1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dep@rpnalaw.com Michael B. Adreani, Esq. (SBN 194991) mba@rpnalaw.com Marina N. Vitek, Esq. (SBN 183397) mnv@rpnalaw.com ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250 Woodland Hills, California 91367 Tel: (818) 992-9999; Fax: (818) 992-9991 {Additional Counsel Continued On Next Page} Attorneys for Plaintiff, VARDAN KARAPETYAN and the Classes	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	VARDAN KARAPETYAN, an individual appearing individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, Plaintiff, V. ABM INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED, a Delaware Corporation, ABM SECURITY SERVICES, INC., a California Corporation, and DOES 1-50, inclusive, Defendants.	CASE NO.: CV15-08313 GW (Ex) Assigned to: Hon. George H. Wu, Courtoom 9D DECLARATION OF MICHAEL B. ADREANI IN SUPPORT OF AMENDED MOTION FOR PRELIINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT DATE: June 12, 2017 TIME: 8:30 a.m. CTRM: 9D Action Filed: October 23, 2015 Trial Date: None
22 23 24 25 26 27 28		

Additional Counsel: Allen B. Felahy, Esq. (SBN 190177) afelahy@felahylaw.com FELAHY TRIAL LAWYERS, APC 4000 Cover Street, Suite 100 Long Beach, California 90808 Tel: (562) 499-2121; Fax: (562) 499-2124 George Chakmakis, Esq. (SBN 162634) george@chakmakislaw.com Matthew P. Blair, Esq. (SBN 278411) mblair@chakmakislaw.com **CHAKMAKIS & ASSOCIATES** 301 N. Canon Drive, Suite 315 Beverly Hills, California 90210 Tel: (310) 550-1555; Fax: (310) 550-1151

DECLARATION OF MICHAEL B. ADREANI

MICHAEL B. ADREANI declares:

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. I am a partner in the law firm of Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP, counsel for the Plaintiff Vardan Karapetyan, and one of the attorneys responsible for the handling of this matter. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and if called upon to testify, I would and could competently testify as follows.
- 2. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the Class Action Settlement and Release agreement in the matter of *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, No. S224853. On April 6, 2017, the Los Angeles Superior Court granted preliminary approval of the *Augustus* settlement and scheduled the final approval/fairness hearing for June 30, 2017.
- 3. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit B** are true and correct copies of the transcript pages from the deposition of Nedy Warren, Defendants' Rule 30(b)(6) witness, cited in Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. Also included in Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the Errata Sheet signed by Ms. Warren regarding her deposition testimony.
- 4. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit C** are true and correct copies of the transcript pages from the deposition of Plaintiff Vardan Karapetyan, cited in Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.
- 5. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit D** are true and correct copies of the transcript pages from the deposition of Oscar Bejarano, Plaintiff's supervisor, cited in Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

28 //

Discovery and Investigation

- 6. The parties engaged in significant discovery. The parties exchanged numerous requests for production and written interrogatories. Plaintiff brought multiple discovery motions regarding ABM's discovery responses and document production. The ABM Defendants initially produced in excess of 3,000 pages of documents including employee handbooks, orientation and training materials, as well as Plaintiff's personnel file, time records, and payroll information. After Plaintiff's motions to compel, ABM had begun production of documents from 40 sample sites as ordered by the Court. The production from the first four sites alone consisted of approximately 59 boxes of documents which included security guard journals, time records, and notes.
- 7. ABM took the deposition of Plaintiff and Class Counsel took the depositions of Plaintiff's supervisor as well as deposing ABM's Rule 30(b)(6) witness over three days, covering 48 categories of topics. Class Counsel served numerous third party subpoenas, including to the business at which Plaintiff worked (Universal City Nissan) while employed by ABM.
- 8. Class Counsel was familiar with ABM's policies and practices as a result of the *Augustus* litigation. As a result, Class Counsel knew what to ask for and look for in discovery and was able to readily ascertain the similarities and differences in those policies and practices for the class period in this action.

Facts Supporting Approval of the Settlement

- 9. This Settlement will apply to all four of the ABM entities listed as defendants in this case, and inclusion in the class may be determined based upon ABM's records.
- 10. Liability in this matter is highly contested and both sides face significant challenges in litigating the case. In *Augustus*, ABM's person most qualified testified that the security guards were "never relieved of all duties" and, based on such testimony, plaintiff was granted summary judgment for her rest break claims.

- obtain certification, Plaintiff has obtained evidence that all class members were subject to the same *unwritten* policies and *practices* making their claims amenable to class treatment. ABM will undoubtedly argue that any violations suffered by Plaintiff were anomalies which were limited to Plaintiff's specific job location and not the company policy or practice at its hundreds of locations throughout the State of California. On the other hand, Plaintiff's Counsel believes that the extensive discovery actually supports class certification and the merits of Plaintiff's claims.
- 12. Furthermore, as evidenced by the history in the *Augustus* action, ABM has evidenced its dedication and willingness to appeal any judgment to the highest court. It is expected that ABM would continue to contest any judgment in favor of Plaintiff until every possible appeal had been exhausted. Thus, in addition to the years it would take to obtain class certification and a judgment on the merits, it would be several more years after that before Plaintiff or the Class were receive any benefit from a successful adjudication on the merits of this action based on the expected appeals.
- 13. On the other hand, the settlement provides an immediate, tangible and significant benefit to the class. The immediacy and certainty of recovery is a factor for the court to balance in determining whether the proposed settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable. *In re Mego Financial Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 458

- 14. The Court in its June 6, 2017 Tentative Ruling on Amended Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement (Dkt. 73) inquired as to what Plaintiff believed may have been recoverable if this case were litigated to completion. *Augustus* provides a benchmark, as it was litigated to completion under similar facts. *Augustus* was a \$90 million judgment covering 10 years, almost 15,000 employees and certain undisputed evidence which led to a finding of liability, damages, interest and penalties. The case before this Court has about 4 years of exposure, 7,000 employees, the possibility of arbitration agreements impacting or limiting the litigation, less prejudgment interest, and different testimony and documentation on liability. I believe the recovery in this case, had it proceeded, would reasonably be in the range of \$12 million to \$16 million.
- 15. While this settlement may be cancelled depending on what happens in *Augustus*, as of the date of my signature below, none of the factors which would give rise to such a cancellation have occurred. For example, there are neither any opt out requests or objections to the *Augustus* settlement at this time.

