Preliminary Approval" means the Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit B to this Agreement and incorporated by this reference herein.

1.38. "Released Class Claims" means claims that occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims under state, federal, or local law, whether statutory or common law expressly pleaded in the Operative Complaint. This release includes all other claims, such as those under the California Labor Code, Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provision of law, that could have been reasonably pleaded based on the facts reasonably alleged in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims for (1) failure to pay overtime wages; (2) failure to authorize or permit meal periods; (3) failure to authorize or permit rest periods; (4) failure to provide accurate and itemized wage statements; (5) failure to timely pay all earned wages due at time of separation of employment; (6) failure to timely pay wages during employment; (7) violation of California's unfair competition law at Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (8) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (9) violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) failure to maintain records. Except as expressly set forth in this Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

1.39. "Released PAGA Claims" means all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice which occurred during the PAGA Period. The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination, unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and claims outside of the PAGA Period.

1.40. "Released Parties" means: Defendant and any of its present and former parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, related or affiliated companies, and all of their respective shareholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers,

reinsurers, successors and assigns, and any individual or entity that could be liable for any of the Released Class Claims or Released PAGA Claims.

1.41. "Request for Exclusion" means a Class Member's submission of a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.

1.42. "Response Deadline" means sixty (60) calendar days after the Administrator mails Class Notice Packet to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) submit Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) submit his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Class Notice Packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline has expired.

1.43. "Settlement" means the disposition of the Action and all related claims effectuated by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.44. "Workweek" means any week during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendant as a Class Member for at least one day.

2. RECITALS

2.1. On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco ("Class Action"). Plaintiff's complaint asserted claims that Defendant:

(a) Violated California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.;
(b) Failed to pay overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code § 510, et seq.;
(c) Failed to provide required meal periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
(d) Failed to provide required rest periods in violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order;
(e) Failed to reimburse employees for required expenses in violation of California Labor Code § 2802.
(f) Failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code § 226;
(g) Failed to provide wages when due in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203;
(h) Failed to pay sick pay wages in violation of California Labor Code §§201-203, 233, 246;
(i) Discrimination and retaliation in violation of FEHA; and,
(j) Wrongful termination in violation of Public Policy.

2.2. On October 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendant in the Superior

Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco ("PAGA Action"). Plaintiff's complaint asserted a claim that Defendant violated the Private Attorney General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq. ("PAGA").

2.3. On February 7, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Jonathan D. Andrews, Esq., a respected mediator of wage and hour representative and class actions. Following the mediation, each side, represented by its respective counsel, were able to agree to settle the Actions based upon a mediator's proposal which was memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties.

2.4. Prior to mediation, Plaintiff obtained sufficient documents and information to sufficiently investigate the claims such that Plaintiff's investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 and *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar"*).

2.5. On June 2, 2025, the Parties filed a stipulation to amend the complaint in the Class Action and add the claims alleged in the PAGA Action and the claims alleged in the PAGA Notices. The First Amended Complaint in the Class Action is referred to as the "Operative Complaint"). Defendant denies the allegations in the Operative Complaint, denies any failure to comply with the laws identified in in the Operative Complaint and denies any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.

2.6. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or will be construed as an admission by Defendant that the claims in the Actions of Plaintiff or the Class have merit or that Defendant bears any liability to Plaintiff or the Class on those claims or any other claims, or as an admission by Plaintiff that Defendant's defenses in the Actions have merit. The Parties agree to certification of the Class for purposes of this Settlement only. If for any reason the settlement does not become effective, Defendant reserves the right to contest certification of any class for any reason and reserves all available defenses to the claims in the Actions.

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

3. MONETARY TERMS

3.1. Gross Settlement Amount. Except as otherwise provided by Paragraph 9 below, Defendant promises to pay $680,000 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount. This amount is all-inclusive of all payments contemplated in this resolution, excluding any

employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages which shall be separately paid by Defendant to the Administrator. Defendant has no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendant.

3.2. Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, the Administrator will make the following payments out of the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval.

(a) To Plaintiff: Class Representative Service Payment to the Class Representative of not more than $15,000 (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member). Defendant will not oppose Plaintiff's request for a Class Representative Service Payment that does not exceed this amount. As part of the motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment, Plaintiff will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Representative Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiff assumes full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment. In addition, Plaintiff is separately settling his claims for Discrimination and Retaliation in violation of FEHA and Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy as alleged in the Class Action Complaint as causes of action numbers 10 and 11 ("Plaintiff's Individual Claims"). The payment for the settlement of Plaintiff's Individual Claims are not being made in consideration of the settlement and dismissal of the Class and PAGA claims in the Actions.

(b) To Class Counsel: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which is currently estimated to be $226,666, and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $25,000. Defendant will not oppose requests for these payments provided that do not exceed these amounts. Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will file a motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiff's Counsel arising from any claim to any portion any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms.

Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendant harmless, and indemnifies Defendant, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these payments.

(c) To the Administrator: An Administration Expenses Payment not to exceed $15,000 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses Payment is less or the Court approves payment less than $15,000, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members.

(d) To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees: PAGA Penalties in the amount of $15,000 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% ($11,250) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($3,750) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

i. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($3,750) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

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

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

i. Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

ii. Effect of Non-Participating Class Members on Calculation of Individual Class Payments. Non-Participating Class Members will not receive any Individual Class

Payments. The Administrator will retain amounts equal to their Individual Class Payments in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING

4.1. Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods. Based on its records, Defendant has represented that as of the date of mediation on February 7, 2025, the Class consisted of 434 Class Members who collectively worked a total of 26,963 Workweeks, and 360 Aggrieved Employees who worked a total of 8,381 PAGA Pay Periods.

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

4.3. Funding of the Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date.

5. PAYMENTS FROM THE GROSS SETTLEMENT AMOUNT

5.1. Within 14 days after Defendant funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment.

5.2. The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and/or Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Class Members via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the "void date", which is 180 days after the date of mailing, when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Class Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class

Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database. If a Participating Class Member's or Aggrieved Employee's check is not cashed within 120 days after its last mailing to the affected individual, the Administrator will also send the individual a notice informing him or her that unless the check is cashed by the void date, it will expire and become non-negotiable, and offer to replace the check if it was lost or misplaced but not cashed.

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

5.4. For any Class Member whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to Children's Advocacy Institute, a Court-approved nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy Pres Recipient"). The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipient.

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

6. RELEASE OF CLAIMS. Effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff, Participating Class Members, Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

6.1. Plaintiff's Release. Plaintiff and his or her respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the Class Period, including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that were, or

reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained, in the Operative Complaint and (b) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged based on facts contained in the Operative Complaint, Plaintiff's PAGA Notice ("Plaintiff's Release"). Plaintiff's Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits, or workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. Plaintiff acknowledges that Plaintiff may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiff's Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiff's discovery of them.

(a) Plaintiff's Waiver of Rights Under Civil Code Section 1542. For purposes of Plaintiff's Release, Plaintiff expressly waives and relinquishes the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which reads:

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

(b) Plaintiff's Other Claims. Plaintiff represents that he has claims against Defendant other than the Class claims and PAGA claims. Plaintiff is separately settling Plaintiff's Individual Claims. Class Counsel will be filing a declaration with the Court affirming that the consideration given for the dismissal of Plaintiff's Individual Claims is unrelated to and separate from the settlement of his Class claims and PAGA claims and is based on separate facts and claims.

6.2. Release by Participating Class Members. All Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims.

6.3. Release of PAGA Claims. All Aggrieved Employees and the LWDA are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims.

7. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL. The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval") that complies with the Court's procedures and instructions.

/ / /

/ / /

7.1. Defendant's Responsibilities. Within 14 days of the full execution of this Agreement, Defendant will prepare and deliver to Class Counsel a signed Declaration disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator and the Cy Pres Recipient, if any.

7.2. Plaintiff's Responsibilities. Plaintiff will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval and Approval of PAGA Settlement; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members and/or the proposed Cy Pres Recipient; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiff, Class Counsel or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiff confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members, and/or the Administrator and/or the proposed Cy Pres Recipient; (v) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(2)); (vi) a redlined version of the parties' Agreement showing all modifications made to the Model Agreement ready for filing with the Court; and (vii) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, the Administrator and/or the Cy Pres Recipient, if any. In their Declarations, Plaintiff and Class Counsel Declaration shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement

7.3. Responsibilities of Counsel. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

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

change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

8. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

8.1. Selection of Administrator. The Parties have jointly selected Apex Class Action to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Apex Class Action agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Administrator's duties will include preparing, printing, and mailing the Class Notice Packet to all Class Members; conducting a National Change of Address search to update Class Member addresses before mailing the Class Notice Packets; re-mailing Class Notice Packets that are returned to the Class Member's new address; setting up a toll-free telephone number and email and a fax number to receive communications from Class Members; receiving and reviewing for validity completed Requests for Exclusion; providing the Parties with weekly status reports about the delivery of Class Notice Packets and receipt of Requests for Exclusion, objections and disputes; calculating Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments; issuing the checks to effectuate the payments due under the Settlement; issuing the tax reports required under this Settlement; and otherwise administering the Settlement pursuant to this Agreement. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

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

8.3. Qualified Settlement Fund. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.

8.4. Notice to Class Members.

(a) No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, PAGA Members, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

(b) Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service ("USPS") mail, the Class Notice substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibit A. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of

any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.

(c) Not later than 7 days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

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

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

8.5. Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

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

(b) The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably

ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

(c) Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Releases under Paragraph 6.2 of the Agreement, regardless whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

(d) Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 6.3 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted and the objection will be void.

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

8.7. Objections to Settlement.

(a) Only Participating Class Members may object to the class action components of the Settlement and/or this Agreement, including contesting the fairness of the Settlement,

and/or amounts requested for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.

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

(c) Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement. If a Class Member submits both a Request for Exclusion and an objection, only the Request for Exclusion will be accepted and the objection will be void.

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

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

(b) Request for Exclusion (Opt-Outs) and Exclusion List. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 7 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted (whether valid or invalid).

