JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Jackland K Hom (State Bar #327243)
jackland@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 255-9047

Attorneys for Plaintiff PETRA RIOS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

PETRA RIOS, an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 24CV003470 **DECLARATION OF JEAN-CLAUDE LAPUYADE, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT** Date: November 21, 2025 Time: 8:30 a.m. Judge: Hon. Carrie M. Panetta Dept.: 14

I, Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., declare as follows:

1. I am over eighteen years of age and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following facts from my own personal knowledge. I am an attorney-at-law and the owner of the law firm of JCL LAW FIRM, APC (hereinafter "Class Counsel"). I am co-counsel of record for Plaintiff PETRA RIOS (hereafter "Plaintiff") in this wage and hour class action filed against PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC. (hereinafter "Defendant"). This declaration is being submitted in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement.

I. EXHIBITS

2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit "1"** is a true and correct copy of the fully executed Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims ("Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement"). Attached as **Exhibit "A"** to the Agreement is a true and correct copy of the proposed Class Notice.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit "2"** is a true and correct copy of the proof of filing with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency notice of this settlement with the Settlement Agreement and Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Action Settlement evidencing Class Counsel's compliance with California Labor Code Section 2699(l)(2).

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit "3"** is a true and correct copy of the JCL Law Firm "Firm Resume" detailing some of the major cases the JCL Law Firm has undertaken.

II. INTRODUCTION

5. An objective evaluation of the Gross Settlement Amount and the Net Settlement Amount confirms that the relief negotiated on behalf of the Class is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Gross Settlement Amount was negotiated by the Parties at arm's length. The Net Settlement Amount confers substantial benefits to the Class. The relief offered by the Net Settlement Amount is particularly impressive when viewed against the difficulties encountered by plaintiffs pursuing wage and hour cases (*see infra)*. Indeed, by settling now rather than proceeding to trial, Class Members will not have to wait

(possibly years) for relief, nor will they have to bear the risk of class certification being denied or of Defendant prevailing at trial. Given that there are approximately 340 Class Members, ***the average gross Individual Class Payment is approximately $589.25.*** (Net Settlement Amount divided by Class Members).

6. As discussed below, the proposed Gross Settlement Amount satisfies all criteria for preliminary settlement approval and falls within the range of reasonableness. The average Individual Class Payment meets or exceeds awards in similar wage and hour class actions. Moreover, the proposed Class is appropriate for provisional certification. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant preliminary approval of the Gross Settlement Amount.

III. FACTS AND PROCEDURE

A. Overview of the Litigation

7. Defendant provides janitorial services in the state of California, including in Monterey County, where Plaintiff worked.

8. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from July 2023 through September 2023, as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis. Throughout her employment, Plaintiff was subject to Defendant's policies and procedures.

9. Generally, Plaintiff claims that Defendant failed to provide compliant meal and rest periods, failed to pay all wages, failed to pay for all time worked, failed to reimburse necessary business expenses, failed to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, and failed to pay all wages upon separation. Defendant denies liability for each of Plaintiff's claims. Further, Defendant asserts that it fully complied with all applicable employment laws and raised several other significant defenses to Plaintiff's claims, including but not limited to timely payment of all wages due upon separation of employment.

10. On August 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint in the Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV003470 (the "Class Action"), alleging class claims for: (1) Unfair Competition in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 *et seq*; (2) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1; (3) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq*; (4) Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods in Violation Of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (5) Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226; (7) Failure to Provide Wages When Due in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203; and (8) Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

11. On the same day, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Violations with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) and served the same on Defendant.

12. On October 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed a representative action complaint in the Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV004490 (the "PAGA Action"), alleging one cause of action for violations of PAGA.

13. On October 3, 2025, the Court consolidated the Class Action and the PAGA Action, with the Class Action deemed the lead case.

14. On June 27, 2025, the Parties participated in mediation presided over by Brian Sinclair, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. The Parties accepted a Mediator's settlement proposal, which was subsequently memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding. Thereafter, the Parties drafted and negotiated a long-form settlement agreement, which is the subject of the instant motion.

B. Class Counsel Thoroughly Investigated the Factual and Legal Issues

15. Months before filing the Action, Class Counsel began its pre-filing investigation into Plaintiff's complaints. Class Counsel's investigation started with several lengthy interviews with Plaintiff. As part of the interview process, Plaintiff produced documents related to her employment, including wage statements and time records. At the conclusion of the interviews, Class Counsel determined that Plaintiff's complaints justified further inquiry.

16. Class Counsel subsequently requested Plaintiff's employee files from Defendant. In response, Defendants produced additional documents including policies, onboarding documents, and complete time and payroll records. Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed the documents and determined the documents appeared to substantiate Plaintiff's claim that Defendant failed to, among other things, pay for all hours worked.

17. To prepare for mediation, Defendant produced a 30% sample of time and payroll records for the Class Members, aggregate workweek and pay period data for the Class Members, average hourly rate for the Class Members, and copies of applicable policies and agreements.

18. Class Counsel then retained the statisticians and economists at Berger Consulting Group ("BCG") to evaluate the Class Members' payroll and time data. BCG provides data analysis and damage modeling consulting services, specializing in wage and hour class actions. BCG's team of financial and data analysts are credentialed and experienced experts in their fields and have provided their expertise on thousands of cases.

19. BCG analyzed Defendant's time and payroll data to assist in the development of various damage models. Among other things, BCG determined the approximate amount of unpaid wages, amount of unpaid overtime wages, number of workweeks, pay periods, average length of shifts and average number of hours worked per week. BCG also estimated the number of missed, late, or truncated meal and rest periods, the amount of unpaid and underpaid overtime, and the amount of missed meal and rest period premiums paid during the Class Period.

20. Class Counsel only agreed to enter the settlement following this thorough investigation and evaluation of Plaintiff's claims. Based on its investigation of the facts, applicable law, and marketplace for similar settlements, and considering the risk of significant delay and uncertainty associated with litigation, and the various defenses asserted by Defendant, Class Counsel firmly believe this Agreement to be in the best interests of the Class Members. Because the settlement's terms are fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court should preliminarily approve the settlement.

/ / /

C. The Parties Settled Following Mediation

21. On June 27, 2025, the Parties conducted a full day of mediation with Brian Sinclair, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. Mediator Sinclair helped manage the Parties' expectations and provided a useful, neutral analysis of the issues and risks to both sides. The Parties made substantial progress with Mediator Sinclair's assistance. Namely, the Parties exchanged information regarding their respective claims and defenses, including their respective evaluation of the damages. At the conclusion of the mediation, Mediator Sinclair issued a mediator's proposal for settlement. The Parties ultimately accepted Mediator Sinclair's proposal. The complete and final terms of the Parties' settlement are now set forth in the Agreement. The first installment in the amount of $131,666.67 was made by Defendant on September 9, 2025 ("First Installment"). Class Counsel submits that the settlement constitutes a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the claims at issue.

22. At all times, the Parties' negotiations were at an arm's length, adversarial and non-collusive. The Parties reached a settlement during mediation when Mediator Sinclair issued a proposal that the Parties accepted. Mediator Sinclair only arrived at his proposal after hearing arguments, reviewing evidence, and evaluating the Parties' respective claims and defenses.

23. Once the Parties agreed to the Mediator's proposal, the Parties engaged in protracted negotiations regarding the written terms of the class action and PAGA settlement. The Parties maintained the arm's length, non-collusive and adversarial negotiations while arriving at the final terms of the settlement. The Agreement is the final product of these mediated negotiations. Objectively, the settlement terms are fair, adequate and represent a reasonable compromise of the claims at issue.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Settlement

24. The Gross Settlement Amount of $395,000.00 is fair and reasonable considering the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled and the various potential impediments to recovery. Prior to the mediation, Class Counsel retained Berger Consulting Group to develop economic damage

models measuring Defendant's liability exposure while accounting for the uncertainties of continued litigation. The various models were informed by Class Counsel's investigation, including the analysis of a significant sample of time and payroll data. Class Counsel projected Defendant's liability exposure for *class claims* (excluding PAGA Penalties) ranged between $2,046,855.00 ("Realistic Damages") and $4,289,380.00 ("Maximum Damages") if successful at trial. This range reflects the uncertainty regarding several of the claims. Thus, the Gross Settlement Amount represents a recovery of between 19.30% ("Realistic Damages") and 9.21% ("Maximum Damages") of Defendant's class-wide exposure – well within the recognized range of reasonableness. The following summarizes Defendant's liability exposure.

(1) <u>Estimated Damages for Meal Period Violations</u>

25. Plaintiff's primary claim in the Action alleges that Defendant failed to provide compliant meal periods. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to record the actual time that Class Members worked. Instead, Defendant required Class Members sign off on fictitious handwritten timecards, reflecting their scheduled hours, including a 30-minute meal period. Plaintiff contends that these records do not accurately record the start and stop times for meal periods and, more importantly, do not reflect missed, late or short meal periods. As a result, nearly all of the recorded meal periods reflected exactly thirty (30) minutes, which Plaintiff argued creates a presumption of a meal period violation.

26. Defendant raised a number of defenses to this claim. Defendant argued that it maintained complaint meal period policies and, in practice, provided its employees with the opportunity to take compliant meal periods. Defendant argued, and the documents in fact reflect, that the written time records evidence nearly a 100% meal period compliance rate. Thus, Defendant argued that there was no potential liability for Plaintiff's alleged meal period violations and any claimed violations required a highly individualized inquiry not suitable to class treatment. Consequently, Plaintiff applied a 50% discount to this claim and estimated Defendant's exposure for this claim ranged from $737,406.00 to approximately $1,474,812.00.

(2) Estimated Damages for Rest Period Violations

27. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant failed to provide compliant rest periods. Plaintiff alleges that because of their rigorous work schedules, Plaintiff and Class Members were not able to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Specifically, Plaintiff contends that she was required to work through her rest periods in order to finish work-related tasks.