Settlement Negotiations and Mediation

arms-length negotiations, including an all-day mediation before respected mediator Mark S. Rudy on January 19, 2017 which was followed by continued negotiations. The parties negotiated by telephone and through email following the all-day mediation session. With the guidance of Mark Rudy, the parties ultimately reached an agreement and executed a term sheet almost two weeks after the mediation session.

Thereafter, the parties continued to have discussions to work out the details of the settlement, including terms of distribution, implementation, claims procedure, and notice to the class. The settlement agreement was finalized in April 2017. There is no side agreement between the parties and/or their counsel at all. The \$5 million settlement, if all other terms and distributions are approved, will result in a net distribution to the class of approximately \$3,145,000. With approximately 7,000 class members, the average recovery as a result of this settlement is approximately \$450. All class members who do not opt out will receive a payment from this settlement, regardless if they make a claim.

Recommendations of Experienced Counsel

- 17. The parties are represented by counsel experienced in complex class action litigation. Class Counsel has extensive experience in class actions, including wage and hour actions such as this one.
- 18. Class Counsel believes, based on the discovery and investigation conducted, as well as an analysis of ABM's defenses, that the proposed settlement is fair and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class Members.

Certification of the Settlement Class is Proper

- 19. Plaintiff seeks certification of class defined as "all non-exempt hourly security guard employees employed by ABM Security Services, Inc. and/or ABM Onsite Services West, Inc. in California from October 6, 2010 through December 10, 2015." The Class Members are readily identified by ABM's employment and payroll records. Thus, the Settlement Class is ascertainable.
- 20. ABM's discovery responses stated there are over 7,000 class members and obviously joinder would be highly impracticable.
- 21. Here, there are numerous questions of fact and law that would satisfy Rule 23(a)(2). This action would require the court to address the following questions that undoubtedly affect all class members:

- Whether Defendants had a policy or practice that failed to timely compensate members of the Classes with all wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 204;
- Whether Defendants had a policy or practice that failed to pay overtime wages as required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Order 4-2001;
- Whether Defendants had a policy or practice that failed to provide lawful meal breaks and pay appropriate wages for missed meal breaks;
- Whether Defendants had a policy or practice that failed to provide lawful rest breaks and pay appropriate wages for missed meal breaks;
- Whether Defendants had a policy or practice that violated California
 Labor Code §§ 201-203 by unlawfully failing to pay all wages due and owing at the time that Plaintiff or any Class Member was discharged or resigned their employment with Defendants; and
- Whether the wage statements provided to Plaintiff and the Class members by Defendants were complete and accurate.

Underlying these basic common questions is a common nucleus of operative facts pertaining to ABM's company-wide policies and procedures constituting a standard course of conduct which is common to all class members.

- 22. The typicality requirement is satisfied here because Plaintiff and the class members were all employed by the ABM Defendants as security guards, all allege the same claims, and their claims all arise from the same course of conduct by the ABM Defendants. Each class member will rely on the same evidence and make the same legal arguments to provide Defendants' liability.
- 23. Plaintiff's rest break claims in this action represent a continuation of the rest break claims summarily adjudicated in the *Augustus* Action. In *Augustus*, ABM produced Fred Setayesh as its "person most qualified" who testified that the "guards are never relieved of all duty." Attached hereto and incorporated herein as **Exhibit E**

- are true and correct copies of the transcript pages from the deposition of Fred Setayesh, Defendants' "person most knowledgeable" witness in the *Augustus* action, which testimony is cited in Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This testimony formed the basis for summary judgment in favor of the *Augustus* Action.
- 24. Plaintiff's claims are virtually coextensive with the claims of the class members. Even with respect to the claim for waiting time penalties under Labor Code § 203 because *all* of the class members had their employment with ABM terminated no later than December 10, 2015. Thus, for purposes of distribution, there is no need for any subclasses and every class member's claim is treated the same. Distribution of the Settlement Amount will be based on the class members' length of employment with ABM. For those Class Members who were employed during the period from October 6, 2010 through July 1, 2011, those work weeks will be paid at fifty percent (50%) of the work week value. (Ex. A, Sett. Agmt., ¶ 2.5.6.(b).) The reduction in payment for this period is designed to account for payment of the rest break claims in *Augustus* which extend through July 1, 2011 for which those Class Members will receive other settlement moneys pursuant to the settlement agreement in *Augustus*. There is no antagonism between the Plaintiff and the class members.

Adequacy of Proposed Class Counsel

25. Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP ("RPNA") has ample class action experience as well as a documented history of successfully serving as class counsel. *See, Augustus v. ABM Industres, Inc.*, 2 Cal. 5th 257 (2016). RPNA has conducted significant discovery in this action, through formal written requests for production, interrogatories, depositions, and third party subpoenas. RPNA has extensive knowledge regarding wage and hour claims in California and has represented numerous plaintiffs as well as defendant employers in class actions.

Augustus alleged a sole claim based on failure to provide rest breaks. This action alleges additional claims based on meal periods, overtime, failure to pay wages timely, and wage statement violations.

26. The Settlement Agreement satisfies the factors set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3)(A), (B), and (C) because (1) any class member who wishes to pursue a separate individual action can opt out of the settlement (Settlement Agreement, ¶ 2.8.1); (2) the parties are unaware of any competing litigation regarding the claims at issue herein; and (3) the parties agree that it would be desirable to resolve Plaintiff's and the Class Members' claims in this forum.