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

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

(e) Administrator's Declaration. Not later than 7 days before the date by which Plaintiff is required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion from Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

(f) Final Report by Administrator. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 7 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court. If a second declaration attesting to the distribution of uncashed checks is required, the Administrator shall provide this second declaration at least 7 days before any deadline for a second declaration and Class Counsel shall be responsible for filing the second declaration with the Court.

9. CLASS SIZE MODIFICATION AND ESCALATOR CLAUSE. Based on its records, Defendant provided figures as to the Class size as set forth in paragraph 4.1 above. The Gross Settlement Amount will increase proportionally with added Class Members and/or added Workweeks if the actual number of Workweeks in the Class Period is more than 10% of the estimate stated herein in paragraph 4.1 (e.g., if the number of workweeks exceeds 26,963 by 17%, then Defendant shall pay 7% more than the Gross Settlement Amount). Alternatively, if the actual number of workweeks in the Class Period is more than 10% of the estimate stated herein in paragraph 4.1, Defendant may, without consent of the Plaintiff, elect to alter the Class Period to a time period that does not trigger the escalator clause.

10. DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO WITHDRAW. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 5% of the total of all Class Members, Defendant may, but is not obligated, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that, if Defendant withdraws, the Settlement shall be void ab initio, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendant will remain responsible for paying all Administration Expenses incurred as of the date Defendant makes this election to withdraw. Defendant must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw not later than 7 days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel. Invalid Requests for Exclusion will have no effect on this threshold for an election.

11. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699(l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel not later than 7 days prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

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

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

11.3. Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Action, and the Settlement under C.C.P. section 664.6 solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.

11.4. Waiver of the Right to Appeal. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment set forth in this Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the

Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.

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

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

13. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

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

13.2. Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval. Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly, specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. At all times, Plaintiff and his counsel agree to keep all terms of this settlement confidential and will not make any public disclosure or social media postings of the dispute except as necessary to respond to requests and inquiries made by putative Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees, and for court filings in seeking settlement approval and disclosures and communications expressly authorized in this Agreement. If comment or information is requested by the media, Plaintiff and his counsel will provide no information other than direct the media to the public records of the action on file with the Court. Plaintiff's counsel will take all steps necessary to ensure Plaintiff are aware of, and will encourage them to adhere to, the restriction against public disclosure and media comment on the Settlement and its terms. Plaintiff's Counsel and the Plaintiff agree that this Confidentiality term is a material term and that breach of this provision shall be deemed a material breach of this Settlement. With the exception of disclosures and communications expressly authorized in this Agreement (e.g. to the Administrator), Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication with third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

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

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

13.5. Attorney Authorization. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiff and Defendant, respectively, to take all

appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

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

13.7. Prior Assignments. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.

13.8. Tax Advice. Neither Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendant nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.

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

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

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

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

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

13.14. Use and Return of Class Data. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendant in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or

in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement, and no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court. Not later than 90 days after the date when the Court discharges the Administrator's obligation to provide a Declaration confirming the final pay out of all Settlement funds, Plaintiff shall destroy, all paper and electronic versions of Class Data received from Defendant.

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

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

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

To Plaintiff and the Class:

Norman B. Blumenthal
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Tel.: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232
E-Mail: norm@bamlawca.com
kyle@bamlawca.com

To Defendant:

Jonathan P. Schmidt
Kelli M. Dreger
Rochelle N. Miller
Jackson Lewis P.C.
200 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 885-1360
E-Mail: Jonathan.schmidt@jacksonlewis.com
Kelli.dreger@jacksonlewis.com

Rochelle.miller@jacksonlewis.com

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

13.19. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process from the mediation on February 7, 2025 until the earlier of the Effective Date or the date this Agreement shall no longer be of any force or effect.

13.20. Fair Settlement. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel believe and warrant that this Agreement reflects a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement of the Action and have arrived at this Agreement through arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, both current and potential.

14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: 07/25/2025

Samuel JG Stevens (Jul 25, 2025 16:10:45 EDT)

Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens

Dated: _____

Nestor Plana, Chief Executive Officer
For Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC

Dated: 7/25/25

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: July 25, 2025

Jonathan P. Schmidt
Attorney for Defendant

Rochelle.miller@jacksonlewis.com

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

13.19. Stay of Litigation. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process from the mediation on February 7, 2025 until the earlier of the Effective Date or the date this Agreement shall no longer be of any force or effect.

13.20. Fair Settlement. The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel believe and warrant that this Agreement reflects a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement of the Action and have arrived at this Agreement through arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, both current and potential.

14. EXECUTION BY PARTIES AND COUNSEL

The Parties and their counsel hereby execute this Agreement.

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens

Dated: 7/28/25

_____
Nestor Plana, Chief Executive Officer
For Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC

Dated: _____

_____
Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: July 28, 2025

_____
Jonathan P. Schmidt
Attorney for Defendant

EXHIBIT A

[NOTICE OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT OF CLASS ACTION AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL]

EXHIBIT "A"

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

***Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC,* Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco, Case No. CGC-24-614434**

The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully! It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.

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

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens ("Plaintiff") and seeks payment of (1) wages and other relief for the Class of all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period which is May 6, 2020 to April 27, 2025 ("Class Members"), and (2) civil penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period which is April 9, 2023 to April 27, 2025 ("Aggrieved Employees").

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

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

The above estimates are based on Defendant's records showing that **you worked <<_____>> workweeks** during the Class Period and **you worked <<_____>> pay periods** during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks and/or pay periods during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 5 of this Class Notice below.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Class Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or do not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to

finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendant to make payments under the Settlement and in exchange requires Class Members to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendant.

If you worked for Defendant during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

(1) **Do Nothing**. You don't have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment if eligible. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims against Defendant as described below in Section 4 below.

(2) **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement**. You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting the written Request for Exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment, however you will preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period wage claims against Defendant. If you are an Aggrieved Employee, you remain eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

Defendant will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT:	
You Don't Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement	If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendant that are covered by this Settlement (Released Class Claims). Additional information is set forth below.
You Can Opt-out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement **The Response Deadline is _____.**	If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. **If you request exclusion, you will receive no money from the Class Settlement and you will not be bound by the Class Settlement.** Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section 7 of this Class Notice. However, you cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement. If you are an Aggrieved Employee and exclude yourself, you will still be paid your Individual PAGA Payment and

	will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether you submit a request for exclusion.
Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement **Written Objections Must be Submitted by the Response Deadline (_____)**	All Class Members who do not opt-out ("Participating Class Members") can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court's decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiff who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff if you think they are unreasonable. See Section **8** of this Class Notice.
You Can Participate in the Final Approval Hearing	The Court's Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on _____ at 9:00 a.m., at the San Francisco County Superior Court, located at 400 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA 94102, in Department 302 before Judge Joseph M. Quinn. This hearing may change as explained below in Section 9. You don't have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court's virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section **9** of this Class Notice.
You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks / Pay Periods **Witten Challenges Must be Submitted by the Response Deadline (_____)**	The amount of your Individual Class Payment and your Individual PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many pay periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Class Period workweeks and number of PAGA Period pay periods you worked according to Defendant's records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by _____. See Section **5** of this Class Notice.

1. Why did I get this Notice?

A proposed class action settlement (the "Settlement") of the above-captioned action pending in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of San Francisco (the "Court"), has been reached between Plaintiff and Defendant as set forth in the written Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("the Agreement"), and has been granted preliminary approval by the Court. 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 individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.
>
> The "Class Period" is May 6, 2020 to April 27, 2025.

2. What is this class action lawsuit about?

On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco (the "Action"). Plaintiff asserted the following class claims against Defendant: unfair competition, failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide required meal periods, failure to provide required rest periods, failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, failure to reimburse employees for required expenses, failure to provide wages when due, and failure to provide sick pay. On October 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a separate Representative Action Complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco (the "PAGA Action").

On _____,2025, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint in the Action that contains the claim for violation of the Private Attorney General Act, Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq. ("PAGA") originally filed in the PAGA Action. The First Amended Complaint is referred to as the "Operative Complaint".

Defendant denies that it has done anything wrong and disputes all the claims in the Action. Specifically, Defendant contends that Plaintiff and the Class Members were, at all times, properly compensated for wages under California law; that Plaintiff and the Class Members were provided with meal and rest periods in compliance with California law; that Defendant did not fail to pay to Plaintiff or any Class Members any wages allegedly due at the time of their termination; that Defendant did not fail to reimburse Class Members for required expenses; that Defendant complied with California wage statement requirements; that Defendant did not violate California Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*; that Defendant is not liable for any of the penalties sought or that could be sought in the Action; and that this Action cannot be maintained as a class or representative 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 firm Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP to serve as Class Counsel.

The Court has not ruled on the merits of Plaintiff's claims. However, to avoid additional expense, inconvenience, and interference with the business operations of Defendant, the Parties concluded that it is in their best interests and the interests of the Class to settle the Action now on the terms summarized in this Class Notice. The Settlement was reached after mediation and arm's-length negotiations between the Parties. The Plaintiff and Class Counsel think the settlement is in the best interest of all Class Members.

Accordingly, the Settlement constitutes a compromise of disputed claims and should not be construed as an admission of liability on the part of Defendant, who expressly deny all liability.

3. What are the terms of the Settlement?

Gross Settlement Amount. **Defendant has agreed to pay an "all in" amount of Six Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars ($680,000) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to fund the settlement of the Action.** The Gross Settlement Amount includes all payments of Individual Class Payments to Class Members, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, and the PAGA Penalties for civil penalties under PAGA. Any employer-side payroll taxes on the portion of the Individual Class Payments allocated to wages shall be separately paid by the Defendant. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount within 30 days after the Effective Date. The "Effective Date" is the date 65 days after the Judgment is entered, or if there is any appeal, the date the Judgment is no longer subject to appeal. Within 14 days after Defendant fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment.

Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement Amount. The proposed payments, subject to Court approval, will be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount before payments of Individual Class Payments are made to Class Members who do not request exclusion ("Participating Class Members"). At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:

- Administration Expenses Payment. Payment to the Administrator, estimated not to exceed $15,000, for expenses, including expenses of notifying the Class Members of the Settlement, processing opt outs, and distributing settlement checks and tax forms.

- Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Payment to Class Counsel of reasonable attorneys' fees not to exceed one-third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount, which presently equals $226,666, and an additional amount to reimburse actual litigation costs incurred by the Plaintiff not to exceed $25,000. Class Counsel has 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 has been paying all litigation costs and expenses. The amounts stated are what Class Counsel will be requesting and the final amounts to be paid will be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.

- Class Representative Service Payment. Class Representative Service Payment in an amount not more than $15,000 to the Plaintiff, or such lesser amount as may be approved by the Court, to compensate for services on behalf of the Class in initiating and prosecuting the Action, and for the risks Plaintiff undertook. The amount stated is what Plaintiff will be requesting and the final amount to be paid will be decided at the Final Approval Hearing.

- PAGA Penalties. A payment of $15,000 relating to Plaintiff's claim under PAGA, $11,250 of which will be paid to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA"). The remaining $3,750 will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($3,750) by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment. "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendant for at least one day during the PAGA Period (April 9, 2023 to April 27, 2025).

Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

Calculation of Payments to Class Members. After all of the payments of the court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs, the Class Representative Service Payment, the PAGA Penalties, and the Administration Expenses Payment are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, the "Net Settlement Amount", shall be distributed as Individual Class Payments to the Participating Class Members. The Net Settlement Amount is estimated to be at least $_____. The Administrator will pay an Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount to each Participating Class Member. The Individual Class Payment for each Participating Class Member will be calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks. "Workweek" means any week during the Class Period in which a Class Member worked for Defendant as a Class Member for at least one day. The number of Workweeks will be based on Defendant's records, however, Class Members may challenge the number of Workweeks as explained below.

If the Settlement is approved by the Court and you do not exclude yourself, you will automatically be mailed a check for your Individual Class 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 Administrator to inform them of your correct address to ensure you receive your payment.

Tax Matters. Twenty Percent (20%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). Accordingly, the Wage Portion is subject to wage withholdings, and shall be reported on IRS Form W-2. Eighty Percent (80%) of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment is in settlement of claims for non-wages, expense reimbursement, interest and penalties allegedly due to employees (collectively the "Non-Wage Portion"). The Non-Wage Portion and any Individual PAGA Payment shall not be subject to wage withholdings and shall be reported on IRS Form 1099. The employee portion of all applicable income and payroll taxes will be the responsibility of the Participating Class Members. Neither Class Counsel nor Defendant's Counsel intend anything contained in this Class Notice to constitute advice regarding taxes or taxability. The tax issues for each Participating Class Member are unique to him/her, and each Participating Class Member

may wish to consult a tax advisor concerning the tax consequences of the payments received under the Settlement.

Conditions of Settlement. This Settlement and your receipt of the Individual Class Payment is conditioned upon the Court entering an order granting final approval of the Settlement and entering Judgment.

The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline to enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiff and Defendant have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendant will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendant.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the funds represented by such checks will be sent Children's Advocacy Institute, a nonprofit organization or foundation consistent with Code of Civil Procedure Section 384(b) ("Cy Pres Recipient"). The Parties, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the intended Cy Pres Recipient.

4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?

Released Class Claims. As of the Effective Date and upon full finding of the Gross Settlement Amount and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments by Defendant, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims. The "Released Class Claims" are all claims that occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims under state, federal, or local law, whether statutory or common law expressly pleaded in the Operative Complaint. This release includes all other claims, such as those under the California Labor Code, Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provision of law, that could have been reasonably pleaded based on the facts reasonably alleged in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims for (1) failure to pay overtime wages; (2) failure to authorize or permit meal periods; (3) failure to authorize or permit rest periods; (4) failure to provide accurate and itemized wage statements; (5) failure to timely pay all earned wages due at time of separation of employment; (6) failure to timely pay wages during employment; (7) violation of California's unfair competition law at Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (8) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (9) violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) failure to maintain records. Except as expressly set forth in the Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

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 or any other

Released Party about the Released Class Claims resolved by this Settlement. It also means that all of the Court's orders in the Actions will apply to you and legally bind you.

Released PAGA Claims. As of the Effective Date and upon full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments by Defendant, all Aggrieved Employees and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims The "Released PAGA Claims" are all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice which occurred during the PAGA Period. The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination, unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and claims outside of the PAGA Period.

Released Parties. The Released Parties are: Defendant and any of its present and former parent companies, subsidiaries, divisions, related or affiliated companies, and all of their respective shareholders, officers, directors, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, reinsurers, successors and assigns, and any individual or entity that could be liable for any of the Released Class Claims or Released PAGA Claims.

5. How much will my payment be?

Defendant's records reflect that you worked <<_____>> Workweeks during the Class Period (May 6, 2020 to April 27, 2025).

Based on this information, your estimated Individual Class Payment from the Net Settlement Amount is <<_____>>.

[Defendant's records reflect that you worked <<_____>> PAGA Pay Periods during the during the PAGA Period (April 9, 2023 to April 27, 2025). Based on this information your estimated Individual PAGA 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 Class Notice no later than the Response Deadline, which is _____ [sixty (60) days after the mailing of the Class Notice or an additional 14 days in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to _____ or email the dispute to _____ by no later than the Response Deadline. Any dispute should include credible written evidence and will be resolved by the Administrator.

6. How can I get a payment?

To get money from the Settlement, you do not have to do anything. A check for your Individual Class Payment will be mailed automatically to the same address as this Class Notice. If your

address is incorrect or has changed, you must notify the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator is: Apex Class Action, _____ (___) _____.

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on _____ at _____ to decide whether to approve the Settlement and fix the amounts to be paid as attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and as a service payment to the Plaintiff. If the Court approves the Settlement and there are no objections or appeals, payments will be mailed approximately two months after this hearing. If there are objections or appeals, resolving them can take time, often more than a year. Please be patient.

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 Class portion of the Settlement or "opt out." **If you opt out, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment from the Settlement**, **and you will not be bound by its terms, which means you will retain the right to sue Defendant for the Released Class Claims.** However, Aggrieved Employees who opt out will still be paid their Individual PAGA Payment and will remain subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether they submit a request for exclusion.

To opt out, you must submit to the Administrator a written, signed and dated request to opt-out postmarked no later than the Response Deadline which is _____. You may also fax your request to opt out to _____ or email the dispute to _____ by no later than the Response Deadline. The request to opt-out should state in substance that you wish to be excluded from the class settlement in the *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC* lawsuit. The request to opt-out should state the Class Member's full name, address and email address or telephone number. Please include the name and number of the case, which is *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC*, Case No. CGC-24-614434. The request to opt-out must be completed and signed by you. No other person may opt-out for a living member of the Class.

The address for the Administrator is _____. 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 Object to the Settlement?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiff and Defendant are asking the Court to approve. At least sixteen (16) court days before the Final Approval Hearing, scheduled for _____, Class Counsel and Plaintiff will file in Court a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses and the amount Plaintiff is requesting as a Class Representative Service Payment. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is below) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class

Notices" for *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC* or on the Case Query page for the California Superior Court for the County of San Francisco (https://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/) and entering the Case No. CGC-24-614434.

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement, the Motion for Final Approval and for Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Expenses and Service Award may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. **The Response Deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is_____**[sixty (60) days after the date of the Notice or an additional 14 days after the Notice in the case of re-mailing]. You may also fax the dispute to _____ or email the dispute to _____ by no later than this Response Deadline. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action, *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC*, Case No. CGC-24-614434, and include your name, current address, email or telephone number, and approximate dates of employment with Defendant and sign the objection. The Administrator's contact information is as follows:

Administrator:
Name of Company: Apex Class Action
Email Address: _____
Mailing Address: _____
Telephone Number: _____
Fax Number: _____

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. You also have the option to appear at the hearing remotely through the Court's procedure at https://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/divisions/civil/law-motion. Check the Court's website for the most current information. See Section 9 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing

The addresses for Parties' counsel are as follows:

CLASS COUNSEL:

Kyle Nordrehaug
Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Tel.: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232
E-Mail: kyle@bamlawca.com

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT:

Jonathan P. Schmidt
Kelli M. Dreger
Rochelle N. Miller

Jackson Lewis P.C.
200 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92618

9. Can I Attend the Final Approval Hearing?

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at 9:00 a.m. (Pacific Standard Time) on _____, in Department 302 of the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco County Superior Court, located at 400 McAllister St., San Francisco, CA 94102, before Judge Joseph M. Quinn. 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 and to fix the amounts to be paid as attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and as a service payment to Plaintiff. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. **You are not required to attend** the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing using the procedure at https://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/divisions/civil/law-motion.

It is possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. If the hearing is continued, notice will be posted on Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class Notices" for *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC.* In addition, hearing dates are posted on the Internet via the Case Query page for the California Superior Court for the County of San Francisco (https://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/) and entering the Case No. CGC-24-614434.

10. How Can I Get More Information?

You may call the Administrator at _____ or write to *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC* Administrator, c/o _____.

This Class Notice summarizes the proposed settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You may receive a copy of the Agreement, the Judgment, the motion for final approval and for attorneys' fees, costs and service award, or other Settlement documents by going to Class Counsel's website at www.bamlawca.com under "Class Notices" for *Gallagher-Stevens v. Independent Living Systems, LLC,* where these documents will be posted as they become available. You may get more details by examining the Court's file on the Internet via the Case Query page for the California Superior Court for the County of San Francisco (https://www.sfsuperiorcourt.org/) and entering the Case No. CGC-24-614434. If you wish to view the Court files in person, you should go to the Clerk's Office at the Civic Center Courthouse, 400 McAllister St., Room 103, San Francisco, CA 94102.

PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT, KYO-YA OHANA LLC OR MARIOTT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.