28. Again, Defendant denied liability and asserted that the workload is not such that it prevented employees from taking a break. Moreover, Plaintiff recognizes the evidentiary burdens establishing this claim. Establishing Plaintiff's rest period claim would rely, almost entirely, on Class Member testimony, making it a riskier claim at class certification and liability stages. Certification likely would have required depositions of Class Members who provided declarations, and Defendant argued that they obtained opposing declarations stating either rest breaks were taken, or rest breaks were voluntarily waived. *See, e.g., Ordonez v. Radio Shack, Inc*. (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2013) 2013 WL 210223, at *11 ("Because of the competing testimony before the Court, plaintiff's evidence that Defendants may have an illegal, written rest break policy is insufficient for this Court to find that common issues predominate."); *Villa v. United Site Servs. of California, Inc*. (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2012) 2012 WL 5503550, at *8 ("Indeed, Plaintiff's own evidence confirms that the written policy does not generate uniform practices"). Accordingly, Plaintiff's Conservative Model applied a 50% discount to the rest break claim. Plaintiff estimated the range of potential outcomes for this claim was between approximately $776,214.00 to approximately $1,552,428.00.

(3) Estimated Exposure for Unpaid Wages

29. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendant failed to pay its employees for all hours worked. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that throughout the entire Class Period, Defendant failed to record the actual time the Plaintiff and Class Members worked. Rather, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant required Class Members to fill in handwritten time sheets consistent with the Class Members' schedules, without any regard to the amount of time employees actually worked. Plaintiff contends that the time records produced by Defendant show that nearly 100% of all time entries were rounded to quarter-hour

intervals. As a result, Plaintiff, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees forfeited compensation, including overtime wages, for all the time they spent working under Defendant's control, including but not limited to time spent cleaning and performing other work-related tasks. Based on Plaintiff's testimony and Class Counsel's investigation, Plaintiff assumed five (5) minutes of unpaid compensable time per workweek by the Class Members during the Class Period.

30. Defendant vigorously denied liability for this claim. As a preliminary matter, Defendant maintains that all hours worked were entered on timecards by the employees and not the employer. Defendant argued that they instructed employees to accurately fill out their timecards to accurately reflect all hours worked, and that employees certified the accuracy of these time entries. Further, Defendant argued that it was entitled to rely on the accuracy of the time entries made by its employees and that it paid employees for all of their time worked. Considering Defendant's defenses, Plaintiff applied 75% discount to this claim. Plaintiff estimated Defendant's exposure for this claim ranged between approximately $5,735.00 and $22,940.00.

(4) Estimated Exposure for Unreimbursed Business Expenses

31. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to reimburse Class Members for use of their personal cell phones and maintenance of their work uniforms in furtherance of their job duties. California employers who require employees to incur personal business expenses for work purposes must reimburse the employee for the cost incurred. (See Cal. Lab. Code § 2802(a), providing that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer….").

32. Again, Defendant vigorously denied any liability for this claim, arguing that there was no mandatory cell phone use, that Class Members were not required to maintain their own uniforms and, in any event, Defendant provided avenues for reimbursement of legitimate business expenses. Considering Defendant's defenses, Plaintiff applied a 50% discount to this claim. Plaintiff estimated Defendant's exposure for this claim ranged between approximately $3,400 and $6,800.

(5) Estimated Exposure for Wage Statement Violations and Waiting Time Penalties

33. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's violations resulted in *derivative* violations of Labor Code sections 203 and 226(a). Class Counsel weighed the potential recoveries against the strength and defenses of the underlying claims as outlined above.

34. Defendant denied that it violated California law regarding wage statements or waiting time penalties. Defendant argued that Plaintiff could not prove the required "willful" prong under Labor Code section 203 and that Plaintiff could not establish the necessary "injury" element to successfully recover derivative wage statement penalties, as required by Labor Code section 226. See, e.g., *Howard v. CVS Caremark Corp.,* 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172406 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2014) (denying class certification for the same penalty claims); *Alonzo v. Maximus, Inc*. (C.D. Cal. 2011) 832 F. Supp. 2d 1122, 1134-1137 (finding insufficient evidence of bad faith or actual injury). Plaintiff could not give the penalty claims great weight given that they depended on proving the underlying claims, which had their own risks. Nevertheless, Class Counsel estimated Defendant's exposure for these claims ranged between $432,000.00 and $864,000.00 for waiting time penalties and $92,100.00 and $368,400 for wage statement penalties.

(6) Defendant's PAGA Exposure

35. Class Counsels' damages models also estimated Defendant's alleged exposure for PAGA Payment. At the time of mediation, Plaintiff estimated Defendant's PAGA exposure at approximately $1,344,400.00.

36. The proposed PAGA allocation of the Gross Settlement Amount is fair, just, and reasonable. *Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77. Where settlements "negotiate a good faith amount" for PAGA Payment and "there is no indication that this amount was the result of self-interest at the expense of class members," such amounts are generally considered reasonable. Sixty-Five percent (65%) of the allocated PAGA Payment ($13,000.00) will be paid to the LWDA ("LWDA Payment") with the remaining thirty-five percent (35%) of the PAGA Payment ($7,000.00) distributed to the Aggrieved Employees ("Aggrieved Employee Payment").

37. The allocated amount for PAGA Payment, which is approximately 5% of the Gross Settlement Amount, falls well within the range of approved PAGA settlements. *Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009) No. CV-08-0844 EDL, 2009 WL 928133, at *9. Courts routinely approve of amounts for PAGA Payment in the range of zero to two percent of the settlement. *See id.* at *1, 9 (approving a PAGA payment of 0.3%); *Jack v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.* (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2011) No. 09cv1683 MMA (JMA), 2011 WL 4899942, at *6 (approving a PAGA payment of 0.25%); *McKenzie v. Fed. Express Corp.* (C.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2012) No. CV 10-02420 GAF (PLAx), 2012 WL 12882124, at *5 (acknowledging that courts approve PAGA claim settlements in the range of zero to two percent of the total settlement).

38. Further, Courts have considerable discretion to reduce the PAGA penalty awards. In *Fleming v. Covidien* (C.D. Cal. 2011) 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154590, a federal court reduced a PAGA Payment from $2,800,000 to $500,000, a reduction of 82.2%, because the court found the maximum penalties "unjust." In some instances, trial courts have awarded no civil penalties, even when Labor Code violations are established. *See In re Nordstrom Com. Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 576, 589 (affirming an award of $0 in PAGA Payment in a wage and hour class action); *In re Taco Bell Wage & Hour Actions* (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2016) 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48557, *40-43 (PAGA Payment denied after trial).

39. The decision in *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*, 30 Cal. App. 5th 504 (2018), illustrates the risk of PAGA claims. In *Carrington*, while the plaintiff prevailed on his PAGA claim upon trial, the trial court reduced the maximum PAGA penalty amount by 90%, citing the employer's good faith attempt at complying with the law. *Id.* at 517. Upon review, the Court of Appeal found such reduction to be proper. *Id.* at 539. Again, the *Carrington* decision was after Plaintiff established the underlying Labor Code violations. Collectively, these cases illustrate the uncertainty and considerable risk associated with maintaining a claim for PAGA penalties. For these reasons, the allocation for PAGA Penalties amounting to 5% of the Gross Settlement Amount is fair, just, and reasonable, and should be approved.

B. Inherent Risks of Continued Litigation Support Preliminary Approval

40. With respect to the most immediate challenge, i.e., class certification, the risks attendant to the certification of similar wage and hour claims are demonstrated by *Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1333, 1341. There, the Court of Appeal affirmed the Trial Court's denial of class certification because employees' declarations attesting to having taken meal and rest breaks demonstrated that individualized inquiries were required to show harm. *See also Campbell v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, (C.D. Cal. 2013) 2013 WL 5302217 at *11-13 (following *Brinker* and denying certification of proposed off-the-clock and rest and meal break classes due to lack of uniform policy); *Brown v. Fed Express Corp.* (C.D. Cal. 2008) 249 F.R.D. 580, 587-88 (denying certification of driver meal and rest period claims based on the predominance of individual issues).

41. Further, even if a class is certified, liability remains uncertain. The risks attendant to the issue of Defendant's liability in similar wage and hour actions are demonstrated by *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association* (2014) 59 Cal.4th 1, 31. There, the Court reversed a trial verdict in favor of plaintiffs in a wage and hour class action. *See also Tien v. Tenet Healthcare Corp.* (2012) 209 Cal.App.4th 1077, 1088 ("[T]he reason, if any, that employees might not take their breaks were predominantly individualized questions of fact not susceptible to class treatment.").

42. Finally, even if a class is certified and Defendant is found liable for the class claims alleged, post-certification risks remain, including a reversal of a favorable judgment for Plaintiff and decertification of the class. These post-certification risks are demonstrated by *Magadia v. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2021) 999 F.3d 668. There, the Ninth Circuit vacated, reversed and remanded a $110 million judgement against an employer for, *inter alia*, inaccurately paying overtime, and directed the trial court to enter judgement in favor of the employer. *See also O'Conner v. Uber Technologies, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2018) 904 F.3d 1087 (decertification of wage and hour misclassification action).

43. Collectively, the examples cited above illustrate the uncertain nature of class litigation. Consequently, the uncertainty of obtaining certification through a contested motion is a significant risk factor favoring settlement.

44. Further, continuing to litigate this action would require continued and extensive resources coupled with significant Court time to proceed through trial and post-trial motions, which can often take years. Furthermore, wage and hour litigation is complex and expensive, requires expert testimony, particularly with regard to damages. But even if Plaintiff is successful at trial, Plaintiff is acutely aware that a judgment does not end the litigation. Plaintiff fully expects that Defendant would appeal any favorable judgment.

45. In this matter, Class Counsel negotiated a Gross Settlement Amount of $395,000.00 that is roughly between 9.21% ("Conservative Model") and 19.30% ("Aggressive Model") of Defendant's maximum class wide liability exposure for damages and statutory penalties. Given the amount of the settlement here, as compared to potential value of the claims, offset by the various inherent risks to continued litigation, the settlement is fair and reasonable.