Adequacy of Class Representative Vardan Karapetyan

- 27. Plaintiff Vardan Karapetyan has no known antagonistic or conflicting interests with the Settlement Class Members. Mr. Karapetyan was subject to the identical policies and practices of ABM and alleges the identical claims on his own behalf and on behalf of the Class Members and understands the obligations of services as a class representative. Mr. Karapetyan has been actively engaged in the prosecution of this action, including responding to discovery and submitting to a deposition by ABM.
- 28. Mr. Karapetyan has retained qualified counsel, experienced in class actions and wage and hour actions. For settlement purposes, the parties have agreed that Plaintiff's counsel, Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP (Drew E. Pomerance, Michael B. Adreani and Marina N. Vitek) and Felahy Employment Lawyers (Allen B. Felahy), should be appointed as Class Counsel with the Roxborough firm as Lead Counsel. (Ex. 1, Sett. Agmt., ¶¶ 2.1.5, and 2.1.14.) Plaintiff's counsel have extensive experience sufficient to be appointed as Class Counsel in this matter.

Proposed Cy Pres Recipients

2.1

28. Counsel for both parties have agreed, in Section 2.5.7(c) of the Settlement Agreement, to designate three organizations to receive any remaining funds from this

Settlement in equal parts. Those organizations are the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles - https://lafla.org/, Legal Aid at Work - https://legalaidatwork.org/, and the Women's Employment Rights Clinic - http://law.ggu.edu/clinics-and-centers/clinics/womens-employment/. Each of these organizations advocates and litigates on behalf of under-represented groups in the area of employment law in California. Each of them routinely pursue wage and hour actions, such as this one, in the state and federal courts in California. Thus, each are involved heavily in the very types of issues involved in this litigation and are therefore deserving of cy pres consideration by this Court. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 7th day of June, 2017 at Woodland Hills, California. /s/ Michael B. Adreani MICHAEL B. ADREANI

EXHIBIT "A"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 12 CASE NO. BC336416 JENNIFER AUGUSTUS, Individually and on 13 (C/W CG5444421; C/W BC345918; Behalf of All Similarly Situated Individuals, Related to BC388380) 14 Plaintiff, Case Assigned for All Purposes to 15 Judge John Shepard Wiley, Jr. Department CCW-311 v. 16 AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, a wholly owned subsidiary of ABM INDUSTRIES INC.; and DOES 1 Complaint Filed: July 12, 2005 17 CLASS ACTION 18 through 100, inclusive, AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT 19 AND RELEASE Defendants. 20 21 Consolidated Case: 22 EMANUEL DAVIS, 23 Plaintiff, 24 ٧. 25 AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, 26 inclusive, 27 Defendants. 28

AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416

Consolidated Case: DELORES HALL and CARLTON ANTHONY WAITE, Plaintiff, $V_{\rm eff}$ AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, Defendants, AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416

AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE

This Amended Class Action Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement" and/or "Settlement") is made by and between the Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, their agents, representatives, assigns, heirs, executors, beneficiaries, trustees; and Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc., formerly d/b/a American Commercial Security Services, Inc. on behalf of itself, its parents, subsidiaries, agents, affiliates, directors, officers, employees, and attorneys (collectively, "ABM" or "Defendant"). The Settlement Class Members and ABM are referred to herein as the "Parties."

This Settlement Agreement is intended to fully, finally, and forever compromise, release, resolve, discharge, and settle the Released Claims subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Settlement Agreement. This Settlement Agreement provides for the settlement of claims on behalf of the Settlement Class Members, as described further herein. Upon the Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement as defined in Section 2.1.12, the Settlement Class Members and Class Counsel will promptly file with the Court an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the Judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 724.010 et seq. indicating that the Judgment has been satisfied.

I, THE INSTANT ACTION

Section 1.1 Background and Procedural History

1.1.1 Proceedings in the Superior Court.

Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus filed her class action complaint against ABM in Jennifer Augustus v. American Commercial Security Services, Inc., et al, Case No. BC33641, in the Superior Court of California, the County of Los Angeles, on July 12, 2005, alleging various meal period and rest break claims on behalf of herself and other current and former employees of ABM. The following actions were eventually consolidated with Augustus (collectively, with Augustus, the "Action"):

- Emanuel Davis v. American Commercial Security Services Inc., et. al, Case No. CGC5444421, filed August 26, 2005 (San Francisco County Superior Court); and
- Delores Hall & Carlton Anthony Waite v. American Commercial Security Services, Inc., et. al, Case No. BC345918, filed January 17, 2006 (Los Angeles County Superior Court).

The Named Plaintiffs filed a Master Complaint on April 18, 2008 alleging, *inter alia*, that ABM "failed to provide net ten minute rest periods for work shifts exceeding four hours . . . and/or uninterrupted, unrestricted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes for work shifts exceeding five hours." ABM denied these allegations and any and all charges of wrong doing or liability arising out of the acts, omissions, facts, matters, transactions, or occurrences alleged, or that could have been alleged.

The Named Plaintiffs moved for class certification as to their meal period and rest break claims in September 2008 which ABM strenuously opposed. On February 27, 2009, the Court certified two classes of all ABM employees who worked: (1) "in any security guard position in California at any time during the period from July 12, 2001 through entry of judgment . . . [and] who worked a shift exceeding four (4) hours or major fraction thereof without being authorized and permitted to take an uninterrupted rest period of net ten (10) minutes per each four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked and [had] not been paid one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided" (the "rest break class"); and (2) in any security guard position who "worked a shift of more than five (5) hours without being afforded an uninterrupted, unrestricted meal period of not less than 30 minutes" (the "meal period class").

As well, the trial court appointed Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye and Adreani, LLP, as Lead Class Counsel.

On July 16, 2010, Plaintiffs and ABM filed cross-motions for summary adjudication and ABM filed a motion for decertification. On December 23, 2010, the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for summary adjudication of the rest break claim and denied ABM's motion for summary adjudication, as well as ABM's motion for decertification as to the rest break claims. The Court, however, decertified the meal period class. The order decertifying the meal period class was not appealed and Plaintiffs have decided to abandon their individual claims for meal period violations.

On August 11, 2011, the Court amended the definition of the rest break class such that the class period was defined as July 12, 2001 through July 1, 2011.