IMPORTANT:

- **What if Your Address Changes -** To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

- **What if You Fail to Cash a Check -** Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed, and this expiration date is printed on the check. In such events, the Administrator shall direct all unclaimed funds to Children's Advocacy Institute as the non-profit Cy Pres Recipient.

- **What if You Lose Your Check -** If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

EXHIBIT B

[ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL]

EXHIBIT "B"

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. INDEPENDENT LIVING SYSTEMS, LLC., a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants.	CASE NO.: **CGC-24-614434** **[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER** Hearing Date: Hearing Time: Judge: Hon. Joseph M. Quinn Dept: 302 Action Filed: May 6, 2024 Trial Date: Not set

This matter came before the Honorable Joseph M. Quinn of the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County San Francisco, on _____[DATE], for the motion by Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens ("Plaintiff") for preliminary approval of the class settlement with Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant"). The Court, having considered the briefs, argument of counsel and all matters presented to the Court and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The Court preliminarily approves the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") submitted as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This preliminary approval is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.

3. The Gross Settlement Amount is Six Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars ($680,000). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Action. It further appears that the Agreement has been reached as the result of serious and non-collusive, arms-length negotiations. The Court therefore preliminarily finds that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.

4. The Agreement specifies an attorneys' fees award not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, an award of litigation expenses incurred, not to exceed $25,000, and a proposed Class Representative Service Payment to the Plaintiff in an amount not to exceed $15,000. The Court will not approve the amount of attorneys' fees and costs, nor the amount of any service award, until the Final Approval Hearing. Plaintiff will be required to present evidence supporting these requests prior to final approval.

5. The Court recognizes that Plaintiff and Defendant stipulate and agree to certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the following Class: "all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period." The Class Period is May 6, 2020 to April 27, 2025.

6. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiff as the representatives of the Class. The Court provisionally appoints Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP as Class Counsel for the Class.

7. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice"), submitted as Exhibit A to the Agreement. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, of the Class Members' right to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written opt-out request, and of each Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the Class Notice Packet by first class mail, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement. If a Class Notice Packet is returned because of an incorrect address, the Settlement Administrator will promptly search for a more current address for the Class Member

and re-mail the Class Notice Packet to the Class Member no later than seven (7) days after the receipt of the undelivered Class Notice.

8. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action as Administrator for the Settlement. No later than thirty (30) calendar days after issuance of this Order, Defendant shall provide an electronic spreadsheet with the Class Data to the Administrator. This information will otherwise remain confidential and will not be disclosed to anyone, except as required to applicable taxing authorities, to carry out the procedures in the Agreement, or pursuant to Defendant's express written authorization or by order of the Court. The Administrator will perform address updates and verifications as necessary prior to the mailing of the Class Notice. Using best efforts to mail it as soon as possible, and in no event later than fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving the Class Data spreadsheet, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice Packet to all Class Members via first-class U.S. Mail.

9. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt-out of and be excluded from the Class as provided in the Class Notice by following the instructions set forth in the Class Notice. All requests for exclusion must be postmarked by no later than the Response Deadline, which is sixty (60) calendar days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice Packet to Class Members. If the Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, this Response Deadline will be extended an additional fourteen (14) calendar days. Any person who chooses to opt-out of and be excluded from the Class will not be entitled to any recovery under the Settlement and will not be bound by the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Aggrieved Employees shall be sent their share of the PAGA Penalties and will be subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims regardless of whether they opt-out of the Class. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement, and the Judgment. A request for exclusion applies only to the individual submitting the request for exclusion, and any attempt to effect an opt-out on behalf of any other individual or individuals (including a group, class, or subclass of individuals) is not permitted and will be deemed invalid.

10. Any Class Member who has not opted-out may appear at the Final Approval Hearing and may object or express the Member's views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Class Notice. Class Members will have until the Response Deadline set forth in the Class Notice to submit their written objections to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the instructions in the Class Notice. If the Class Notice is re-mailed, the Response Deadline will be extended an additional fourteen (14) calendar days. Alternatively, Class Members may appear at the Final Approval Hearing to make an oral objection.

11. A Final Approval Hearing shall be held before this Court on _____ _____ at 9:00 a.m. in Department 302 at the Civic Center Courthouse of the San Francisco County Superior Court to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether the Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class Members; and to finally approve attorneys' fees and costs, the service award, and the expenses of the Administrator. The motion for final approval and for attorneys' fees, costs and service award shall be filed with the Court and served on all counsel no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing and shall be heard at the Final Approval Hearing.

12. Neither the Settlement nor any exhibit, document, or instrument delivered thereunder shall be construed as a concession or admission by Defendant in any way that the claims asserted have any merit or that this Action was properly brought as a class or representative action, and shall not be used as evidence of, or used against Defendant as, an admission or indication in any way, including with respect to any claim of any liability, wrongdoing, fault or omission by Defendant or with respect to the truth of any allegation asserted by any person. Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Agreement, nor any exhibit,

document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to the Settlement or Agreement, nor any reports or accounts thereof, shall in any event be construed as, offered or admitted in evidence as, received as or deemed to be evidence for any purpose adverse to the Defendant, including, but not limited to, evidence of a presumption, concession, indication or admission by Defendant of any liability, fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession or damage.

13. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled or fails to become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that no claim in the Action could be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action. In such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Order, shall not be used or referred to in litigation or otherwise for any purpose.

14. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Final Approval Hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

15. The Action is stayed and all trial and related pre-trial dates are vacated, subject to further orders of the Court at the Final Approval Hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

_____
HON. JOSEPH M. QUINN
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
4904-1424-0907, v. 1

EXHIBIT C

[FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT]

Exhibit C-1

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. INDEPENDENT LIVING SYSTEMS, LLC., a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. **CGC-24-614434** **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** Hearing Date: Hearing Time: Judge: Dept: Action Filed: May 6, 2024 Trial Date: Not set

Exhibit C-1

On _____, a hearing was held on the motion of Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens ("Plaintiff") for final approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the "Agreement") with Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant") and payments to the Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Aggrieved Employees, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the Administrator.

The parties have submitted their Agreement, which this Court preliminarily approved by its _____, 2026, order ("Preliminary Approval Order"). In accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, Class Members have been given notice of the terms of the Agreement and the opportunity to comment on or object to it or to exclude themselves from its provisions.

Having received and considered the Settlement, the supporting papers filed by the parties, and the evidence and argument received by the Court at the hearing before it entered the Preliminary Approval Order and the final approval hearing on _____, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement, and HEREBY ORDERS as follows:

1. The Class Members confirmed for the sole and exclusive purpose of entering a settlement in this matter are:

> All individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period. The Class Period is May 6, 2020 to April 27, 2025.

2. The Administrator received ___ valid requests for exclusion from the Class. [The individuals who timely submitted valid requests for exclusion are _____.]

3. The Court confirms the appointment of Plaintiff as the Class Representative, and Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, and Aparajit Bhowmik of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP as Class Counsel for the Class.

4. Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("Class Notice") was sent to each Class Member by first-class mail. These papers informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Class Payment, their right to comment on or object to the Settlement or to opt-out of the Settlement and pursue their own remedies, and their right to

appear in person or remotely or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing and be heard regarding final approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided by each of these procedures to provide notice of their rights and time for Class Members to act with respect to these rights. _____ objected to the Settlement as part of this notice process or stated an intent to appear at the final approval hearing. [The Court overrules the objections raised by objecting Participating Class Members.]

5. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate protections to Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of Class Members. The Court finds and determines that the Class Notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable and it satisfied the requirements of law and due process.

6. The Court further finds and determines that the Gross Settlement Amount of Six Hundred Eighty Thousand Dollars ($680,000) and the terms of the Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Class and to each Class Member. The Class Members who have not opted-out will be bound by the Settlement. Aggrieved Employees (as defined in the Agreement as all individuals who were employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period which is April 9, 2023 to April 27, 2025) will be subject to the release of the Released PAGA Claims as set forth in the Agreement, and will be sent an Individual PAGA Payment, regardless of whether they opt-out of the Class portion of the Settlement. The Settlement is ordered finally approved, and all terms and provisions of the Settlement should be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.

7. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Class Payments to be paid to the Participating Class Members, as provided for by the Agreement, are fair and reasonable. The Court hereby grants final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts to be made to the Participating Class Members out of the Net Settlement Amount in accordance with the Agreement.

8. Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, the LWDA has been given notice of the Settlement. Pursuant to PAGA, on the date the Plaintiff filed the motion seeking approval of the Settlement with the Court, Plaintiff

served the LWDA with the motion which included a copy of the Agreement. The Court finds and determines that the notice of the Settlement complied with the statutory requirements of PAGA.

9. The Court finds and determines that the resolution of the Released PAGA Claims and the PAGA Penalties of Fifteen Thousand Dollars ($15,000), which includes payment to the LWDA of $11,250 as its share of the settlement of civil penalties and the allocation of $3,750 as Individual PAGA Payments to the Aggrieved Employees, is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court hereby grants approval of the resolution of the PAGA claims and orders that the PAGA Penalties be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount and distributed in accordance with the Agreement.

10. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses of Apex Class Action in administrating the settlement, in the amount of $_____, are fair and reasonable. The Court hereby grants final approval to such amount and orders that the payment of approximately that amount be paid out of the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Agreement.

11. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive from the Net Settlement Amount and PAGA Penalties, and in recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the Class, and the risks he undertook, the Court hereby approves the payment of the Class Representative Service Payment to Plaintiff in the amount of $15,000. The Class Representative Service Payment shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

12. Pursuant to the authorities and argument presented to the Court, the Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the sum of $_____, plus costs and expenses in the amount of $_____. Said amounts shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount.

13. The parties are hereby ordered to comply with the terms of the Settlement. Defendant shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes, by transmitting the funds to the Administrator within 30 days after the Effective Date.