B. Proposed Notice Informs the Class About the Case and Settlement

46. Plaintiff drafted and Defendant reviewed the Class Notice which fairly and neutrally informs the Class Members of their rights and remedies. The Settlement Administrator will first verify addresses, then mail the proposed Class Notice to all Class Members. The Notice will include information regarding the nature of the lawsuit, a summary of the substance of the settlement's terms, the class definition, the procedure and time within which to make requests for exclusions or objections to the settlement, the date for the final approval hearing, the formula used to calculate settlement payments, and the terms and scope of the Released Class Claims. Agreement at § III(M). This method was negotiated by the Parties to ensure delivering the most reasonable method of notice to the Class Members while ensuring cost effective administration of the Settlement.

47. Accordingly, both the method of disseminating the Class Notice and content of the Class Notice satisfy due process and the requirements of California law. (*See* C.R.C. 3.776(e)-(f); *State of Cal. v. Levi Strauss* (1986) 41 Cal.3d 460,485 (the class notice must "fairly apprise the class members of the terms of the proposed compromise and of the options open to dissenting class members.").)

/ / /

C. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Service Award

48. Approximately 340 Class Members will share in the Net Settlement Amount due entirely to the effort and commitment of Plaintiff. Subject to Court approval, therefore, the settlement provides for a Service Award of $10,000 to Plaintiff (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment). The Service Award is fair and reasonable compensation for the Plaintiff's efforts bringing the action. Among other things, Plaintiff assisted Class Counsel with the litigation and settlement, regularly conferred with Class Counsel on the status of her case and the strategies for prosecuting the claims and reviewed the proposed settlement to ensure that its terms are fair and provide adequate relief for the Settlement Class.

49. If this motion is granted, Class Counsel will file a formal motion with supporting arguments and evidence requesting the Court approve Service Award. Plaintiff respectfully submits that the above showing is sufficient for preliminary approval of the negotiated Service Award.

D. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Class Counsel Award

50. Class Counsel took this matter on a contingency fee basis and invested significant time and expense successfully prosecuting Plaintiff's claims. As discussed *supra*, the estimated average Individual Class Payment and Individual PAGA Payment demonstrably illustrate the positive outcome for the putative Class Members. The Agreement provides for a payment of attorneys' fees not to exceed 1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount ($131,666.67) and reimbursement of attorneys' expenses supported by declaration not to exceed $25,000.00. Agreement at § III(N)(10) (pp. 24-25). Considering the positive outcome for the Class Members and the supporting authority, the Class Counsel Award is fair and reasonable. Class Counsel will file a formal motion for approval of the Class Counsel Award at the time of final approval.

E. Provisional Certification for Settlement Purposes Only Is Appropriate Under C.C.P. Section 382.

51. For settlement purposes only, Plaintiff contends, and Defendant does not dispute, that provisional certification of the Class is appropriate.

52. Because all Class Members are Defendant's current and former employees, the putative class is readily ascertainable from Defendant's regular business records, i.e., payroll records.

53. The statutes relating to each of Plaintiff's claims apply with equal force and effect to the entire Class. Factually, Defendant's policies and practices apply class-wide and Defendant's liability can be determined by facts common to all members of the class. The wage and hour issues are both numerous and substantial, and a class action is the most advantageous method of dealing with the claims of the Settlement Class Members.

54. Plaintiff's wage and hour claims are typical of the proposed Class because they arise from the same factual basis and are based on the same legal theories applicable to the other Class Members. Likewise, Plaintiff's interests are entirely coextensive with the interests of the Class. Plaintiff alleges she was injured by the same company-wide practices to which the proposed Class Members were subject to and seek the same relief. Plaintiff has already demonstrated her ability to advocate for the interests of the Class Members by initiating this litigation, undertaking extensive class discovery, and evaluating the proposed settlement to assure that it is fair.

55. A class action is superior to a multitude of individual lawsuits. Given the size and amount of each individual claim, the Class Members likely have little incentive to litigate their claims on an individual basis because the out-of-pocket expense and personal commitment necessary to litigate each claim outweighs any potential recovery. In sum, class treatment is superior to individual, case-by-case adjudication.

F. Class Counsel's Experience

56. Plaintiff, the Settlement Class Members and the Aggrieved Employees are represented by competent and experienced counsel to pursue their claims. I established the JCL Law Firm, APC ("Firm"), in 2010. The Firm is a boutique plaintiff firm representing aggrieved employees and consumers throughout California in wage and hour class actions, PAGA Actions and complex multi-party product liability matters. A true and correct copy of the JCL Law Firm, APC's resume is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

57. I am qualified to represent Plaintiff, the Class Members, the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees. I have extensive experience with wage and hour class and representative actions litigation like this matter, and employment matters in general. Additionally, I have extensive complex mass tort litigation experience and complex construction product liability experience. I can, will and have adequately represented the interests of the Plaintiff, the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees throughout this action.

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

59. I have significant class counsel and collective action counsel experience. My credentials are reflected in the JCL Law Firm, APC, Firm Resume, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

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

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

62. Consequently, I was named to the prestigious Thomson Reuters, Super Lawyers, Rising Star in 2015, 2016, 2017 and, again, in 2018. According to Thomson Reuters, the Super Lawyers, Rising Star list recognizes the top 2.5% of eligible attorneys. (see https://www.superlawyers.com/about/selection_process.html.) Additionally, I was named a 2025 and 2026 Super Lawyer in Employment Law by Thompson Reuters.

/ / /

V. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

63. The parties selected Apex Class Action, LLC as the Administrator for this Settlement. A true and correct copy of Apex's bid for administration is attached hereto as **Exhibit "4".**

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 24th day of October 2025, at San Diego, California.

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

By: ______________________________
Jean-Claude Lapuyade
Attorneys for Plaintiff PETRA RIOS

EXHIBIT 1

JCL LAW FIRM, APC
Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)
jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com
Perssia Razma (State Bar #351398)
prazma@jcl-lawfirm.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619) 599-8292

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC
Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924)
shani@zakaylaw.com
Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)
jackland@zakaylaw.com
Jaclyn Joyce (State Bar #285124)
jaclyn@zakaylaw.com
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (619)255-9047

Attorneys for Plaintiff PETRA RIOS

(Additional Counsel on Next Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTEREY

PETRA RIOS, an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 24CV003470 [Complaint Filed: August 20, 2024] **STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT OF CLASS AND PAGA ACTION CLAIMS AND RELEASE OF CLAIMS**

This Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims is entered into by and between Plaintiff PETRA RIOS (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), an individual, on behalf of herself, and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, and in her representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees, and Defendant PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC. ("Defendant") (together, the "Parties"):

I. <u>DEFINITIONS</u>

A. "Action" shall mean the putative class and representative[1] action lawsuit designated *Rios v. Pureserve Building Services, Inc. et al.,* Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV003470.

B. "Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement" means this Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims.

C. "Aggrieved Employees" means all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time during the PAGA Period.

D. "Aggrieved Employee Payment" shall mean the thirty-five percent (35%) of the $20,000 PAGA Payment ($7,000.00) that will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as described in this Agreement.

E. "Class" or the "Class Members" means all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period.

F. "Class Counsel" shall mean Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. of JCL Law Firm, APC, and Shani O. Zakay, Esq. of Zakay Law Group, APLC.

G. "Class Counsel Award" means the award of fees and expenses that the Court authorizes to be paid to Class Counsel for the services they have rendered to Plaintiff, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees in the Action, consisting of attorneys' fees currently not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount currently estimated to be $131,666.67 out of $395,000.00 plus costs of up to

[1] On September 30, 2025, the Parties filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to consolidate the instant class action and Plaintiff's separate representative action (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV004490) for purposes of settlement approval.

$25,000.00. Attorneys' fees will be divided between Class Counsel in the following percentages (50% to JCL Law Firm, APC, and 50% to Zakay Law Group, APLC.) If the Court approves a lesser amount, then the difference shall remain part of the Net Settlement Amount.

H. "Class Data" means information regarding Class Members that Defendant will in good faith compile from its records and provide to the Settlement Administrator. It shall be formatted as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and shall include: each Class Member's full name; last known address; Social Security Number; start dates and end dates of employment; and any other information the Settlement Administrator deems necessary to accurately calculate the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods worked by each Class Member and Aggrieved Employee during the Class and PAGA Periods.

I. "Class Period" means the period beginning August 20, 2020, through June 27, 2025.

J. "Class Representative" means Plaintiff Petra Rios.

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

L. "Defendant" means Pureserve Building Services, Inc.

M. "Defendant's Counsel" means Noland, Hamerly, Etienne & Hoss, including Sharilyn R. Payne.

N. "Effective Date" means the date upon which final approval of the Settlement is granted by the Court.

O. "Employer's Share of Payroll Taxes" means the amount of Defendant's employer payroll tax obligations on the wage portion of Individual Settlement Payments including withholdings and contributions for federal, state, local taxes and any similar tax or charge, payable from Defendant's own accounts, separate from the Gross Settlement Amount.

P. "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing the Court sets wherein Plaintiff shall move the Court to find that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and to enter a Final Approval Order and Final Judgment.

Q. "Final Approval Order" means the Court's order, which shall, among other things, finally approve the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of this Settlement Agreement.

R. "Final Judgment" means the Court's judgment, which shall, among other things, finally adjudge the Action as resolved pursuant to this Stipulation Of Settlement Of Class And Paga Action Claims And Release Of Claims and deeming it binding as provided herein.

S. "Funding Date" means the date by which Defendant delivers the Third Installment payment (as defined herein below) and fully funds the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator.

T. "Gross Settlement Amount" means Three Hundred Ninety-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($395,000.00) that Defendant must pay into the QSF in connection with this Settlement, inclusive of the sum of Settlement Administration Costs, Class Counsel Award, Service Award, and the PAGA Payment. The Gross Settlement Amount is all-in with no reversion and ***exclusive*** of the employer's share of payroll tax, if any, triggered by any payment under this Settlement.

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

V. "LWDA" shall mean the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

W. "LWDA Payment" shall mean the sixty-five percent (65%) of the $20,000 PAGA Payment ($13,000.00) payable to the to the LWDA.

X. "Net Settlement Amount" or "NSA" means the aggregate amount payable to Participating Class Members, which is calculated as follows: Gross Settlement Amount, less Class Counsel Award, Service Award, PAGA Payment, and Settlement Administration Costs.

Y. "Notice Packet" means the Class Notice to be provided to the Class Members by the Settlement Administrator in the form set forth as **Exhibit A** to this Agreement (other than formatting changes to facilitate printing by the Settlement Administrator), with certified Spanish translation.