On February 8, 2012, Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment seeking damages on the rest

break claims and ABM concurrently moved to decertify the rest break class. On July 6, 2012, the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion and denied ABM's decertification motion. On July 31, 2012, the Court entered a judgment awarding to Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and the rest break class \$55,887,565.00 under California Labor Code section 226.7 and California Business & Professions Code section 17200, \$31,204,465.00 in pre-judgment interest, and \$2,650,096.00 under California Labor Code section 203, for a total amount of \$89,742,126. On February 22, 2013, the Court entered an amended judgment awarding to Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and the rest break class \$55,887,565.00 under California Labor Code section 226.7 and California Business & Professions Code section 17200, \$31,204,465.00 in pre-judgment interest, and \$2,650,096.00 under California Labor Code section 203, and awarding Plaintiffs' counsel 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees for work performed up through entry of judgment and \$184,020.33 in costs from the common fund, plus an additional award of attorneys' fees and costs to be paid by ABM in the amount of \$4,455,336.88 under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, for a total amount of \$94,197,462.88.

ABM timely filed notices of appeal from both judgments, but did not challenge on appeal the award of 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees and reimbursable costs from the common fund, which was not opposed by ABM and has never been the subject of any appeal by any party, and is therefore final.

1.1.2 Proceedings in the Court of Appeal.

On December 31, 2014, the Court of Appeal issued a unanimous decision in which it concluded that "[b]ecause on-call rest breaks are permissible, the trial court erroneously granted summary adjudication in 2010 and summary judgment in 2012," and thus "[t]hose orders and the consequent order granting plaintiffs' attorney fees under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 must therefore be reversed." (Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc. (2014) 182 Cal.Rptr.3d 676, 689.) The Court of Appeal, however, affirmed the order certifying the rest break class. (Id. at pp. 689–691.)

1.1.3 Proceedings in the California Supreme Court.
Plaintiffs filed a petition for review with the California Supreme Court on March 5, 2015,

11 12 13

10

15 16 17

14

18 19

20 21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

which ABM opposed. ABM did not file a cross-petition for review. The California Supreme Court granted Plaintiffs' petition for review on April 29, 2015. On December 22, 2016, the California Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeal's judgment.

On January 5, 2017, ABM filed a petition for rehearing with the California Supreme Court in which it asked the Supreme Court to grant rehearing and (a) hold that triable issues of material fact precluded entry of a summary judgment order awarding damages to all class members and depriving ABM of a trial on that issue, and/or (b) hold that the new rule of law adopted in this case does not apply retroactively, and affirm the Court of Appeal's judgment, or, in the alternative, to modify its opinion to add a sentence making clear that it is remanding the case to the Court of Appeal for it to address ABM's unresolved arguments that (a) triable issues of material fact precluded the trial court's classwide summary judgment ruling awarding nearly \$90 million in damages to all class members, and (b) the trial court improperly awarded Plaintiffs' counsel nearly \$4.5 million in additional attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5. Plaintiffs filed an answer opposing ABM's petition for rehearing on January 17, 2017. The California Supreme Court has extended the time for considering modification or rehearing to March 22, 2017.

ABM also filed a conditional motion to stay issuance of the remittitur on January 5, 2017, in which it sought a stay of the issuance of the remittitur until the U.S. Supreme Court resolves ABM's petition for a writ of certiorari and, in the event that petition is granted, until the U.S. Supreme Court issues its decision on the merits. This stay motion was conditioned on the California Supreme Court's denial of ABM's petition for rehearing and refusal to modify its opinion as ABM had requested. Plaintiffs have not opposed ABM's conditional stay motion, which remains pending before the California Supreme Court.

Parties' Statements and Recognition of the Benefits of the Settlement Section 1.2

This litigation has spanned the course of eleven years and has entailed extensive discovery regarding and litigation over the asserted claims. Class Counsel vigorously prosecuted the Action since the outset, having conducted an investigation into the facts of the Action and the Settlement Class Members' claims, including through formal discovery, informal disclosures between the Parties, and other investigations undertaken by counsel for Plaintiffs. Furthermore, the Parties have

engaged in extensive motion practice, including multiple motions for summary judgment and motions relating to class certification. The Parties have also vigorously litigated the rulings in the Action, including in extensive appellate proceedings in both the Court of Appeal and the California Supreme Court. The Parties have also engaged in extensive negotiations with mediator Mark Rudy.

As a result, Class Counsel have concluded that this Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Settlement Class in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the likely damages, risk of significant delay, and appellate risk. In particular, Class Counsel acknowledges the risks that the California Supreme Court could grant ABM's petition for rehearing and/or modify its opinion to remand the case to the Court of Appeal for further appellate review, and that either action could lead to vacatur or reversal of the Judgment. In addition, even if the California Supreme Court denies ABM's petition for rehearing and does not modify its opinion, there is a risk that the U.S. Supreme Court would grant certiorari and reverse the California Supreme Court's judgment. Class Counsel acknowledges solely for the purposes of settlement that there is a risk of the entire Judgment being vacated or reversed.

ABM denies each and all of the claims in the Action, but acknowledges the risk that, absent further appellate review, the Judgment will become executable and that Plaintiffs will seek to collect post-judgment interest in addition to the amount owed in the Judgment. Nevertheless, while ABM has further options for additional appellate review of the Judgment, ABM has concluded that further litigation of the Action would be protracted and expensive. ABM, therefore, has determined that it is desirable and beneficial that the Action be settled in a manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Settlement Agreement. Neither this Settlement Agreement, nor any action taken to carry out this Settlement Agreement is, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission, concession, or indication by or against ABM of any fault, wrongdoing or liability whatsoever.

II. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Section 2.1 Definitions

As used in this Settlement Agreement, the following terms have the meanings specified below:

- 2.1.1 "Administrative Costs" means the costs of administering the Settlement, including, without limitation, providing Notice of Settlement, establishing a toll-free number, various efforts to locate class members, receiving and forwarding objections from Class Members, administering any disputes regarding payments to Class Members, Settlement Fund Tax Expenses as defined in Section 2.10.4, administering payment of claims on behalf of the Settlement Class Members, and administering payments to any Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award, the Settlement Class Members, and Class Counsel by the Claims Administrator.
- 2.1.2 "Attorneys' Fees and Costs" refers to the fees and costs amount to be paid to Class Counsel under Section 2.4.2 of this Settlement Agreement.
- 2.1.3 "Claims Administrator" means CPT Group, Inc., which is the entity that has been selected to provide Notice of Settlement to the Settlement Class and to perform other related functions to administer the Settlement contemplated by this Settlement Agreement as described herein.
- 2.1.4 "Class Counsel" means the following attorneys representing the Settlement Class Members in the Action: Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP (Drew E. Pomerance, Michael B. Adreani, Marina N. Vitek), 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250, Woodland Hills, California 91367, and Scott Cole & Associates, APC (Scott Edward Cole), 1970 Broadway, Suite 950, Oakland, CA 94612. Additional Counsel who filed actions which were related to the Action include: Knapp, Petersen & Clarke (Andre E. Jardini), 550 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 1500, Glendale, California 91203 and Initiative Legal Group LLP (Monica Balderrama, G. Arthur Meneses) 1800 Century Park East, Suite 250, Los Angeles, California 90067.
- 2.1.5 "Lead Class Counsel" means the law firm of Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP.
 - 2.1.6 "Class Period" means the period from July 12, 2001 to July 1, 2011.
- 2.1.7 "Court" means the California Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, and any Court-appointed referee or agent of the Court or other judicial entity with jurisdiction over this matter.

- 2.1.8 "Defendant" and/or "ABM" means ABM Security Services, Inc., formerly d/b/a American Commercial Security Services, Inc.
- 2.1.9 "Escrow Account" means the money market interest bearing bank account insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC") pass-through insurance program and maintained by the Escrow Agent into which the Settlement Fund shall be deposited, pursuant to the Escrow Agreement, which shall be agreed to by the Parties.
- 2.1.10 "Escrow Agent" means MUFG Union Bank, N.A., the entity mutually agreed upon by ABM and Class Counsel to maintain the Escrow Account into which the Settlement Fund shall be deposited in accordance with the terms of this Settlement Agreement.
- 2.1.11 "Escrow Agreement" means the agreement, to be agreed upon by the Parties, setting forth the Escrow Agent's responsibilities and duties.
- 2.1.12 "Effective Date" means seven days after all of the following conditions have been satisfied:
- (a) Execution of this Settlement Agreement by Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus, Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis, ABM, Class Counsel, and counsel for ABM;
 - (b) Expiration of the Notice Period as defined in the Notice;
- (c) Entry of an Order of Final Approval by the Court approving this Settlement Agreement and entering final disposition with respect to the Action;
 - (d) Payment of the full Settlement Amount pursuant to Section 2.10; and
- (e) The later of the following events has occurred: the period for filing any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding challenging the Order of Final Approval has elapsed without any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding having been filed; or any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding challenging the Order of Final Approval has been dismissed finally and conclusively and there is no possibility of further appellate review or relief; or any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding challenging the Order of Final Approval has resulted in affirmance of the Order of Final Approval and there is no possibility of further appellate review or relief.

- 2.1.13 "Employee Payroll Taxes" means the employee portion of all applicable tax withholdings including, but not limited to, FICA, FUTA, and other employment related taxes and withholding of federal, state, and local income taxes.
- 2.1.14 "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing to be conducted by the Court, or any other court taking jurisdiction of this matter, to determine whether to finally approve the Settlement.
- 2.1.15 "Judgment" means the amended judgment the Court entered on February 22, 2013 in the Action.
- 2.1.16 "Action" means Jennifer Augustus v. American Commercial Security Services, Case No. BC336416 in the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles and the following consolidated actions:
- (a) Emanuel Davis v. American Commercial Security Services, Inc., Case No. CGC5444421;
- (b) Delores Hall and Carlton Anthony Waite v. American Commercial Security Services, Case No. BC345918.
- 2.1.17 "Motion for Preliminary Approval" refers to the motion for preliminary approval of this Settlement and its supporting papers.
- 2.1.18 "Named Plaintiffs" means Jennifer Augustus, Emanuel Davis, Delores Hall, and Carlton Anthony Waite.
- 2.1.19 "Notice of Settlement" refers to the official notice of settlement of class action, materially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 2.1.20 "Notice Period" refers to the time period of forty-five days from the first mailing date postmarked on the first Notice of Settlement mailed by the Claims Administrator.
- 2.1.21 "Order Granting Preliminary Approval" refers to the Court order or statement of decision granting preliminary approval to this Settlement Agreement.
- 2.1.22 "Order of Final Approval" and "Final Approval" means an order that finally and unconditionally grants final approval of this Settlement Agreement, and authorizes payments to the Claims Administrator, the Settlement Class Members, and Class Counsel as provided in this Settlement Agreement.

2.1.23 "Plaintiffs" means the Settlement Class Members.

- 2.1.24 "Released Claims" means the claims released pursuant to Section 2.6.1 of this Settlement Agreement.
- 2.1.25 "Released Parties" means ABM, including all of ABM's past and present successors, subsidiaries, investors, parents, holding companies, sister and affiliated companies, divisions and other related entities, as well as the successors, predecessors, shareholders, subsidiaries, investors, parent, sister and affiliated companies, officers, directors, partners, assigns, agents, employees, principals, heirs, administrators, attorneys, vendors, accountants, auditors, consultants, fiduciaries, insurers, reinsurers, employee benefit plans, and representatives of each of them, both individually and in their official capacities, past or present, as well as all persons acting by, through, under or in concert with any of these persons or entities.
- 2.1.26 "Service Award" means a Court-approved sum to be paid to certain Named Plaintiffs in accordance with Section 2.4.3.
- 2.1.27 "Settlement Class" means the rest break class certified by the Court in the Action, which in the Judgment is defined as "All persons who are or were employed by Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc. dba American Commercial Security Services in any security guard position in California at any time during the period from July 12, 2001 through July 1, 2011 ("Class Period") (excluding those persons assigned to the locations for which Defendant was granted a permit for exemption from the rest period requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4-2001 and for such time period as the exemption was or is granted which currently includes the time period of December 27, 2006 through December 26, 2007, which time period may be extended in the event the rest period exemption is renewed by the IWC for any time period within the Class Period) who worked a shift exceeding four (4) hours or major fraction thereof without being authorized and permitted to take an uninterrupted rest period of net ten (10) minutes per each four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked and has not been paid one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided," other than those persons who have previously submitted a timely and valid request for exclusion from the rest break class certified in the Action.