14. Without affecting the finality of this order in any way, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 the Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the

interpretation, administration, implementation, effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

_____
The Honorable Joseph M. Quinn
Judge of the Superior Court

4908-6834-0107, v. 1

Exhibit C-2

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS, an individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. INDEPENDENT LIVING SYSTEMS, LLC., a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. **CGC-24-614434** **[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT** Hearing Date: Hearing Time: Judge: Hon. Joseph M. Quinn Dept: 302 Action Filed: May 6, 2024 Trial Date: Not set

Exhibit C-2

The parties having settled this action and the Court having entered an Order Granting Final Approval of Settlement and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDICATED AND DECREED THAT:

1. Except as set forth in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the "Agreement") and the Order Granting Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement Plaintiff Samuel Gallagher-Stevens ("Plaintiff"), and all members of the Class, shall take nothing by their complaint(s) in this Action.

2. The Court finds that in consideration of Plaintiff's awarded Class Representative Service Payment, and the other terms and conditions of the Settlement, as of the date the Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("Defendant") fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount and fund all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiff generally release and discharge the Released Parties (as defined in the Agreement) from the Plaintiff's Release as fully set forth in the Agreement.

3. The Court finds that in consideration for their Individual Class Payments, effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Participating Class Members, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, release Released Parties from the Released Class Claims. The "Released Class Claims" are all claims that occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims under state, federal, or local law, whether statutory or common law expressly pleaded in the Operative Complaint. This release includes all other claims, such as those under the California Labor Code, Wage Orders, regulations, and/or other provision of law, that could have been reasonably pleaded based on the facts reasonably alleged in the Operative Complaint which occurred during the Class Period including any and all claims for (1) failure to pay overtime wages; (2) failure to authorize or permit meal periods; (3) failure to authorize or permit rest periods; (4) failure to provide accurate and itemized wage statements; (5) failure to timely pay all earned wages due at time of separation of employment; (6) failure to timely pay wages during employment; (7) violation of California's unfair competition

law at Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; (8) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses; (9) violation of Labor Code § 227.3; and (10) failure to maintain records. Except as expressly set forth in the Agreement, Participating Class Members do not release any other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, or claims based on facts occurring outside the Class Period.

4. The Court finds that in consideration for the approved PAGA Penalties payment, effective on the date when Defendant fully funds the entire Gross Settlement Amount and fund all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, all Aggrieved Employees and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims The "Released PAGA Claims" are all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts stated in the Operative Complaint and the PAGA Notice which occurred during the PAGA Period. The Released PAGA Claims do not include other PAGA claims, underlying wage and hour claims, claims for wrongful termination, discrimination, unemployment insurance, disability and worker's compensation, and claims outside of the PAGA Period.

5. The Parties shall bear his, her, its or their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Agreement, the Order Granting Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and this Judgment.

6. The Court enters final judgment in the Action in accordance with the Agreement and the Order Granting Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. Without affecting the finality of this judgment in any way, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6 the Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation, effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.

7. Upon completion of administration of the settlement, the Administrator will provide written certification of such completion to the Court and counsel for the parties. The Court

sets a compliance hearing date of _____, at _____ a.m. / p.m., and the written certification of the Administrator shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) days before this hearing.

LET JUDGMENT BE FORTHWITH ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: _____

_____
The Honorable Joseph M. Quinn
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT #3

Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CA - California 92037-3107

INVOICE

Invoice # 1
Date: 11/18/2026
Due On: 12/18/2026

Samuel Gallagher-Stevens
735 Taylor Street Apt 411
San Francisco, CA 94108

CA3276

Independent Living Systems

Services

Attorney	Date	Notes	Quantity	Rate	Total
NDB	03/16/2024	Review and analyze original intake notes. Legal research regarding related litigation. Review Defendant's business operations in CA. Legal research claims and review facts and law.	3.10	$850.00	$2,635.00
NDB	03/18/2024	Review emails and documents from Plaintiff. Review and analyze DFEH and retaliation claims. Legal research regrading the same. Analyze off the clock work tasks.	3.20	$850.00	$2,720.00
NDB	03/21/2024	Review entire employment file for legal claims. Review and analyze pay stubs for 226 and meal break violations. Legal research wage and hour claims. Obtain background facts for mediation brief.	2.80	$850.00	$2,380.00
NDB	03/23/2024	Review facts and law. Legal research. Draft Complaint.	3.10	$850.00	$2,635.00
NDB	03/24/2024	Review emails and questions from Plaintiff. Draft complaint. Analyze flexible spending account claims. Legal research.	2.00	$850.00	$1,700.00
NDB	03/30/2024	Review case file. Draft internal case notes memo detailing facts and specific violations.	2.10	$850.00	$1,785.00
NDB	03/31/2024	Review and revise complaint. Send to client for approval. Conference to discuss.	1.50	$850.00	$1,275.00

NDB	04/06/2024	Review case file. Review and research PAGA claims and penalties. draft PAGA notice.	2.30	$850.00	$1,955.00
NDB	04/09/2024	Review, research, and analyze individual claims. Obtain right to sue.	1.20	$850.00	$1,020.00
RE	05/04/2024	Review case notes/damage analysis	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	05/04/2024	Review & analyze employment file documents	2.00	$675.00	$1,350.00
KN	05/04/2024	Review research from ND; review documents; review draft complaint; analysis of facts and claims; advise RE	1.50	$950.00	$1,425.00
RE	05/06/2024	Review, revise & edit class action complaint; finalize draft	2.50	$675.00	$1,687.50
RE	05/06/2024	Draft summons & civil case cover sheet re class action	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	05/06/2024	Review & finalize class action complaint draft; file in SF Sup. Ct.	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	05/07/2024	Review court-returned docs re class action; review docket; memo to firm re judicial/ department assignment & status of initial case management conference	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	05/08/2024	Review filed complaint; review court notices; review memo from RE	0.40	$675.00	$270.00
RE	06/07/2024	Various comm w OPC; prep docs for service of process re class action, prep NAR; email to OPC w service docs; instruct staff to mail hard copies per code	0.75	$675.00	$506.25
RE	07/03/2024	File proof of service of summons w/executed NAR; memo to firm re post service written discovery	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
GG	07/18/2024	Finalize discovery requests, set one, and serve.	0.60	$250.00	$150.00
CJ	07/18/2024	Analyze complaint, status of case, review prior orders and case notes, review documents in file	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	07/18/2024	Revise and review set one discovery packet to Defendant	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
GG	07/29/2024	Review email re Def's Answer to complaint. Update POS, save to file and update internal spreadsheet.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
PM	07/29/2024	Review legal and factual claims; review Def. removal papers.	2.50	$750.00	$1,875.00
GG	08/12/2024	File/serve Consent declination form via ecf.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
CJ	08/13/2024	Prepare for 2f conference, review case and	1.00	$550.00	$550.00

		claims			
CJ	08/13/2024	T/c to conduct 2f conference	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
GG	08/14/2024	File notices of appearance for CJ and AR.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
AR	08/16/2024	Multiple correspondence regarding mediation; review file.	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
GG	08/20/2024	Draft discovery requests, set one, in class action (full set, including NOD and Belaire notice).	1.50	$250.00	$375.00
GG	08/26/2024	prepare motion to remand shells (Notice, memo, proposed order, POS)	0.90	$250.00	$225.00
CJ	08/26/2024	Analyze Removal and basis for same, annotate in pre for remand	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
PM	08/27/2024	Review chambers rules; review Def. removal papers.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
CJ	08/27/2024	Evaluate Removal Papers, research law re CAFA and basis for remand	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	08/27/2024	Draft Notice of Remand, draft proposed order	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	08/27/2024	Begin drafting Memo of P&As	2.00	$550.00	$1,100.00
GG	08/28/2024	Review email re mediation confirmation, confirm service list, email mediation case admin with service list and case caption.	0.30	$250.00	$75.00
GG	08/28/2024	Update table of contents and table of authorities for memo re remand motion. Adjust formatting, email with CJ.	1.90	$250.00	$475.00
PM	08/28/2024	Review and revise motion for remand.	1.50	$750.00	$1,125.00
GG	08/28/2024	Finalize, file, and serve Motion to Remand, send courtesy copies of order to court.	0.80	$250.00	$200.00
CJ	08/28/2024	Revise and finalize Memo of P&As	2.00	$550.00	$1,100.00
CJ	08/28/2024	Revise and finalize Motion for Remand	2.00	$550.00	$1,100.00
KN	08/28/2024	Review removal documents; review draft motion to remand; advise team	0.75	$950.00	$712.50
CJ	09/10/2024	Evaluate case and documents received to date, draft mediation data and document request to Defendant	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	09/11/2024	Finalize adn serve mediation data request	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
PM	09/16/2024	Review Def. opposition to motion for remand and analyze; strategize regarding reply.	2.50	$750.00	$1,875.00
PM	09/17/2024	Draft/review/revise reply brief re Motion for	6.50	$750.00	$4,875.00

		Remand, legal research re the same.			
GG	09/18/2024	Review reply re Motion to Remand, and create table of contents and table of authorities for brief.	1.50	$250.00	$375.00
PM	09/18/2024	Review and revise reply re motion for remand.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
GG	09/18/2024	Update POS, finalize, file/serve Reply re Motion to remand, save to file and email update to team.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
SB	09/23/2024	Review and revise complaint, analyze, advise ND	2.80	$450.00	$1,260.00
CJ	10/14/2024	Research prior orders re status conference and stay	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
GG	10/15/2024	Review case file and prepare ADR cert form draft.	0.30	$250.00	$75.00
CJ	10/16/2024	Evaluate case and claims, review Court's order re ADR, review and accept	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
GG	10/17/2024	Review order and case, review court rules re stipulation to continue, respond to email re continuance of CMC.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
GG	10/17/2024	Finalize, file/serve ADR cert form.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
RE	10/17/2024	Review file; draft PAGA only complaint	3.75	$675.00	$2,531.25
NDB	10/17/2024	Review case file and PAGA notice. Review and revise PAGA only complaint. Legal research regarding venue and claims.	1.50	$850.00	$1,275.00
RE	10/18/2024	Draft summons & civil case cover sheet re PAGA action	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	10/18/2024	Review & finalize PAGA only complaint package; file in SF Sup. Ct.	0.75	$675.00	$506.25
GG	10/18/2024	Review case file, notice of removal, disco served, complaint, and draft stipulation to continue CMC.	1.30	$250.00	$325.00
RE	10/18/2024	Review court-returned docs re PAGA action; review docket; memo to firm judicial/department assignment & status of initial case management conference	0.50	$675.00	$337.50
RE	10/18/2024	Provide notice to LWDA of PAGA action filing	0.40	$675.00	$270.00
GG	10/25/2024	Finalize, file, serve CMC statement, review court rules re proposed orders, email proposed order to chambers.	0.70	$250.00	$175.00
PM	10/28/2024	Review order granting stipulation to stay action; strategize regarding initial disclosures.	0.50	$750.00	$375.00
GG	10/31/2024	Update POS, finalize/serve initial disclosures, save to file.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00