Z. “Objection” means a Participating Class Member’s timely and valid written objection to the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Of Settlement Of Class And Paga Action Claims And Release Of Claims.

AA. “Opt-Out Request” means a Class Member’s timely and valid written request to be excluded from the Settlement and release of Released Claims that do not arise under PAGA.

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

CC. “PAGA Payment Ratio” means the respective Pay Periods during the PAGA Period for each Aggrieved Employee divided by the total Pay Periods for all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period.

DD. “PAGA Pay Periods,” for purposes of calculating the distribution of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, as defined herein, means the number of pay periods of employment during the PAGA Period that each Aggrieved Employee worked in California.

EE. “PAGA Period” means the period beginning August 20, 2023, to June 27, 2025.

FF. “PAGA Payment” shall mean Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($20,000.00) to be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of PAGA Claims asserted in the Action.

GG. “PAGA Payment to PAGA Members” means the amount of Seven Thousand Dollars and No/100 Cents ($7,000.00) payable from the Gross Settlement Amount to PAGA Members as their aggregate thirty-five percent (35%) share of the PAGA Payment.

HH. “PAGA Payment to the LWDA” means the amount of Thirteen Thousand Dollars and No/100 Cents ($13,000.00) payable from the Gross Settlement Amount and due to the LWDA as its sixty-five percent (65%) share of the PAGA Payment.

II. “PAGA Settlement” means the settlement and release of the PAGA Claims that arise under PAGA, which Plaintiff brought against Defendant, as a deputized PAGA representative of the State of California, which shall bind the State of California and which PAGA Members shall not be entitled to opt out of.

JJ. "Participating Class Members" means Plaintiff and all Class Members who do not submit a timely and valid Opt-Out Request.

KK. "Parties" means Plaintiff and Defendant, collectively, and "Party" shall mean either Plaintiff or Defendant, individually.

LL. "Payment Ratio" means the respective Workweeks for each Class Member divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members.

MM. "Plaintiff" shall mean Petra Rios.

NN. "Preliminary Approval Order" means the Court's order which shall, among other things, preliminarily approve the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of this Stipulation Of Settlement Of Class And Paga Action Claims And Release Of Claims.

OO. "QSF" means the Qualified Settlement Fund established, designated, and maintained by the Settlement Administrator to fund the Gross Settlement Amount.

PP. "Released Class Claims" means all class claims or causes of action alleged, or that reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged, including costs and attorneys' fees related thereto, in the operative complaint in the Action which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the Class Period.

QQ. "Released PAGA Claims" means all claims for penalties or causes of action under the California Private Attorneys' General Act, including attorneys' fees and costs related thereto, alleged or that reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged, including costs and attorneys' fees related thereto, in the operative complaint in Plaintiff's separate PAGA action (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV004490) and Plaintiff's August 20, 2024 PAGA notice to the LWDA which occurred during the PAGA Period, predicated upon violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, and California Industrial Welfare Commission Orders and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

RR. "Released Parties" means Defendant and its current or former attorneys, insurers, brands, concepts, parents, affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, assigns, agents, officers, exempt employees, directors, owners, members, parent companies, and any individual or entity that could be jointly liable with Defendant for any of the Released PAGA Claims and/or Released Class Claims.

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

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

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

VV. "Settlement Administration Costs" shall mean the amount paid to the Settlement Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount for administering the Settlement pursuant to this Agreement currently estimated not to exceed $7,990.00. The Settlement Administration Costs shall include Spanish translations of notices to the Aggrieved Employees and to the Class Members. If the Court finally approves a lesser amount, then the difference shall remain a part of the Net Settlement Amount.

WW. "Settlement Administrator" means Apex Class Action LLC, located at 18 Technology Drive, Suite 154, Irvine, CA 92618 Tel: (800) 355-0700, whom the Parties have agreed to as the third-party settlement administrator to perform notice and settlement administration duties pursuant to this Stipulation Of Settlement Of Class And Paga Action Claims And Release Of Claims. The Settlement Administrator establishes, designates, and maintains, a QSF under Internal Revenue Code section 468B and

Treasury Regulation section 1.468B-1, into which the amount of the Gross Settlement Amount is deposited for the purpose of resolving the claims of Settlement Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain the funds until distribution in an account(s) segregated from the assets of Defendant and any person related to Defendant. ***All accrued interest shall be paid and distributed to the Settlement Class Members as part of their respective Individual Settlement Payment.***

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

YY. "Unclaimed Property Fund" means the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund (Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1314).

ZZ. "Workweeks," shall mean any seven (7) consecutive days beginning on Sunday and ending on Saturday, in which a Class Member is employed by Defendant during the Class Period in California.

II. <u>RECITALS</u>

A. On August 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint in the Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV003470 (the "Action"), alleging claims for:

1. Unfair Competition in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 *et seq*;
2. Failure To Pay Minimum Wages in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1;
3. Failure To Pay Overtime Wages in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq*;
4. Failure To Provide Required Meal Periods in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order;
5. Failure To Provide Required Rest Periods in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the Applicable IWC Wage Order;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Statements in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226;

7. Failure to Provide Wages When Due in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 & 203; and

8. Failure To Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802.

B. On the same day, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Violations with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) and served the same on Defendant.

C. On October 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed a representative action complaint in the Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV004490, alleging one cause of action for violations of PAGA.

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

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

F. The Class Representative is represented by Class Counsel. Class Counsel investigated the facts relevant to the Action, including conducting an independent investigation as to the allegations, reviewing documents and information exchanged through informal discovery, and reviewing documents and information provided by Defendant pursuant to informal requests for information to prepare for mediation. Defendant produced for the purpose of settlement negotiations certain employment data concerning the Class, which Class Counsel reviewed and analyzed with the assistance of an expert. Based on their own independent investigation and evaluation, Class

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

G. On June 27, 2025, the Parties participated in mediation presided over by Brian Sinclair, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. The Parties accepted a Mediator's settlement proposal, which was subsequently memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding.

H. On September 30, 2025, the Parties filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to consolidate the instant class action and Plaintiff's separate representative action (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV004490) for purposes of settlement approval.

I. This Agreement replaces and supersedes the Memorandum of Understanding and any other agreements, understandings, or representations between the Parties. 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 Action of Plaintiff or the Class Members 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 Action have merit.

J. The Parties believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Settlement was arrived at through arm's-length negotiations, considering all relevant factors. The Parties recognize the uncertainty, risk, expense, and delay attendant to continuing the Action through trial and any appeal. Accordingly, the Parties desire to settle, compromise and discharge all disputes and claims arising from or relating to the Action fully, finally, and forever.

K. 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 reserve all available defenses to the claims in the Action. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on and will not be admissible in connection with any litigation.

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

III. TERMS OF AGREEMENT

A. Settlement Consideration and Settlement Payments by Defendant.

1. Settlement Consideration. In full and complete settlement of the Action, and in exchange for the releases set forth below, Defendant will pay the sum of the Individual Settlement Payments, the Service Award, the Class Counsel Award, PAGA Payment, and the Settlement Administration Costs, as specified in this Agreement, equal to the Gross Settlement Amount of Three Hundred Ninety- Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($395,000.00). The Parties agree that this is a non-reversionary Settlement and that no portion of the Gross Settlement Amount shall revert to Defendant. Other than the Defendant's share of employer payroll taxes and as provided in Section III.A.2 below, Defendant shall not be required to pay more than the Gross Settlement Amount.

2. Class Size. At the time of mediation, Defendant represented that the Class was comprised of approximately 340 individuals who collectively worked approximately 18,350 Workweeks during the Class Period. Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding, if the actual number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period were to exceed the above number by more than 10%, the settlement amount would be increased by the percentage over 110% of the increased Workweeks. For example, if the total Workweeks in the Class Period are 115% of 18,350, the Gross Settlement would increase by 5%. At its option, Defendant could avoid increasing the Gross Settlement Amount by

electing to end the Class Period date in which the number of Workweeks reached 18,350. On September 17, 2025, Defendant provided the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data. Using the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator confirmed that there are 19,886 Workweeks. Therefore, the actual number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period did not exceed the above number by more than 10%.

3. Settlement Payment. Defendant shall deposit the Gross Settlement Amount into the QSF, through the Settlement Administrator in three (3) equal installments as follows:

(1) The first installment in the amount of $131,666.67 is to be made no later than September 7, 2025 ("First Installment"), which is 30 days after execution of the Memorandum of Understanding;

(2) The second installment in the amount of $131,666.67 is to be made 6 months after payment of the First Installment, or the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the settlement, whichever is later ("Second Installment"); and

(3) The third installment in the amount of $131,666.66 is to be made 6 months after payment of the Second Installment, or the date the Court grants final approval of the settlement, whichever is later ("Third Installment").

4. Defendant's Share of Payroll Taxes. Defendant's share of employer side payroll taxes is in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount and shall be paid together with the Second Installment.

B. Release by Settlement Class Members. Upon the Settlement Administrator's receipt of the Third Installment and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members release the Released Parties from the Released Class Claims for the Class Period.

C. Release by the Aggrieved Employees. Upon entry of final judgment and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, in exchange for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, the Plaintiff and the State of California release the Released Parties from the Released PAGA Claims for the PAGA Period.

D. General Release by Plaintiff. Upon the Settlement Administrator's receipt of the Third Installment and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, for the consideration set forth in this Agreement, Class Representative, for herself and her estates, trusts, attorneys, heirs, successors, beneficiaries, devisees, legatees, executors, administrators, trustees, conservators, guardians, assigns, and representatives, will waive, release, acquit and forever discharge the Released Parties from any and all claims, known or unknown. Class Representative waives all rights and benefits afforded by section 1542 of the Civil Code which provides as follows:

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.