- 2.1.28 "Settlement Class Members" means the persons in the Settlement Class.
- 2.1.29 "Settlement Fund" or "Settlement Amount" refers to \$110,000,000.00, which is the total and maximum amount ABM will be required to pay under this Settlement. The Settlement Fund will be distributed in accordance with Section 2.4.
- 2.1.30 "Settlement Payments" means the amounts to be paid to individual Settlement Class Members pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Settlement Agreement.

Section 2.2 Settlement of the Action

- 2.2.1 It is agreed by and among the Settlement Class Members and ABM that any and all claims, damages, remedies sought or causes of action arising out of or related to ABM's provision of rest breaks or alleged failure to provide rest breaks during the Class Period shall be settled and compromised as between the Settlement Class Members and ABM, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Settlement Agreement and the approval of the Court, including through any Court-appointed referee or agent of the Court or other judicial entity with jurisdiction over this matter.
- 2.2.2 It is agreed by and among the Settlement Class Members, Class Counsel, and ABM that upon the Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement as defined in Section 2.1.12, the Settlement Class Members and Class Counsel will promptly file with the Court an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the Judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 724.010 et seq. indicating that the Judgment has been satisfied.
- 2.2.3 The Parties agree that the Settlement Class Members and Class Counsel shall have no right to pursue enforcement of the Judgment, except upon Cancellation of this Settlement Agreement as described in Section 2.3.1.
- 2.2.4 The occurrence of the Effective Date is a prerequisite to any distributions from the Settlement Fund, other than distributions to pay for Administrative Costs or Settlement Fund Taxes.

Section 2.3 Cancellation of Settlement Agreement

2.3.1 In the event that the Court does not enter an Order of Final Approval, an Order of Final Approval is modified in any material respect on appeal (other than a reduction or elimination of any Service Awards or a reduction or elimination of any Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel

awarded in connection with the application described in Section 2.4.2(b)), or the Effective Date does not occur, then (a) this Settlement Agreement shall be deemed cancelled, null and void, and shall be of no force or effect whatsoever, and shall not be referred to or utilized for any purpose whatsoever, and (b) ABM shall be entitled to the return of all funds in the Escrow Account, but ABM agrees that the undertakings in the amount of \$94,197,352.88 that are currently in place in the Action will remain in place unless the Judgment is reversed or vacated or ABM satisfies the Judgment, and that ABM will pay any outstanding Administrative Costs owed to the Claims Administrator.

2.3.2 This Settlement Agreement may not be revoked, cancelled, terminated, or voided except as set forth in Section 2.3.1. The Parties expressly agree to be bound by this Settlement Agreement, regardless of whether the California Supreme Court grants or denies ABM's petition for rehearing or modifies its opinion or of any action taken by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Section 2.4 Settlement Fund Distribution

the sum of one hundred and ten million dollars (\$110,000,000.00) ("Settlement Fund" or "Settlement Amount") for Administrative Costs, Service Awards, Settlement Payments, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Employee Payroll Taxes. The Settlement Fund is to be allocated to the Claims Administrator, Class Counsel, any Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award, and the Settlement Class Members, as described herein. The Settlement Fund is the total and maximum amount ABM is required to pay for any and all purposes under this Settlement Agreement, and in connection with the termination of the Action.

2.4.2 Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

- (a) The Court has already awarded Class Counsel 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees for work performed up through entry of judgment along with reimbursable costs totaling \$184,020.33 from the common fund, and that order was not challenged on appeal and is now final.
- (b) Class Counsel will request from the Court an additional award of 5% of the common fund, plus additional reimbursable costs incurred since entry of judgment in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, which will compensate Class Counsel for fees and costs incurred for work

performed on appeal, including work at the California Supreme Court, as well as the work remaining to be performed in complying with terms of the Settlement, including, but not limited to, documenting the Settlement, securing Court approval of the Settlement, administering the Settlement, and defending against any appeals, as well as all associated expenses. ABM will not oppose the request for attorneys' fees and costs as described in this Section 2.4.2(b).

- (c) Any and all awards of Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel will be paid from the Settlement Fund, which constitutes the common fund in the Action. Neither Class Counsel nor any of the Settlement Class Members will seek any payment of attorneys' fees and costs that are in addition to the foregoing or that exceed the Settlement Fund. Class Counsel agree to work together in in good faith to divide and distribute all Court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs awarded in the Action to Class Counsel, and that Class Counsel agree to release ABM and the Released Parties from any responsibility for or liability arising out of or related to the division and distribution of any Court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs to Class Counsel.
- (d) The Parties agree that, aside from the Court-approved Attorneys' Fees and Costs awarded in the Action, each of the Parties, including all Settlement Class Members, shall bear their own fees and costs, including, but not limited to, those related to the investigation, filing, prosecution, or settlement of the Action; the negotiation, execution, or implementation of this Settlement Agreement; and/or the process of obtaining, administering, or challenging Final Approval.
- (e) In the event that the Court denies, modifies, or reduces Class Counsel's request for an additional award of 5% of the common fund and additional costs in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, Class Counsel and the Settlement Class Members may not seek to modify, revoke, cancel, terminate, or void this Settlement Agreement, or seek, request, or demand an increase in the Settlement Amount.
- (f) If Class Counsel appeal the Court's ruling on their request for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, any ruling of any appellate court in such an appeal (regardless of its substance) shall not constitute a material alteration of this Settlement Agreement, and shall not give Class Counsel or Settlement Class Members the right to modify, revoke, cancel, terminate, or void this Settlement Agreement.