PM	10/31/2024	Review and analyze client documents; draft and finalize initial disclosures.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
GG	11/05/2024	Docket check re upcoming hearing re Motion to remand, review standing order, and scheduling note, advise PM.	0.30	$250.00	$75.00
PM	11/13/2024	Prepare for motion for remand hearing; review Def. opposition and Plaintiff's reply brief; appear for hearing.	2.50	$750.00	$1,875.00
CJ	12/09/2024	Evaluate status of claims, review discovery and documents received to date, analyze mediation demand, correspond with OPC re same	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	12/13/2024	Analyze status of mediation documents, correspond with OPC re same	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
GG	01/03/2025	Organize, combined, and bates number clients documents.	1.50	$250.00	$375.00
PM	01/03/2025	Review Def. documents and analyze; analyze legal and factual claims; draft correspondence to Def. regarding mediation doc production questions.	2.50	$750.00	$1,875.00
NDB	01/03/2025	Review and analyze case file. review Defendant's wage and hour policy documents and timekeeping. Legal research wage and hour claims. Prepare for mediation.	4.10	$850.00	$3,485.00
NDB	01/05/2025	Review and research previous settlements with similar claims and workweeks for mediation valuation. Review and research vacation pay and rest break claims. Review settlement authority and Plaintiff's individual claims. Prepare for mediation.	2.50	$850.00	$2,125.00
CJ	01/09/2025	Research posture, review complaint, review case notes	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	01/09/2025	Evaluate Plaintiff's documents (over 300 pages), annotate	1.50	$550.00	$825.00
CJ	01/09/2025	Review Def's producution, advise expert, annotate for mediation	1.50	$550.00	$825.00
CJ	01/09/2025	Research status of claims and draft procedural posture for mediation brief	2.00	$550.00	$1,100.00
CJ	01/09/2025	Create exhibits and review exhbit book to incorporate into mediation brief	1.50	$550.00	$825.00
NDB	01/09/2025	Review facts and law. research release and Defendant issues. Draft mediation brief. Prepare for mediation.	4.10	$850.00	$3,485.00
PM	01/10/2025	Review mediation prep documentation and advise	1.50	$750.00	$1,125.00

		AJB and CJ re the same.			
AB	01/10/2025	Draft mediation brief.	5.00	$895.00	$4,475.00
PM	01/13/2025	Review mediation brief; review exhibits to mediation brief and Def. meal and rest period policies.	0.75	$750.00	$562.50
CJ	01/13/2025	Review expert analysis and incorporate into mediation brief, continue drafting facts section for brief	1.50	$550.00	$825.00
NDB	01/16/2025	Legal research regarding harassment and discrimination claims. Analyze damages. Review and research 204 late payment of wage claims. Analyze pay stubs.	1.90	$850.00	$1,615.00
KN	01/16/2025	Review research and analysis from ND and Team; review draft mediation brief and documents; review expert valuation; analyze claims and theories; advise Team and AJ.	2.00	$950.00	$1,900.00
PM	01/31/2025	Review status of action and review stipulation to continue CMC and advise defense re the same.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50
SB	02/01/2025	Speak with client in advance of mediation, analyze claims, and advise AJB	2.60	$450.00	$1,170.00
SB	02/03/2025	Prepare for mediation, review and analyze mediation brief, advise AJB	2.60	$450.00	$1,170.00
GG	02/06/2025	Reviewed ROA re upcoming CMC, sent email re docket updated and case remanded.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
NDB	02/06/2025	Review and analyze all mediation materials including briefs and exhibits thereto. Analyze expert damage and penalty report and notes and assumptions. Prepare for mediation.	1.50	$850.00	$1,275.00
AB	02/07/2025	Prep and appear for mediation.	5.00	$895.00	$4,475.00
GG	02/13/2025	Reviewed email re clients additional documents, and saved to file.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
AB	02/14/2025	Review/analyze mediator's proposal. Draft/send response to mediator.	4.00	$895.00	$3,580.00
GG	02/26/2025	Reviewed notice re cancelled CMC and notice for plaintiff to provide notice. Sent email to Rico to inquire about service.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
CJ	02/26/2025	Research status of settlement and mediators proposal	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
AB	02/27/2025	Review/analyze corr from mediator re settlement. Draft MOU.	5.00	$895.00	$4,475.00
KN	02/27/2025	Review mediator proposal; review draft MOU;	1.00	$950.00	$950.00

		analysis of settlement issues; advise AJ			
GG	03/11/2025	Reviewed email from AJ re MOU and redline draft.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
GG	03/11/2025	Updated POS, Finalized, filed, and served CMC statement in Class action.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
GG	03/12/2025	Reviewed d email from Def re service of Jt CMC statement, and saved to file.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
GG	03/12/2025	Reviewed notification re confirmation of filing, downloaded and saved filed copy of CMC statement.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
AR	03/12/2025	Receive and review joint statement; draft revisions; submit for filing.	0.60	$550.00	$330.00
GG	03/13/2025	Reviewed email from AJ re MOU, compared documents and saved redlined version, and emailed to AJ.	0.30	$250.00	$75.00
GG	03/18/2025	Reviewed order re status of CMC, updataed events email.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
NDB	03/24/2025	Review mediation notes and results. review emails and analyze MOU terms. Send MOU to Plaintiff for signature. Follow up to discuss.	1.40	$850.00	$1,190.00
PM	04/18/2025	Review MOU; draft and finalize amended PAGA notice; draft long form settlement agreement.	3.00	$750.00	$2,250.00
GG	04/18/2025	Reviewed email from PM re filing amended PAGA notice, uploaded to LWDA portal, circulated confirmation and saved to file.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
PM	04/19/2025	Draft long form settlement agreement	2.50	$750.00	$1,875.00
KN	04/19/2025	Review draft settlement agreement; analyze settlement issues; advise PM	1.50	$950.00	$1,425.00
PM	04/21/2025	Review and revise long form agreement; draft individual settlement agreement.	1.50	$750.00	$1,125.00
PM	04/22/2025	Draft, review, revise individual settlement agreement; review draft amended complaint; draft correspondence to defense re the same.	1.25	$750.00	$937.50
CJ	04/30/2025	T/c with Plaintiff	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	05/07/2025	Research status of settlement, correspond with Plaintiff and	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
PM	05/09/2025	Review status of settlement agreement finalization and correspond with defense re the same.	0.30	$750.00	$225.00
GG	05/19/2025	Reviewed ROA to confirm upcoming CMC,	0.20	$250.00	$50.00

		circulated notice of continued hearing, saved to file.			
CJ	05/22/2025	Research status of case, correspond with Plaintiff	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
PM	06/02/2025	Review draft long form settlement agreement; review correspondences with def. and strategize re finalization of agreement.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50
GG	06/02/2025	Finalized, filed, served, stipulation for leave for plaintiff to file FAC, saved to file, and circulated confirmation.	0.70	$250.00	$175.00
BW	06/03/2025	Review and Analyze: Review and analyze Case Management Order re Continuing Case Management Conference	0.10	$750.00	$75.00
PM	06/06/2025	Review status of settlement agreement finalization and strategize re the same.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50
KN	06/12/2025	Review draft agreement and revisions thereto; review memo from PM; respond to issues from PM and advise PM	1.25	$950.00	$1,187.50
PM	06/13/2025	Review status of long form settlement agreement; review and revise Def. revisions to agreement; correspond with defense re the same.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
AR	06/16/2025	Review file for onboarding and status; multiple correspondence with PM regarding the same.	0.80	$550.00	$440.00
AR	06/17/2025	Teleconference with client regarding status; follow up correspondence with opposing counsel; update file.	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
AR	06/17/2025	Review file for tax information; draft follow up correspondence.	0.40	$550.00	$220.00
AR	06/18/2025	Receive and review W-2; multiple correspondence with client regarding the same.	0.40	$550.00	$220.00
PM	06/23/2025	Review status of long form settlement agreement; draft correspondence to Def. re the same.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50
AR	06/24/2025	Multiple follow up correspondence with client regarding status.	0.40	$550.00	$220.00
VR	06/25/2025	Review and Analyze: review court's orders and docket; review correspondence between parties; review settlement agreement and status; advise PM	0.60	$750.00	$450.00
GG	06/30/2025	Checked ROA re status of stip to file FAC, called clerk and left VM.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
PM	06/30/2025	Review status of long form agreement and status of stipulation for leave to file the amended complaint; advise GG re the same.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50