Thus, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1542, and to implement a full and complete release and discharge of the Released Parties, Plaintiff expressly acknowledges this Settlement Agreement is intended to include in its effect, without limitation, all claims Plaintiff does not know or suspect to exist in Plaintiff's favor at the time of signing this Settlement Agreement, and that this Settlement Agreement contemplates the extinguishment of any such claims. Plaintiff warrants that Plaintiff has read this Settlement Agreement, including this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542, and that Plaintiff has consulted with or had the opportunity to consult with counsel of Plaintiff's choosing about this Settlement Agreement and specifically about the waiver of section 1542, and that Plaintiff understands this Settlement Agreement and the section 1542 waiver, and so Plaintiff freely and knowingly enters into this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff further acknowledges that Plaintiff later may discover facts different from or in addition to those Plaintiff now knows or believes to be true regarding the matters released or described in this Settlement Agreement, and even so Plaintiff agrees that the releases and agreements contained in this Settlement Agreement shall remain effective in all respects notwithstanding any later discovery of any different or additional facts. Plaintiff expressly assumes any and all risk of any mistake in connection with the true facts involved in the matters, disputes, or controversies released or described in this Settlement Agreement or with regard to any facts now unknown to Plaintiff relating thereto.

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

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

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

1. This Settlement Agreement shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative, or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural;

2. The conditional class certification (obtained for any purpose) shall be void *ab initio* and of no force or effect, and shall not be admissible in any judicial, administrative, or arbitral proceeding for any purpose or with respect to any issue, substantive or procedural; and

3. None of the Parties to this Settlement will be deemed to have waived any claims, objections, defenses, or arguments in the Action, including with respect to the issue of class certification.

G. <u>Failure to Fund the Gross Settlement Amount</u>. If, after the Effective Date, Defendant fails to fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff shall be entitled to all reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and interest in any proceeding to enforce the terms of this Agreement.

H. <u>Certification of the Class</u>. The Parties stipulate to conditional class certification of the Class for the Class Period for purposes of settlement only.

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

J. <u>Circular 230 Disclaimer</u>. Each Party to this Agreement (for purposes of this section, the "acknowledging party" and each Party to this Agreement other than the acknowledging party, an "other party") acknowledges and agrees that: (1) no provision of this Agreement, and no written communication or disclosure between or among the Parties or their attorneys and other advisers, is or was intended to be, nor shall any such communication or disclosure constitute or be construed or be relied upon as, tax advice within the meaning of United States Treasury Department circular 230 (31 CFR part 10, as amended); (2) the acknowledging party (a) has relied exclusively upon his, her or its own, independent legal and tax counsel for advice (including tax advice) in connection with this Agreement, (b) has not entered into this Agreement based upon the recommendation of any other Party or any attorney or advisor to any other Party, and (c) is not entitled to rely upon any communication or disclosure by any attorney or adviser to any other party to avoid any tax penalty that may be imposed on the acknowledging party, and (3) no attorney or adviser to any other Party has imposed any limitation that protects the confidentiality of any such attorney's or adviser's tax strategies (regardless of whether such limitation is legally binding) upon disclosure by the acknowledging party of the tax treatment or tax structure of any transaction, including any transaction contemplated by this Agreement.

K. Preliminary Approval Motion. As soon thereafter as practicable after the execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff shall file with the Court a Motion for Order Granting Preliminary Approval and supporting papers, which shall include this Settlement Agreement. Plaintiff will provide Defendant with a draft of the Motion at least three (3) business days prior to the filing of the Motion to give Defendant an opportunity to review and comment upon the Motion.

L. Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for: establishing and administering the QSF; calculating, processing and mailing payments to the Class Representative, Class Counsel, LWDA and Class Members; printing and mailing the Notice Packets to the Class Members as directed by the Court; receiving and reporting the objections and requests for exclusion; calculating, deducting and remitting all legally required taxes from Individual Settlement Payments and distributing tax forms for the Wage Portion, the Penalties Portion and the Interest

Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment; processing and mailing tax payments to the appropriate state and federal taxing authorities; providing declaration(s) as necessary in support of preliminary and/or final approval of this Settlement; and other tasks as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the Settlement Administrator to perform. The Settlement Administrator shall keep the Parties timely apprised of the performance of all Settlement Administrator responsibilities by among other things, sending a weekly status report to the Parties' counsel stating the date of the mailing, the number of opt outs from the Settlement it receives (including the numbers of valid and deficient), and the number of objections received.

M. Notice Procedure.

1. Class Data. On September 17, 2025, Defendant provided the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data for purposes of preparing and mailing Notice Packets to the Class Members.

2. Notice Packets.

a) The Notice Packet shall contain the Notice of Class Action Settlement in a form substantially similar to the form attached as **Exhibit A,** including a Spanish translation. The Notice of Class Action Settlement shall inform Class Members and Aggrieved Employees that they need not do anything in order to receive an Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment and to keep the Settlement Administrator apprised of their current mailing address, to which the Individual Settlement Payments and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment will be mailed following the date that the Net Settlement Amount ("NSA") is fully funded. The Notice of Class Action Settlement shall set forth the release to be given by all members of the Class who do not request to be excluded from the

Settlement Class and/or Aggrieved Employees in exchange for an Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved Employees' individual shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, the number of Workweeks worked by each Class Member during the Class Period, and number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, if any, and the estimated amount of their Individual Settlement Payment if they do not request to be excluded from the Settlement and each Aggrieved Employees' share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, if any. The Settlement Administrator shall use the Class Data to determine Class Members' Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods. The Notice will also advise the Aggrieved Employees that they will receive their share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment regardless of whether they request to be excluded from the Settlement.

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

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

identified by the Settlement Administrator as the current mailing address shall be presumed to be the best mailing address for each Class Member.

4. Undeliverable Notices. Any Notice Packets returned to the Settlement Administrator as non-delivered on or before the Response Deadline shall be re-mailed to any forwarding address provided within seven (7) days of receiving the returned notice. If no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly attempt to determine a correct address by lawful use of skip-tracing, or other search using the name, address and/or Social Security number of the Class Member involved, and shall then perform a re-mailing, if another mailing address is identified by the Settlement Administrator. In addition, if any Notice Packet to a Class Member who is currently employed by Defendant is returned to the Settlement Administrator as non-delivered and no forwarding address is provided, the Settlement Administrator shall notify Defendant. Defendant will request that the currently employed Class Member provide a corrected address and transmit to the Settlement Administrator any corrected address provided by the Class Member. Class Members who received a re-mailed Notice Packet shall have their Response Deadline extended fifteen (15) days from the original Response Deadline.

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

6. Disputes Regarding Administration of Settlement. Any disputes not resolved by the Settlement Administrator concerning the administration of the Settlement will be resolved by the Court under the laws of the State of California. Before any such involvement of the Court, counsel for the Parties will confer in good faith to resolve the disputes without the necessity of involving the Court.

7. Exclusions. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to exclude themselves from the Settlement must submit a written request for exclusion by the Response Deadline. The written request for exclusion must state that the Class Member wishes to exclude himself or herself from the Settlement and (1) must contain the name, address, and the last four digits of the Social Security number of the person requesting exclusion; (2) must be signed by the Class Member; (3) must be postmarked or fax stamped by the Response Deadline and returned to the Settlement Administrator at the specified address or fax telephone number; and (4) contain a typewritten or handwritten notice stating in substance that he or she wishes to be excluded from the settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled *Rios v. Pureserve Building Services, Inc., et al.*, currently pending in Superior Court of Monterey County, Case No. 24CV003470. The request for exclusion will not be valid if it is not timely submitted, if it is not signed by the Class Member, or if it does not contain the name and address and last four digits of the Social Security number of the Class Member. The date of the postmark on the mailing envelope or fax stamp on the request for exclusion shall be the exclusive means used to determine whether the request for exclusion was timely submitted. Any Class Member who submits a timely request for exclusion shall be excluded from the Settlement Class, will not be entitled to an Individual Settlement Payment and will not be otherwise bound by the terms of the Settlement or have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon. However, any Class Member that submits a timely request for

exclusion that is also an Aggrieved Employee will still receive his/her pro rata share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, as specified below. Class Members who fail to submit a valid and timely request for exclusion on or before the Response Deadline shall be bound by all terms of the Settlement and any final judgment entered in this Action if the Court approves the Settlement. No later than seven (7) calendar days after the Response Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall provide counsel for the Parties with a final list of the Class Members who have timely submitted timely requests for exclusion. At no time shall any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage members of the Class to submit requests for exclusion from the Settlement.

8. Objections. The Notice of Class Action Settlement contained in the Notice Packet shall state that Class Members who wish to object to the Settlement may submit to the Settlement Administrator a written statement of objection ("Notice of Objection") by the Response Deadline. The postmark date of mailing shall be deemed the exclusive means for determining that a Notice of Objection was served timely. The Notice of Objection, if in writing, must be signed by the Settlement Class Member and state: (1) the case name and number; (2) the name of the Settlement Class Member; (3) the address of the Settlement Class Member; (4) the last four digits of the Settlement Class Member's Social Security number; (5) the basis for the objection; and (6) if the Settlement Class Member intends to appear at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing. Settlement Class Members will have a right to appear at the Final Approval/Settlement Fairness Hearing to have their objections heard by the Court regardless of whether they submitted a written objection. At no time shall any of the Parties or their counsel seek to solicit or otherwise encourage Class Members to file or serve written objections to the Settlement or appeal from the Order and Final Judgment.

Class Members who submit a written request for exclusion may not object to the Settlement. Class Members may not object to the PAGA Payment.

N. Allocation of the Gross Settlement Amount.

1. Calculation of Individual Settlement Payments. Individual Settlement Payments shall be paid from the Net Settlement Amount and shall be paid pursuant to the formula set forth herein. Using the Class Data, the Settlement Administrator shall add up the total number of Workweeks for all Class Members. The respective Workweeks for each Class Member will be divided by the total Workweeks for all Class Members, resulting in the Payment Ratio for each Class Member. Each Class Member's Payment Ratio will then be multiplied by the Net Settlement Amount to calculate each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Payments. Each Individual Settlement Payment will be reduced by any legally mandated employee tax withholdings (e.g., employee payroll taxes, etc.). Individual Settlement Payments for Class Members who submit valid and timely requests for exclusion will be redistributed to Settlement Class Members who do not submit valid and timely requests for exclusion on a pro rata basis based on their respective Payment Ratios.