- (g) All claims for attorneys' fees or costs or expenses that Class Counsel and the Settlement Class Members may possess against ABM have been compromised and resolved in this Settlement Agreement.
 - 2.4.3 Named Plaintiffs Service Awards.
- (a) In addition to the amounts determined to be due to them as Settlement Class Members under this Settlement Agreement, certain Named Plaintiffs who contributed time and effort to the case may apply to the Court through Class Counsel for Service Awards. Any such motion shall be filed concurrently with Class Counsel's application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Any Service Award approved by the Court in conjunction with the Settlement shall be paid from the Settlement Fund and shall reduce the amount payable to the Settlement Class Members. The requested Service Awards for these Named Plaintiffs will not exceed the following amounts:
 - Jennifer Augustus: \$50,000.00
 - Emanuel Davis: \$25,000.00.

ABM will not oppose the requests for Service Awards as described in this Section 2.4.3(a).

- with Section 2.10 of this Settlement Agreement and shall be reported by the Claims Administrator to state and federal taxing authorities as non-wage income on IRS Form 1099. Those Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award will be solely responsible for correctly characterizing the Service Award for tax purposes and are solely responsible for paying any taxes owing on the Service Award and they agree to assume responsibility of remitting to the Internal Revenue Service and any other relevant taxing authority the amounts which may be required by law, if any, to be withheld by the Claims Administrator from their Service Awards. In addition, those Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award shall hold ABM harmless and indemnify and defend ABM and the Released Parties for all taxes, interest, penalties, and costs incurred by ABM or the Released Parties by any reason of any claims relating to their non-withholding of taxes from the Service Award.
- (c) In the event that the Court denies, modifies, or reduces any request for a Service Award, Class Counsel and the Settlement Class Members may not seek to modify, revoke,

cancel, terminate, or void this Settlement Agreement, or seek, request, or demand an increase in the Settlement Amount.

- (d) If any of the Named Plaintiffs appeal the Court's ruling on any request for a Service Award, any ruling of any appellate court in such an appeal (regardless of its substance) shall not constitute a material alteration of this Settlement Agreement, and shall not give Class Counsel or the Settlement Class Members the right to modify, revoke, cancel, terminate, or void the Settlement Agreement.
- 2.4.4 <u>Claims Administration Expenses</u>. The Claims Administrator shall be paid for the Administrative Costs, which are estimated to be \$100,000.00, from the Settlement Fund. No fewer than ten court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, the Claims Administrator shall provide the Court and all counsel for the Parties with a statement detailing the Administrative Costs. The Parties agree to cooperate in the settlement administration process and to make all efforts to control and minimize the costs and expenses incurred in the administration of this Settlement.
 - 2.4.5 Distributions to Settlement Class Members.
- (a) The Claims Administrator will determine the amount payable to individual Settlement Class Members by the method set forth below.
- (b) "Work Week Settlement Amount" is the amount calculated by taking the Settlement Amount (1) less Administrative Costs, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Service Awards; (2) plus any income earned on the Settlement Amount less any Settlement Fund Taxes; and dividing the resulting amount by the total number of weeks worked by all Settlement Class Members.
- (c) "Settlement Class Member Work Weeks" means the number of weeks in which a person who is a Settlement Class Members was employed by ABM during the Class Period.

 ABM's records shall be conclusive as to calculating the Settlement Class Member Work Weeks.
- (d) The "Gross Individual Settlement Payment" for each person who is a Settlement Class Members is the amount calculated by multiplying the Work Week Settlement Amount by the Settlement Class Member Work Weeks for that person.
- (e) The "Net Individual Settlement Payment" for each person who is a Settlement Class Members is the amount calculated by taking the Gross Individual Settlement Payment and

subtracting all Employee Payroll Taxes and any other withholdings required by law for that person. The Net Individual Settlement Payment is the amount that will be paid from the Settlement Fund to each Settlement Class Members by the Claims Administrator.

- Payment and Net Individual Settlement Payment for all Settlement Class Members within thirty days of the close of the Notice Period. The Claims Administrator will provide a copy of its calculations, without any personal identifying data, for the Parties to review. The Parties may dispute the calculations only with respect to mathematical errors or an incorrect application of the above method of allocation. Such a dispute must be raised in writing within seven days after the Claims Administrator provides the calculations for review.
- Weeks identified for a Class Member, the Class Member shall notify the Claims Administrator of such dispute and provide any materials or evidence in support of the dates of employment and/or work weeks for which the Class Member contends he or she is entitled to compensation no later than the last day of the Notice Period. The Claims Administrator shall promptly notify counsel for the Parties of any such disputes and forward any materials or evidence received in support thereof to counsel for the Parties. Lead Class Counsel shall make a determination regarding the dispute and advise the Class Member within seven days of receipt of the dispute. If the Class Member and Lead Class Counsel do not reach a resolution of the dispute, Lead Class Counsel will notify the Court of the dispute at the time of filing the Motion for Final Approval and the dispute will be resolved by the Court pursuant to Section 2.15.1.
 - 2.4.6 Allocation and Taxability of Settlement Distributions.
- (a) For tax purposes, 50% of each Gross Individual Settlement Payment will be treated by the Parties as wages reported on IRS Form W-2, and the Claims Administrator shall pay over all such withheld funds to the appropriate state and federal taxing authorities. The Employee Payroll Taxes withheld shall be paid from the Settlement Fund. The remaining 50% of the Gross Individual Settlement Payment will be treated by the Parties as additional, non-wage interest, not subject to payroll withholdings, and shall be reported on an IRS Form 1099. These allocations

approximate the allocation between wages and non-wage interest (including post-judgment interest) arising from the Judgment entered in the Action. Neither the terms of this Settlement Agreement nor any Settlement Payments paid to the Settlement Class Members shall have any effect on the eligibility or calculation of employee benefits for any Settlement Class Members. Neither this Settlement Agreement, nor any of its attachments, should be interpreted to contain or constitute representations or advice regarding any U.S. federal or state tax issue. The Settlement Class Members will be specifically informed that neither ABM nor Class Counsel make any representations regarding the tax implications of any amounts paid under this Settlement Agreement and that if the Settlement Class Members have any questions regarding those implications, they can and should consult a tax expert.