CJ	06/30/2025	Prepare for t/c with Plaintiff and conduct t/c	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	06/30/2025	Memorialize and advise NDB, evaluate status of settlement adn declaration	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
PM	07/09/2025	Review status of long form settlement agreement; advise team; email defense counsel re status.	0.30	$750.00	$225.00
PM	07/10/2025	Review, revise and finalize long form settlement agreement; review and finalize individual settlement agreement.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
NDB	07/10/2025	Review and analyze settlement agreements for conformity with MOU terms. Discuss with Plaintiff.	1.30	$850.00	$1,105.00
GG	07/16/2025	Checked ROA re status of filed stip for leave to file FAC, called clerk and left VM, followed up with email to civil filing clerk, and sent update to PM and VR.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
GG	07/16/2025	Reviewed email response from clerk re stip to file FAC, and forwarded to VR.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
GG	07/23/2025	Reviewed ROA re status of stipulation, called clerk, and left VM.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
GG	07/25/2025	Reviewed complaint, case file, and ROA, and drafted CMC statement in PAGA action, sent to PM for review.	1.20	$250.00	$300.00
PM	07/25/2025	Review and revise CMC statement in PAGA action.	0.50	$750.00	$375.00
PM	07/25/2025	Review status of settlement agreement; advise VR.	0.25	$750.00	$187.50
GG	07/28/2025	Reviewed email from VR re status of stip to file FAC, checked ROA, and informed VR.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
GG	07/28/2025	Drafted POS for PAGA action, finalized CM Statement in PAGA action, finalized, filed, and served.	0.60	$250.00	$150.00
GG	08/04/2025	Reviewed CMC order, prepared POS, and served Defendant.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
VR	08/18/2025	Receipt and Review of Correspondence: review correspondence between parties; review complaint; advise CJ	0.70	$750.00	$525.00
CJ	08/21/2025	Prepare for t/c with plaintiff	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
PM	08/28/2025	Finalize motion for leave to amend and file FAC; prepare and finalize supporting documents.	1.25	$750.00	$937.50
GG	09/04/2025	Prepared POS, finalized, filed, and served motion for leave to file amended complaint, saved to file, and circulated confirmation.	0.80	$250.00	$200.00

PM	09/04/2025	Review, revise and finalize motion for leave to file FAC.	1.25	$750.00	$937.50
GG	09/05/2025	Reviewed notification re rejected filing, contacted PM re needing new hearing date, updated/revised motion, finalized, filed, and served, saved to file and circulated confirmation.	0.60	$250.00	$150.00
CJ	09/05/2025	Evaluate Settlement Agreement, t/c with Plaintiff, review preliminary approval timing and amended complaint timing	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
KN	09/09/2025	Draft Exhibits for Agreement; review final agreement; memo to PM	2.50	$950.00	$2,375.00
KN	09/10/2025	Draft Exhibits for Agreement; email draft of exhibits to the Defendant	2.00	$950.00	$1,900.00
CJ	09/18/2025	Evaluate settlement agreement, MOU and mediation brief, review onboarding documents	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	09/18/2025	Draft MPA Declaration	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	09/22/2025	Finalize drafting MPA declaration, sent to Plaintiff	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
GG	09/26/2025	Reviewed ROA and checked calendar re status of upcoming hearing re motion for leave to file FAC, updated/scheduled remote appearance, and updated events email with hearing information.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
GG	09/29/2025	Reviewed email from PM re proposed order to court re Motion for leave to file FAC, searched local rules re procedure for submitting, prepared and sent email to court/cc def. counsel, saved to file.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
PM	09/29/2025	Review tentative ruling re motion for leave to amend; prepare revised proposed order.	0.50	$750.00	$375.00
CJ	09/29/2025	Analyze status of amended complaint, correspond with plaintiff	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
CJ	09/29/2025	Evaluate status of settlement, research agreement for terms and advise Plaintiff	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	09/30/2025	T/c with Plaintiff, research Settlement docs, advise NDB	2.00	$550.00	$1,100.00
PM	10/01/2025	Review and finalize amended complaint and file and serve.	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
GG	10/06/2025	Reviewed email from PM re signed order re motion for leave to file FAC, updated lists re orders to track.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
GG	10/07/2025	Independent Living Systems, reviewed email from Def., re Joint CMC Statement, downloaded and saved to file.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00

CJ	10/10/2025	Research CMC deadlines	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
GG	10/23/2025	Reviewed email from PM re FAC, reviewed One legal, searched LWDA portal for related actions, uploaded FAC to portal, saved confirmation to file, and circulated confirmation email. Updated list re FACs to track.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
AR	10/30/2025	Review and outline file and orders for status; multiple correspondence regarding remaining timeline.	0.40	$550.00	$220.00
AR	10/31/2025	Receive and review dismissal documents; draft follow up correspondence.	0.40	$550.00	$220.00
GG	10/31/2025	Reviewed email from AR re proposed order, searched file, and prepared proposed order re dismissal.	0.30	$250.00	$75.00
GG	11/03/2025	Reviewed email from AR re dismissal. Reviewed, documents, finalized Dismissal, declaration, order, and POS.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
GG	11/03/2025	Reviewed email from AR re OSC, prepared POS, finalized, filed, served, and saved to file, and circulated confirmation email.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
GG	11/03/2025	Reviewed court rules for submitted dismissal and order, Filed, served, saved to file, circulated confirmation email.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
AR	11/03/2025	Review and outline file and docket for status; draft OSC statement; finalize and submit for filing.	1.30	$550.00	$715.00
AR	11/03/2025	Draft request for dismissal and accompanying documents; submit for filing.	1.50	$550.00	$825.00
AR	11/04/2025	Receive and review answer from opposing counsel; draft follow up correspondence.	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
PM	11/20/2025	draft motion to dismiss for PAGA action	1.00	$750.00	$750.00
PM	11/25/2025	draft declaration in support of motion to dismiss PAGA action; finalize motion and supporting documents for filing.	1.50	$750.00	$1,125.00
AR	12/08/2025	Receive and review notice from court; multiple correspondence with GG regarding the same.	0.30	$550.00	$165.00
AR	12/10/2025	Multiple correspondence regarding dismissal.	0.20	$550.00	$110.00
CJ	01/07/2026	Prepare for t/c with Plaintiff	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
CJ	01/07/2026	T/c with Plaintiff, analyze case file	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	01/07/2026	Draft revisions to declaration	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
KN	01/09/2026	Review emails; review status; email Defendant;	0.40	$950.00	$380.00

		review settlement agreement; advise NBB			
CJ	01/12/2026	Evaluate Plaintiff correspondence, advise NDB, review status of settlement and declaration issues	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
CJ	01/21/2026	Analyze case status, review Plaintiff correspondence, correspond with Plaintiff	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
AR	01/27/2026	Receive and review case management statement.	0.30	$550.00	$165.00
GG	01/27/2026	Reviewed email from VR, prepared POS, finalized, filed, and served CMC statement. Saved to file and circulated confirmation email.	0.50	$250.00	$125.00
GG	01/29/2026	Reviewed email re. filed CMC, downloaded, and saved.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
CJ	04/20/2026	Evaluate status of settlement, review stats of client declaration adn MPA, review prior correspondence, advise SB and NDB	0.75	$550.00	$412.50
VR	04/28/2026	Review and Analyze: review court's orders and docket; review status of settlement and motion for approval; draft CMC statement; review correspondence between parties; advise KN	0.90	$750.00	$675.00
GG	04/28/2026	Reviewed email regarding CMC statement, prepared POS, finalized, filed, and served. Saved to file and circulated confirmation email.	0.40	$250.00	$100.00
GG	04/29/2026	Reviewed email regarding filed CMC statement, downloaded, and saved.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
KN	04/30/2026	Draft motion for preliminary approval; draft approval outline; analysis of Kullar issues; research requirements for this Court; revise motion in compliance with these requirements; email Defendant; memo to Admin regarding notice estimate	4.80	$950.00	$4,560.00
KN	04/30/2026	Memo to Admin regarding revisions to estimate; review revised estimate; respond to Admin; memo to Admin regarding declaration	0.50	$950.00	$475.00
CJ	05/12/2026	Evaluate settlement, advise NDB and correspond with Plaintiff	0.75	$550.00	$412.50
KN	06/17/2026	Draft Declaration ISO motion; research issue; further revisions to draft Decl and motion; serve LWDA; serve related case.	4.00	$950.00	$3,800.00
CJ	06/17/2026	Evaluate status of declaration, Motion hearing and deadlines, correspond with Plaintiff	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	06/17/2026	Continue to analyze status of settlement, review timelines and prior correspondences, advise Plaintiff Green	0.75	$550.00	$412.50

KN	06/18/2026	Review and revise motion for final approval; update proposed order; prepare exhibits; email related case; serve LWDA; finalize and file and serve motion; memo to file	2.50	$950.00	$2,375.00
CJ	06/18/2026	Continue to analyze status of settlement, review timelines and prior correspondences, advise Plaintiff Hatch	0.75	$550.00	$412.50
CJ	06/23/2026	Prepare for video conference an devaluate all prior correspondence with Plaintiff	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
CJ	06/23/2026	Conduct video conference with Plaintiff, advise NDB	1.00	$550.00	$550.00
GG	06/25/2026	Reviewed email from CJ re filing declaration ISO of motion for prelim. approval, prepared POS, finalized, filed, and served. Uploaded to LWDA portal, and circulated confirmation email.	0.60	$250.00	$150.00
GG	06/29/2026	Reviewed notice re filed declaration re MPA, downloaded, and saved.	0.20	$250.00	$50.00
GG	07/16/2026	Reviewed ROA and Calendar to confirm upcoming hearging re prelim approval, and updated events email with appearance information.	0.10	$250.00	$25.00
KN	07/21/2026	Court appearance - motion for preliminary approval; prepare for hearing; email to Def; review documents and tentative ruling; memo to file; update chart	1.00	$950.00	$950.00
KN	07/21/2026	Memo to Admin with documents and instructions	0.50	$950.00	$475.00
CJ	07/24/2026	Evaluate settlement and status of settlement	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
CJ	07/24/2026	T/c with Plaintiff, advise NDB	0.75	$550.00	$412.50
CJ	09/08/2026	Analyze status of CMC and status of settlement	0.50	$550.00	$275.00
KN	09/24/2026	Review email from Admin; review weekly report	0.20	$950.00	$190.00
KN	10/01/2026	Review email from Admin; review weekly report	0.20	$950.00	$190.00
KN	10/15/2026	Review email from Admin; review weekly report	0.20	$950.00	$190.00
KN	10/24/2026	Review email from Admin; review weekly report	0.20	$950.00	$190.00
PM	11/06/2026	Review preliminary approval motion and order; draft final approval motion and notice of motion.	3.00	$750.00	$2,250.00
KN	11/07/2026	Review email from Admin; review weekly report	0.20	$950.00	$190.00
KN	11/09/2026	Review status; review draft motion; revise notice; review procedures and local rules for motions; review escalator issue and email Admin regarding update to GSA and opt outs	1.00	$950.00	$950.00