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

3. Allocation of Individual Settlement Payments. For tax purposes, Individual Settlement Payments shall be allocated and treated as 20% wages ("Wage

Portion") and 80% penalties and pre-judgment interest ("Penalties and Interest Portion"). The Wage Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form W-2 and the Penalty Portion and Interest Portion of the Individual Settlement Payments shall be reported on IRS Form 1099 issued by the Settlement Administrator.

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

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

6. Sole Payments: All monies received by Settlement Class Members under the Settlement which are attributable to wages shall constitute income to such Settlement Class Members solely in the year in which such monies are received by the Settlement Class Members. It is the intent of the Parties that Individual Settlement Payments and individual shares of the PAGA Payment provided for in this Settlement agreement are the sole payments to be made by Defendant to Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees in connection with this Settlement Agreement, with the exception of Plaintiff, and that the Settlement Class Members and/or Aggrieved Employees are not entitled to any new or

additional compensation or benefits as a result of having received the Individual Settlement Payments and/or their shares of the Aggrieved Employee Payment.

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

8. Expiration. Any checks issued to Settlement Class Members and Aggrieved Employees shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty (180) days from the date of their issuance. If a Settlement Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employees does not cash his or her settlement check within ninety (90) days, the Settlement Administrator will send a letter to such persons, advising that the check will expire after the 180th day, and invite that Settlement Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee to request reissuance in the event the check was destroyed, lost, or misplaced. In the event an Individual Settlement Payment and/or Aggrieved Employee's individual share of the PAGA Payment check has not been cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days, all funds represented by such uncashed checks, plus any interest accrued thereon, shall be distributed consistent with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384 to the Children's Advocacy Institute (https://www.sandiego.edu/cai/), and subject to court approval. Neither Class Counsel, Defendant's counsel, nor any of the Parties, have any interest, pecuniary or otherwise, in the Children's Advocacy Institute.

9. Service Award. In addition to Plaintiff's Individual Settlement Payment as a Settlement Class Member and Plaintiff's individual share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment, Plaintiff will apply to the Court for an award of not more than $10,000 as the Service Award. Defendant will not oppose the Service Award of not more than $10,000.00 for Plaintiff. The Settlement Administrator shall pay the Service Award, either in the amount stated herein if approved by the Court or some other amount as approved by the Court, to

Plaintiff from the Gross Settlement Amount no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after Defendant funds the Second Installment. Any portion of the requested Service Award that is not awarded to the Class Representative shall be part of the Net Settlement Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members as provided in this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall issue an IRS Form 1099 — MISC to Plaintiff for her Service Award. Plaintiff shall be solely and legally responsible to pay any and all applicable taxes on her Service Award and shall hold harmless Defendant and all other Released Parties from any claim or liability for taxes, penalties, or interest arising as a result of the Service Award. Approval of this Settlement shall not be conditioned on Court approval of the requested amount of the Service Award. If the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Service Award, Plaintiff shall not have the right to revoke the Settlement, and it will remain binding.

10. Class Counsel Award. Defendant understands, and will not oppose, a motion for Class Counsel Award consisting of attorneys' fees not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, currently estimated to be One Hundred Thirty-One Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Six Dollars and Sixty-Seven Cents ($131,666.67), ***and*** reimbursement of attorneys' expenses supported by declaration not to exceed Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($25,000.00). Any awarded Class Counsel Award shall be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. Any portion of the requested Attorneys' Fees and/or Attorneys' Expenses that are not awarded to Class Counsel shall be part of the Net Settlement Amount and shall be distributed to Settlement Class Members as provided in this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall allocate and pay the Class Counsel Award to Class Counsel from the Gross Settlement Amount no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Funding Date. Class Counsel shall be solely and legally responsible to pay all applicable taxes on the payment made pursuant to this paragraph. The Settlement Administrator

shall issue an IRS Form 1099 — MISC to Class Counsel for the payments made pursuant to this paragraph. If the Court reduces or does not approve the requested Class Counsel Award, Plaintiff and Class Counsel shall not have the right to revoke the Settlement, or to appeal such order, and the Settlement will remain binding.

11. PAGA Payment. Twenty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($20,000.00) shall be allocated from the Gross Settlement Amount for settlement of claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA Payment"). The Settlement Administrator shall pay sixty-five percent (65%) of the PAGA Payment ($13,000.00) to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after Defendant funds the Second Installment (hereinafter "LWDA Payment"). Thirty-five percent (35%) of the PAGA Payment ($7,000.00) will be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees as described in this Agreement (hereinafter "Aggrieved Employee Payment"). For purposes of distributing the PAGA Payment to the Aggrieved Employees, each Aggrieved Employee shall receive their pro-rata share of the Aggrieved Employee Payment using the PAGA Payment Ratio as defined above.

12. Settlement Administration Costs. The Settlement Administrator shall be paid for the costs of administration of the Settlement from the Gross Settlement Amount. The estimate of the Settlement Administration Costs is $7,990.00. The Settlement Administrator shall be paid the Settlement Administration Costs no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Funding Date.

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

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

2. <u>Final Approval Order and Judgment</u>. Class Counsel shall present an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement to the Court for its approval, and Judgment thereon, at the time Class Counsel files the Motion for Final Approval.

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

O. <u>Cooperation</u>. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts to implement the Settlement.

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

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

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

S. Authorization to Enter into Settlement Agreement. Counsel for all Parties warrant and represent they are expressly authorized by the Parties whom they represent to negotiate this Agreement and 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 required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The person signing this Agreement on behalf of Defendant represents and warrants that he/she is authorized to sign this Agreement on behalf of Defendant. Plaintiff represents and warrants that she is authorized to sign this Agreement and that she has not assigned any claim, or part of a claim, covered by this Settlement to a third-party.

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

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

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

W. This Settlement Is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable. The Parties believe this Settlement is a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement of this Action and have arrived at this

Settlement after extensive arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, present and potential.

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

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

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

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

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

DATED: 10 15 25

Petra Ríos soto (Oct 15, 2025 13:36:18 PDT)

PETRA RIOS

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

DATED: ________________

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC.

Printed Name

Title

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

DATED: ________________ ________________________________

PETRA RIOS

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

DATED: 10/16/25 ________________________________

PURESERVE BUILDING SERVICES, INC.

HECTOR MARQUEZ

Printed Name

CEO

Title

IT IS SO AGREED AS TO FORM BY COUNSEL:

DATED: October 15, 2025

JCL LAW FIRM, A.P.C.

By: ______________________

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members

DATED: October 15, 2025

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: ______________________

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members

DATED: ________________

NOLAND, HAMERLY, ETIENNE & HOSS

By: ______________________

Attorneys for Defendant

IT IS SO AGREED AS TO FORM BY COUNSEL:

DATED: ________________

JCL LAW FIRM, A.P.C.

By: ________________________________

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members

DATED: ________________

ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC

By: ________________________________

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members

DATED: 10/16/25

NOLAND, HAMERLY, ETIENNE & HOSS

By: Sharilyn R. Payne

Attorneys for Defendant

<u>EXHIBIT A</u>

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

(Rios v. Pureserve Building Services, Inc., **Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV003470)**

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

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

1. Why did I get this Notice?

A proposed class action settlement (the “Settlement”) of this lawsuit pending in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Monterey (the “Court”) has been reached between Plaintiff Petra Rios (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Pureserve Building Services, Inc. (“Defendant”). The Court has granted preliminary approval of the Settlement. **You may be entitled to receive money from this Settlement.**

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

> All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California, at any time during the period beginning August 20, 2020, through June 27, 2025 (“Class Period”).

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

2. What is this class action lawsuit about?

On August 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint against Defendant in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Monterey (the “Class Action”). The Class Action asserted the following claims against Defendant: (1) Unfair Competition in Violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200 *et seq*; (2) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197 & 1197.1; (3) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510, *et seq*; (4) Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order; (5) Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order; (6) Failure to Provide Accurate

Itemized Statements in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code § 226; (7) Failure to Provide Wages When Due in Violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203; and (8) Failure to Reimburse Employees for Required Expenses in Violation Of Cal. Lab. Code § 2802. On October 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed a representative action complaint in the Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV004490, alleging one cause of action for violations of the Private Attorneys General Act [Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq*.] (Monterey County Superior Court Case No. 24CV004490) (the "Representative Action"). On September 30, 2025, the Parties filed a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order to consolidate the Class Action and the Representative Action for purposes of settlement approval (collectively, the "Action").

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

On June 27, 2025, the Parties participated in an all-day mediation with Brian Sinclair, Esq., an experienced mediator of wage and hour class and PAGA actions. The Parties accepted a Mediator's settlement proposal and reached an agreement for settlement. The Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement on <<INSERT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL DATE>>. At that time, the Court also preliminarily approved the Plaintiff to serve as the Class Representative, and the law firms of JCL Law Firm, APC and Zakay Law Group, APLC to serve as Class Counsel.

3. What are the terms of the Settlement?

Gross Settlement Amount. Defendant agreed to pay an "all in" amount of Three Hundred Ninety-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($395,000.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount") to fund the settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount includes the payment of all Individual Settlement Payments, Settlement Administration Costs, Class Counsel Award, Service Award, and the PAGA Payment.

Defendant will pay to the Settlement Administrator the Gross Settlement Amount in three (3) equal installments as follows: (1) The first installment in the amount of $131,666.67 is to be made no later than September 7, 2025 ("First Installment"); (2) The second installment in the amount of $131,666.67 is to be made 6 months after payment of the First Installment, or the date the Court grants preliminary approval of the settlement, whichever is later ("Second Installment"); and (3) The third installment in the amount of $131,666.66 is to be made 6 months after payment of the Second Installment, or the date the Court grants final approval of the settlement, whichever is later ("Third Installment").

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

- Settlement Administration Costs. Payment to the Settlement Administrator, estimated not to exceed $7,990.00 for expenses, including expenses of sending this Notice, processing opt outs, distributing settlement payments, and translating this notice to Spanish.

- Class Counsel Award. Payment to Class Counsel of an award of attorneys' fees of no more than 1/3 of the Gross Settlement Amount ($131,666.67) and actually incurred litigation expenses of not more than $25,000 for all expenses incurred as documented in Class Counsel's billing records, both subject to Court approval. Class Counsel have been prosecuting the Action on behalf of Plaintiff and the Class on a contingency fee basis (that is, without being paid any money to date) and have been paying all litigation costs and expenses.