KN	11/12/2026	Work on motion issues; update chart; review and revise draft motion for final approval; email Defendant; memo to staff	2.00	$950.00	$1,900.00
PM	11/17/2026	Draft declaration in support of final approval.	1.50	$750.00	$1,125.00
KN	11/18/2026	Review and revise draft declaration	1.00	$950.00	$950.00
KN	11/18/2026	Review and revise motion for final approval; finalize motion; review draft Admin declaration and email Admin; file and serve motion; serve LWDA	2.75	$950.00	$2,612.50
			Quantity Subtotal		**249.65**
			Services Subtotal		**$172,338.75**

Expenses

Type	Date	Notes	Quantity	Rate	Total
Expense	04/10/2024	PAGA Filing Fee	1.00	$75.00	$75.00
Expense	05/07/2024	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$1,492.72	$1,492.72
Expense	07/05/2024	KNOX filing and Messenger Service	1.00	$35.75	$35.75
Expense	09/18/2024	Mediation Fees - Signature Resolution	1.00	$8,995.00	$8,995.00
Expense	10/18/2024	KNOX Filing and Messenger Service	1.00	$526.25	$526.25
Expense	01/23/2025	Expert Fees - Berger Consulting	1.00	$6,270.00	$6,270.00
Expense	03/12/2025	One Legal Filing Fee: One Legal Filing Fee	1.00	$52.50	$52.50
Expense	03/12/2025	One Legal Filing Fee: One Legal Filing Fee	1.00	$87.76	$87.76
Expense	03/12/2025	One Legal Filing Fee: One Legal Filing Fee	1.00	$21.42	$21.42
Expense	06/03/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$98.09	$98.09
Expense	06/20/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$43.11	$43.11
Expense	08/08/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$21.42	$21.42
Expense	09/05/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$21.42	$21.42
Expense	09/08/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$84.41	$84.41
Expense	09/08/2025	One Legal/Court Fees	1.00	$113.58	$113.58
Expense	07/01/2026	File & ServeXpress	1.00	$129.17	$129.17
Expense	11/18/2026	Filing fee - motion for final approval	1.00	$60.00	$60.00
			Expenses Subtotal		**$18,127.60**

Time Keeper	Quantity	Rate	Total
AJ Bhowmik	19.0	$895.00	$17,005.00
Scott Blumenthal	8.0	$450.00	$3,600.00
Nicholas De Blouw	39.6	$850.00	$33,660.00
Ricardo Ehmann	14.05	$675.00	$9,483.75
Charlotte James	50.25	$550.00	$27,637.50
Piya Mukherjee	47.6	$750.00	$35,700.00
Kyle Nordrehaug	33.95	$950.00	$32,252.50
Victoria Rivapalacio	2.2	$750.00	$1,650.00
Andrew Ronan	8.5	$550.00	$4,675.00
Brooke Waldrop	0.1	$750.00	$75.00
Gerardo Galaviz	26.4	$250.00	$6,600.00
		Quantity Total	**249.65**
		Subtotal	**$190,466.35**
		Total	**$190,466.35**

Detailed Statement of Account

Current Invoice

Invoice Number	Due On	Amount Due	Payments Received	Balance Due
1	12/18/2026	$190,466.35	$0.00	$190,466.35
			Outstanding Balance	**$190,466.35**
			Total Amount Outstanding	**$190,466.35**

Please make all amounts payable to: Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik DeBlouw LLP

Please pay within 30 days.

EXHIBIT #4

LAFFEY MATRIX

History

Case Law

See the Matrix

Contact us

Home

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

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

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

* ï¿½Years Out of Law Schoolï¿½ is calculated from June 1 of each year, when most law students graduate. ï¿½1-3" includes an attorney in his 1st, 2nd and 3rd years of practice, measured from date of graduation (June 1). ï¿½4-7" applies to attorneys in their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th years of practice. An attorney who graduated in May 1996 would be in tier ï¿½1-3" from June 1, 1996 until May 31, 1999, would move into tier ï¿½4-7" on June 1, 1999, and tier ï¿½8-10" on June 1, 2003.

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

EXHIBIT #5

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
Norman B. Blumenthal (SBN 068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (SBN 205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (SBN 248066)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858) 551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS, individually, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

INDEPENDENT LIVING SYSTEMS, LLC. a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

.

Case No. CGC-24-614434

DECLARATION OF SAMUEL GALLAGHER-STEVENS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT

[Re-Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Rochelle C. East, Dept. 610]

Hearing Date: July 21, 2026
Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: 302

Date Filed: May 6, 2024
Trial Date: Not set

I, Samuel Gallagher-Stevens, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of eighteen, a Plaintiff and a proposed Class Representative in the above-entitled matter. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and in support of my application for a Class Representative Service Payment.

2. I have personal knowledge of all the facts stated herein. I could and would competently testify under oath to these facts in court if requested to do so.

3. During the class period I worked as a non-exempt Care Manager for the Defendant Independent Living Systems, LLC ("ILS" or "Defendant") in California and during that time period I was classified by ILS as a non-exempt employee.

4. I retained my attorneys who are experienced in both class action and PAGA representative action litigation and claims against employers for violations of the California Labor Code. I have no personal relationship or family ties to my attorneys or any officer of the Court. I am not aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with another class member in this case nor am I aware of having any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Apex Class Action Services, the settlement administrator. I am not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by this settlement.

5. I decided to pursue this class action lawsuit and be a plaintiff/class representative because I felt that my legal rights as an employee and others like me were violated. For example, I received non-discretionary compensation from time to time, such as bonuses, but these payments during certain pay periods when I worked overtime were not factored into my regular rate. I was underpaid as a result. As another example, I often did not receive compliant meal and

rest breaks which were late, interrupted or missed entirely. I also did not receive all the meal and rest break premiums I was entitled to and when I did receive premium payments, they were often an incorrect amount. Additionally, I was required to use my personal vehicle, including incurring mileage, wear and tear, and gas/toll road expenses without reimbursement by ILS. I was also required to use my home office and cellular phone for company business without reimbursement by ILS.

6. I spoke to my attorneys several times and discussed how ILS implemented its company policies and procedures. I also assisted my attorneys in their investigation into my claims by providing them documents and answering their questions. I reviewed the complaint before it was filed and after it was filed I was given access to an electronic file sharing program that alerted me via email when important documents were filed so that I could review them and keep up with the developments in the case which I understood was one of my duties as a class representative. I would also contact my attorneys from time to time if I had any questions about the case.

7. Even though this action is in the process of settling, I was and remain prepared to perform all the duties of a class representative. I understand that as a class representative I have assumed a fiduciary responsibility to prosecute this class action on behalf of the absent class members. I have understood that as a fiduciary, I have a duty to prosecute this action for the benefit of the class members and surrender any right to compromise the group action for an individual gain.

8. I understood that being a plaintiff/class representative in this case meant that I was seeking damages not only for myself but also other current and/or former non-exempt employees working for ILS in California who make up the class. I felt that these individuals were not aware

of their labor law rights and even if they were they would probably be apprehensive about speaking up or even simply because of the time, effort and risk involved in filing a class action lawsuit.

9. I understood that being a part of this lawsuit involved risks. For example, my attorneys explained to me that if the case went to trial and we lost, I could be held responsible to pay for all or part of the attorney fees and costs paid by ILS to defend this lawsuit. Also, I knew there was a risk that future employers, if they ever find out about this lawsuit, could hold it against me or downgrade me as a potential hire. As the only named Plaintiff in this case it would not be difficult for a future employer to become aware that I sued my employer for labor law violations. Ultimately, I decided these risks were worth it and decided to fight for my rights and the rights of others regardless of the risks, time and effort I spent on this case.

10. During the lawsuit I stayed in touch with my attorneys by phone and email. I also kept up to date on important developments by reviewing court filings that were made available to me electronically as I described above.

11. A mediation took place on February 27, 2025, with Jonathan Andrews, a well-respected and experienced mediator of wage and hour class actions. After the mediation the parties were able to reach an agreement to settle the action. I communicated with my attorneys regarding the terms of the settlement which was reached between the parties and understood that I was representing absent class members and therefore wanted the best possible result to be obtained for the class members and I believe a very positive result was in fact achieved via settlement. I reviewed and signed the Memorandum of Understanding on March 24, 2025 and when the final settlement papers were ready, I closely reviewed the Settlement Agreement which I signed on July 25, 2025.

12. I have been actively involved with this lawsuit performing the duties described above. Although I did not keep time records, I was in regular contact with my attorneys, reviewed court filings, and spent a significant amount of time on the issues presented during the lawsuit and in the settlement process. I estimate that I spent approximately 100 hours working on this case up until this point. I believe I have been diligent and have done what is expected of a named plaintiff and a proposed class representative to date and will continue to do so. I have and always will maintain the best interests of the class members.

13. My attorneys explained to me that the settlement process involves a two-step review by the Court to determine whether the settlement is fair before approving the settlement. I know this process also involves notifying all class members of the settlement terms and of their rights to make a claim for their settlement share, to opt out of the settlement or to object to the settlement.

14. I believe I did the right thing by filing this case on behalf of the class members who, subject to court approval, are in line to receive monetary payments as a result of this case and settlement. This is money they may never have ever gotten if I did not pursue this action on their behalf. I feel significant personal satisfaction to know that I played a role in the class members being entitled to monetary payments as a result of the filing of this lawsuit. I also believe that the requested Class Representative Service Payment of $15,000 from the settlement is fair compensation for the work I performed and the risks I undertook.

15. In light of all the time and effort I have spent on this case, the risk I undertook by suing my employer, the exposure to being responsible for paying Defendant's costs in the event we did not win the case, and the reputational risk that future employers may hold this lawsuit against me, I believe the request for $15,000 as a Class Representative service payment is fair

and reasonable.

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

Executed on 06/25/2026, at San Francisco, California.
(city, state)

Samuel JG Stevens (Jun 25, 2026 10:48:20 PDT)
Samuel Gallagher-Stevens