- Service Award. A Service Award of up to Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents ($10,000.00) to Plaintiff, or such lesser amount as may be approved by the Court, to compensate her for her services on behalf of the Class in initiating and prosecuting the Action, and for the risks she undertook.

- PAGA Payment. A payment of $20,000.00 relating to Plaintiff's claim under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), $13,000.00 of which will be paid to the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and the remaining $7,000.00 which will be distributed to Aggrieved Employees as part of the PAGA Payment.

- Calculation of Payments to Settlement Class Members. After all the above payments of the court-approved Class Counsel Award, the Service Award, the PAGA Payment, and the Settlement Administration Costs are deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount, the remaining portion, called the "Net Settlement Amount," shall be distributed to class members who do **not** object or request exclusion ("Settlement Class Members"). The Individual Settlement Payment for each Settlement Class Member will be calculated by dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of workweeks for all Settlement Class Members that occurred during the Class Period and multiplying the result by each individual Settlement Class Member's workweeks that occurred during the Class Period. A "workweek" is defined as any seven (7) consecutive days beginning on Sunday and ending on Saturday, in which a Class Member is employed by Defendant during the Class Period in California.

- Calculation of Aggrieved Employees Payments to Aggrieved Employees. The PAGA Payment shall be distributed to Aggrieved Employees irrespective of whether they exclude themselves or opt-out. The PAGA Payment will be divided by the total number of pay periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and then taking that number and multiplying it by the number of pay periods worked by each respective Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. "Aggrieved Employee" means all current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant in California, at any time during the period beginning August 20, 2023, to June 27, 2025 ("PAGA Period").

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

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

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

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

4. What Do I Release Under the Settlement?

Released Claims. Upon the Settlement Administrator's receipt of the Third Installment and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members shall release all Released Class Claims that occurred during the Class Period as to the Released Parties. Released Class Claims means all class claims alleged, or that reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts alleged, including costs and attorneys' fees related thereto, in the operative complaint in the Action which occurred during the Class Period, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and class claims outside of the Class Period. Upon the Settlement Administrator's receipt of the Third Installment and full funding of the Gross Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and the State of California shall release all Released PAGA Claims. "Released PAGA Claims" means all claims for penalties under the California Private Attorneys' General Act, including attorneys' fees and costs related thereto, alleged in the operative complaint in the Action and Plaintiff's PAGA notice to the LWDA which occurred during the PAGA Period, predicated upon violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.14, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2804, and expressly excluding all other claims, including claims for vested benefits, wrongful termination, unemployment insurance, disability, social security, workers' compensation, and PAGA claims outside of the PAGA Period.

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

5. How much will my payment be?

Defendant's records reflect that you have <<_____>> Workweeks worked during the Class Period (August 20, 2020, through June 27, 2025).

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

Defendant's records reflect that you have <<_____>> pay periods worked during the PAGA Period (August 20, 2023, through June 27, 2025).

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

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

6. How can I get a payment?

To get money from the settlement, you do not have to do anything. A check for your settlement payment will be mailed automatically to the same address as this Notice. If your address is incorrect or has changed, you must notify the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator is: Apex Class Action LLC, 18 Technology Drive, Suite 154, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800) 355-0700.

The Court will hold a hearing on __________________ to decide whether to finally approve the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement and there are no objections or appeals, payments will be mailed within a few months after this hearing. If there are objections or appeals, resolving them can take time, perhaps more than a year. Please be patient. After entry of the Judgment, the Settlement Administrator will provide notice of the final judgment to the Class Members by posting a copy of the Judgment on the administrator's website at https://apexclassaction.com/

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

If you do not wish to participate in the Settlement, you may exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out." **If you opt out, you will receive NO money from the Settlement, and you will not be bound by its terms, except as provided as follows**. Irrespective of whether you exclude yourself from the Settlement or "opt out," you will be bound by the PAGA Release, you will be deemed to have released the Released PAGA Claims, and you will receive a share of the PAGA Payment.

To opt out, you must submit to the Settlement Administrator, by First Class Mail, a written, signed and dated request for exclusion postmarked no later than _______________. The address for the Settlement Administrator is 18 Technology Drive, Suite 154, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800) 355-0700. The request for exclusion must state in substance that the Class Member has read the Class Notice and that he or she wishes to be excluded from the settlement of the class action lawsuit entitled *Rios v. Pureserve Building Services, Inc.,* currently pending in Superior Court of Monterey Case No. 24CV003470. The request for exclusion must contain your name, address, signature and the last four digits of your Social Security Number for verification purposes. The request for exclusion must be signed by you. No other person may opt out for a member of the Class.

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

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

Any Class Member who has not opted out and believes that the Settlement should not be finally approved by the Court for any reason, may object to the proposed Settlement. Objections may be in writing and state the Class Member's name, current address, telephone number, and describe why you believe the Settlement is unfair and whether you intend to appear at the final approval hearing. All written objections or other correspondence must also state the name and number of the case, which is ***Rios v. Pureserve Building Services, Inc.,*** **Monterey County Superior Court, Case No. 24CV003470**. You may also object without submitting a written objection by appearing at the final approval hearing scheduled as described in Section 9 below.

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

Written objections must be delivered or mailed to the Settlement Administrator no later than _______________. The address for the Settlement Administrator is 18 Technology Drive, Suite 154, Irvine, CA 92618; Tel: (800) 355-0700.

The addresses for the Class Counsel are as follows:

Class Counsel:	**Class Counsel:**
Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq.	Shani O. Zakay, Esq.
JCL Law Firm, APC	Zakay Law Group, APLC
5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600	5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600

San Diego, CA 92121
Tel.: (619) 599-8292
Fax: (619) 599-2891
E-Mail: jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com

San Diego, CA 92121
Tel: (619) 599-8292
Fax: (619) 599-8291
Email: shani@zakaylaw.com

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

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing at 00:00 AM/PM on _______________, at the Monterey County Superior Court, Department 14, located at 1200 Aguajito Road, Monterey, CA 93940 before Judge Carrie M. Panetta. At this hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The purpose of this hearing is for the Court to determine whether to grant final approval to the Settlement. If there are objections, the Court will consider them. The Court will listen to people who have made a timely written request to speak at the hearing or who appear at the hearing to object. This hearing may be rescheduled by the Court without further notice to you. **You are not required to attend** the Final Approval Hearing, although any Class Member is welcome to attend the hearing.

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

You may call the Settlement Administrator at 1-800-355-0700 or write to ***Rios v. Pureserve Building Services Inc.*, Monterey County Superior Court, Case No.24CV003470** , Settlement Administrator, 18 Technology Drive, Suite 154, Irvine, CA 92618 c/o Apex Class Action.

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

PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT ABOUT THIS NOTICE.

IMPORTANT:

- You must inform the Settlement Administrator of any change of address to ensure receipt of your settlement payment.

- Settlement checks will be null and void 180 days after issuance if not deposited or cashed. In such event, the Settlement Administrator shall pay all funds from such uncashed checks to the Children's Advocacy Institute, consistent with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384. If your check is lost or misplaced, you should contact the Settlement Administrator immediately to request a replacement.

EXHIBIT 2

EXHIBIT 3

JCL LAW FIRM, APC

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

FIRM RESUME

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

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHIES

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

Biography:

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

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

Bar Admissions:

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

Professional Associations:

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

Education:

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

Honors:

- Super Lawyers Rising Star, Thomson Reuters, 2015 – 2018
- Super Lawyers 2025 - 2026
- Distinguished Advocate Award for Outstanding Oral Advocacy, 2005 – 2006

Perssia Razma, **Esq**.
California Bar Number 351398
Associate Attorney

Biography:

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

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

Education:

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

Sydney Castillo-Johnson, **Esq**.
California Bar Number 343881
Associate Attorney

Biography:

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

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

Education:

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

JCL Law Firm, APC - REPORTED CASES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXHIBIT 4

APEX
CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION

Quotation Request:		**Case Name:**	**Rios v. Pureserve Building Services Inc., et al**
Alice Walker Dupler		Date:	Wednesday, August 6, 2025
JCL Law Firm, A.P.C.		RFP Number:	17490004
awalker@jcl-lawfirm.com			
888.498.6999			

Prepared By:
Sean Hartranft
Apex Class Action LLC
Sean@apexclassaction.com
949.878.3676

Settlement Specifications	
Estimated Class Size:	**340**
Certified Language Translation:	**Yes**
Static Settlement Website	**No**
Percentage of Undeliverable Mail	**20%**

Professional Services	Fee Calculation	Rate(s)	Quantity	Estimated Cost
Data Analytics and Standardization				
Import and Standardize Data*	Per Hour	$125.00	1	$125.00
Data Analyst	Per Hour	$150.00	2	$300.00
*Data provided must be in a workable format. Apex can standardize provided data at an additional cost of $150/hr.				
			Sub Total:	$425.00
Mailing of Class Notice				
Form Set Up	Per Hour	$120.00	1	$120.00
Print & Mail Class Notice	Per Piece	$1.50	340	$510.00
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	$0.78	340	$265.20
Remail Undeliverable Mail (Skip-Trace)	Per Piece	$2.00	68	$136.00
Receive and Process Undeliverable Mail	Per Hour	$75.00	1	$75.00
Process Class Member Correspondence via mail, e-mail & fax	Per Piece	$75.00	1	$75.00
NCOA Address Update (USPS)	Static Rate	$70.60	1	$70.60
Certified Language Translation: Spanish	Static Rate	$1,200.00	1	$1,200.00
			Sub Total:	$2,451.80
Project Management				
Project Management	Per Hour	$150.00	2	$300.00
Project Coordinator	Per Hour	$90.00	2	$180.00
Data Analyst and Reporting	Per Hour	$140.00	1	$140.00
			Sub Total:	$620.00

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION

Professional Services	Fee Calculation	Rate(s)	Quantity	Estimated Cost
Toll-Free Contact Center, Website & Reporting				
Bilingual Toll-Free Contact Center	Static Rate	$85.00	1	$85.00
Settlement Status Reports	Static Rate	$750.00	1	Waived
			Sub Total:	$85.00
Distribution & Settlement Fund Management				
Settlement Calculations (Preliminary and Final)	Per Hour	$120.00	2	$240.00
Account Management and Reconciliation	Per Hour	$140.00	2	$280.00
Print & Mail Distribution Settlement Check (W-2/1099)	Per Piece	$1.25	340	$425.00
USPS First Class Postage	Per Piece	$0.78	340	$265.20
Remail Distribution to Updated Address (Skip Trace)	Per Piece	$2.00	34	$68.00
Individual Income Tax Preparation & Reporting	Per Hour	$100.00	6	$600.00
QSF Income Tax Reporting (per calendar year)	Per Year	$1,200.00	1	$1,200.00
Unclaimed Funds: State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund	Static Rate	$500.00	1	$500.00
			Sub Total:	$3,578.20
Post Distribution Reconciliation				
Bank Account Reconciliation	Per Hour	$135.00	2	$270.00
Project Management Reconciliation	Per Hour	$100.00	2	$200.00
Declarations	Per Hour	$120.00	3	$360.00
			Sub Total:	$830.00
			WILL NOT EXCEED:	**$7,990.00**

Thank you for your business!

CLASS ACTION ADMINISTRATION

Terms & Conditions

The following Terms and Conditions govern the provision of all services to be provided by Apex Class Action and its affiliates ("Apex") to the Client. These terms and conditions are binding and shall apply to all services provided by Apex in relation to any related services or products.

1. Services: Apex commits to providing the Client with the administrative services detailed in the attached Proposal (the "Services").

2. Payment Terms: As compensation for the legal services to be provided, the Client agrees to pay Apex all fees detailed in the Proposal. The fees quoted in the Proposal (and any subsequent proposals for additional services) are estimates based on the information provided to Apex by the Client. Apex makes no representation that the estimated fees in the Proposal or any subsequent proposals for additional services shall equal the actual fees charged by Apex to the Client, which fees (including individual line items) may be greater or less than estimated. If additional services are requested on an hourly basis and are not specifically detailed in the Proposal, Apex will prepare estimates for such services subject to approval by the Client. In the performance of such additional services, Apex will charge standard hourly fees which shall apply.

3. Incurred Expenses: In relation to the provision of services outlined in this agreement, the Client agrees to reimburse Apex for all reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred. Such expenses may include, but are not limited to, costs associated with postage, media production or publication, banking fees, brokerage fees, messenger and delivery service expenses, travel expenses, filing fees, office supplies, meals, staff overtime expenses, and other related costs and expenses. If not otherwise specified in writing, fees for print notice and certain expenses, such as media publication and postage, must be paid immediately upon invoicing and, in certain cases, at least ten (10) days prior to the date on which such expenses will be incurred.

4. Invoicing: Apex shall present invoices for its fees and expenses on a monthly basis, except as provided in Section 3. The Client agrees to pay each invoice within 30 days of receipt. In case of non-payment within 90 days of the billing date, an additional service charge of 1.5% per month may apply. Apex reserves the right to increase its prices, charges, and rates annually, subject to reasonable adjustments. If any price increases exceed 10%, Apex shall give thirty (30) days' notice to the Client. In the event of any unpaid invoices beyond 120 days of the due date, Apex reserves the right to withhold services and reports until payment is received, subject to notice to the Client. It is important to note that Apex's failure to provide services and reports in such instances shall not constitute a default under this agreement.

5. Case Duration: The duration of these Terms and Conditions, except for the data storage obligations, shall be in effect until 30 days following the completion of the Services as described in the Proposal. The parties may extend these Terms and Conditions in writing for a mutually agreed-upon period beyond this initial 30-day period.

6. Termination of Services: Either party may terminate the Services by providing thirty (30) days written notice to the other party. Alternatively, termination may occur immediately upon written notice for Cause, as defined below. Cause means (I) Apex's gross negligence or willful misconduct that causes serious and material harm to the Client; (ii) the Client's failure to pay Apex invoices for more than one hundred twenty (120) days from the date of the invoice; or (iii) the accrual of invoices or unpaid services where Apex reasonably believes it will not be paid. Termination of the Services shall not relieve the Client of its obligation to pay Apex for services rendered prior to the termination.

7. Independent Contractor: As an independent contractor, Apex will provide services under the terms of this agreement. It is agreed that neither Apex nor any of its employees will be considered an employee of the Client. Consequently, Apex and its employees will not be eligible for any benefits provided by the Client to its employees. The Client will not make any tax deductions from the payments due to Apex for state or federal tax purposes. Apex will be solely responsible for paying all taxes and other payments due on payments received from the Client under this agreement.

8. Apex warrants that the Services outlined in the Proposal will be performed in accordance with the standards generally adhered to by professionals providing similar services. It is acknowledged that the Services may entail the likelihood of some human and machine errors, omissions, delays, and losses that may result in damage. However, Apex shall not be held liable for such errors, omissions, delays, or losses unless they are caused by its gross negligence or willful misconduct. In the event of any breach of this warranty by Apex, the Client's sole remedy will be limited to Apex's rerunning, at its expense, any inaccurate output provided that such inaccuracies occurred solely as a result of Apex's gross negligence or willful misconduct under this agreement.

9. Limitation of Liability: The Client acknowledges that Apex shall not be held liable for any consequential, special, or incidental damages incurred by the Client in relation to the performance of Services, whether the claim is based on breach of warranty, contract, tort (including negligence), strict liability, or any other grounds. Under no circumstances shall Apex's liability to the Client, for any Losses (including court costs and reasonable attorney's fees), arising out of or in connection with these Terms and Conditions, exceed the total amount charged or chargeable to the Client for the specific service(s) that caused the Losses.

10. Indemnification: The Client agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Apex from any losses, suits, actions, judgments, fines, costs, liabilities, or claims arising from any action or proceeding relating to the Services provided by Apex, regardless of whether or not it results in liability (collectively referred to as "Indemnified Claims"). However, this indemnification provision shall not apply to the extent that such Indemnified Claims are caused by Apex's willful misconduct, gross negligence, or breach of these Terms and Conditions. This provision shall survive termination of the Services.

11. Confidentiality: Apex will uphold strict confidentiality between Apex and the Client and applies to all non-public records, documents, systems, procedures, processes, software, and other information received by either party in connection with the performance of services under these terms. Both Apex and the Client agree to keep confidential all such non-public information, including any material marked or identified as confidential or proprietary. Any such confidential information shall not be disclosed, provided, disseminated, or otherwise made available to any third party, except as required to fulfill the parties' obligations under these terms. The parties acknowledge that in the event of any request to disclose any confidential information in connection with a legal or administrative proceeding, or otherwise to comply with a legal requirement, prompt notice of such request must be given to the other party to enable that party to seek an appropriate protective order or other remedy or to waive compliance with the relevant provisions of these terms. If the Client seeks a protective order or another remedy, Apex, at the Client's expense, will cooperate with and assist the Client in such efforts. If the Client fails to obtain a protective order or waives compliance with the relevant provisions of these terms, Apex will disclose only that portion of the confidential information that it determines it is required to disclose. This confidentiality provision shall survive termination of the services provided. Both parties acknowledge and agree that any breach of this these terms may cause irreparable harm to the non-breaching party and that injunctive relief may be necessary to prevent any actual or threatened breach. The terms set forth between the parties supersede all prior negotiations, understandings, and agreements between the parties concerning confidentiality. These terms may only be amended in writing and signed by both parties.

12. Ownership of the programs, system data, and materials provided by Apex to the Client during the course of providing services herein shall solely belong to Apex. It is acknowledged that fees and expenses paid by the Client do not confer any rights in such property. It is also understood that the said property is made available to the Client solely for the purpose of using it during and in connection with the services provided by Apex.

13. Apex may derive financial benefits from financial institutions in connection with the deposit and investment of funds with such institutions, including without limitation, discounts on eligible banking services and fees, and loans at favorable rates.

14. COMPLETE AGREEMENT. These Terms and Conditions, along with the attached Proposal, represent the complete agreement and understanding between the parties and override any prior agreements (whether written or oral) between Apex and the Client regarding the subject matter. Any modification to these Terms and Conditions may only be made in writing and must be signed by both Apex and the Client. The headings in this document are included for convenience only and do not alter or restrict any provisions in these Terms and Conditions. They may not be used in the interpretation of these Terms and Conditions.

15. This provision outlines the requirements for providing notice or other communication under this agreement. All such communications must be in writing and can be delivered either by personal delivery or through U.S. Mail with prepaid postage or overnight courier. Once delivered personally or sent through the mail, the notice will be considered given after five (5) days from the deposit date in the U.S. Mail. Alternatively, if sent through an overnight courier, the notice will be considered given one business day after delivery to the such courier. It's important to note that the notice must be provided to a responsible officer or principal of the Client or Apex, depending on the case.

16. Force Majeure: In the event of any failure or delay in performance due to circumstances beyond Apex's control, including but not limited to strikes, lockouts, fires, floods, acts of God or public enemy, riots, civil disorders, insurrections, war or war conditions, or interference by civil or military authorities, Apex shall not be held liable for any resulting loss or damage. The time for performance under this agreement shall be extended for a period equal to the duration of the disabling cause and a reasonable time thereafter. This provision shall constitute a force majeure clause and shall be construed accordingly.

17. The applicable state and federal laws shall govern the interpretation and enforcement of these Terms and Conditions. No choice of law or conflict of laws provisions shall affect this governing law provision.

18. Severability: This applies to all clauses and covenants contained within these Terms and Conditions. In the event that any clause or covenant is deemed invalid, illegal, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions shall remain valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permissible by law. The validity, legality, and enforceability of the remaining provisions shall in no way be affected or impaired by the invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability of any provision deemed so.

19. Nonwaiver: This applies to these Terms and Conditions. This means that any failure by one party to enforce a provision of these terms on one or more occasions shall not be construed as a waiver of that provision. In other words, any failure to enforce a provision does not give up the right to enforce it in the future. All provisions of these Terms and Conditions remain in full force and effect, regardless of any prior failure to enforce them.