- entitled to a Net Individual Settlement Payment with a IRS Form W-2 reflecting the wages and the taxes withheld from those wages and with a IRS Form 1099 reflecting the non-wage interest paid. The Claims Administrator shall provide all Settlement Class Members who are entitled to a Net Individual Settlement Payment with appropriate documentation setting forth the amount of any tax or other payment withheld and employer contribution made, in accordance with state and federal tax requirements. The Settlement Class Members shall be solely and exclusively responsible for remitting to state and/or federal taxing authorities any applicable other taxes due and shall hold ABM and the Released Parties harmless for any taxes, penalties, interest, liabilities, costs, attorneys' fees, and expenses caused by any such taxing authority relating in any way to the Settlement Class Members' tax treatment of payments made to them pursuant to this Settlement Agreement or failure to timely or properly pay any taxes owed on their respective Settlement Payments.
- (c) Any checks issued to Settlement Class Members shall remain valid and negotiable for one hundred and eighty days from the date of their mailing. If any Settlement Class Members do not cash the settlement check within one hundred and eighty days after issuance, then ten business days after the check-cashing deadline the Claims Administrator shall void any such uncashed checks, and shall distribute all amounts from such uncashed checks to the Legal Aid

Foundation of Los Angeles, Legal Aid at Work, and the Women's Employment Rights Clinic, in equal amounts.

Section 2.5 Appointment and Duties of Claims Administrator

- 2.5.1 Subject to the approval of the Court, the Parties have agreed to the appointment of a professional class action claims administration firm, CPT Group, Inc., as the Claims Administrator for the purpose of administering the settlement process, including preparing and mailing the Notice of Settlement to the Settlement Class Members, providing live call agents during business hours, distributing Settlement Funds, and responding to inquiries from Settlement Class Members.
 - 2.5.2 The duties of the Claims Administrator shall include without limitation:
 - (a) handling all mailings to the Settlement Class Members;
 - (b) tracing undeliverable mailings;
- (c) recording and tracking responses to the mailing to the Settlement Class

 Members (including recording the identity of any Settlement Class Members who request exclusion);
- (d) duties relating to the filing of tax returns and payment of any taxes related to interest earned on the Settlement Fund while deposited in the Escrow Account, as outlined in Section 2.10;
 - (e) responding to inquiries made by the Settlement Class Members;
 - (f) calculating the Settlement Payments;
 - (g) mailing Settlement Payments;
- (h) issuing copies of IRS Form 1099 and IRS Form W-2 (where applicable) for any Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award and for all Settlement Class Members who receive a payment of any kind from the Settlement Fund;
- (i) reporting payment of Settlement Payments to all required taxing and other authorities, taking appropriate withholding from the Settlement Payments and remitting all Employee Payroll Taxes and other required payments to the proper authorities; and
 - (j) other related tasks as mutually agreed to by the Parties.
- 2.5.3 The Claims Administrator shall keep ABM's counsel and Class Counsel timely apprised of the performance of all Claims Administrator responsibilities through weekly emails.

- 2.5.4 All disputes relating to the Claims Administrator's performance of its duties will be referred to the Court, if necessary, which will have continuing jurisdiction over this Settlement until all payments and obligations contemplated by this Settlement Agreement have been fully carried out. Neither the Parties nor their counsel shall have any responsibility or liability for the acts or omissions of the Claims Administrator.
- 2.5.5 At least twenty-one days before the Final Approval Hearing, the Claims Administrator shall prepare a declaration of due diligence and proof of mailing with regard to the mailing of the Notice of Settlement, and any attempts by the Claims Administrator to locate Settlement Class Members, and its inability to deliver the Notice of Settlement to the Settlement Class Members due to invalid addresses ("Due Diligence Declaration"), to Class Counsel and ABM's counsel for presentation to the Court. Class Counsel shall be responsible for filing the Due Diligence Declaration with the Court.

Section 2.6 Release of Claims by the Settlement Class Members

- 2.6.1 Upon the Effective Date, the Settlement Class Members, including their heirs, assigns, and estates, shall be deemed to fully forever, irrevocably and unconditionally release, and discharge ABM and the Released Parties from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, guarantees, penalties, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, liquidated damages, action or causes of action whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, contingent or accrued, against ABM or the Released Parties or any of them, under any state or municipal statute, ordinance, regulation, order or common law, arising out of or related to ABM's provision of rest breaks or alleged failure to provide rest breaks during the Class Period, including but not limited to claims under California Labor Code section 226.7, California Business & Professions Code section 17200, California Labor Code section 203, and any related claims for interest (whether pre- or post-judgment) and/or attorneys' fees and costs.
- 2.6.2 This Settlement Agreement shall be binding on all Settlement Class Members, whether or not they actually receive a payment pursuant to this Settlement Agreement. This Settlement Agreement shall constitute, and may be pleaded as, a complete and total defense to any Released Claims raised in the future.

- 2.6.3 The Settlement Class Members promise not to file a lawsuit in any court alleging any Released Claims, or participate as a party or a class member in any administrative or other legal proceedings, in any forum, against ABM or the Released Parties, for any claims released under this Settlement Agreement. In consideration for the promises made by ABM in this Settlement Agreement, the Settlement Class Members agree never to institute any suit, complaint, proceeding, grievance, or action of any kind at law, in equity, or otherwise in any court of the United States, state, or municipality, or administrative agency, or any arbitration or other legal forum, against ABM or the Released Parties for any claim included in the Released Claims. The Settlement Class Members also agree that they will not join, participate in, or consent to opt in to any actions alleging that he or she is similarly situated to any other employee with respect to any such Released Claims, and that each will elect to opt out of any such actions against ABM or the Released Parties of which he or she is involuntarily made a member or party. If any of the Settlement Class Members are joined in any class or collective lawsuits for any Released Claims, he or she will receive no further compensation of any kind for such released claim or claims.
- 2.6.4 The Settlement Class Members and Class Counsel shall, and hereby do, fully and finally release and forever discharge ABM and the Released Parties of and from any and all claims, demands, damages, actions and/or causes of action whatever kind or nature, including claims for attorneys' fees or costs, whether known or unknown, existing or claimed to exist, in any way set forth in or arising out of any: (i) dispute or claim between or among any Settlement Class Members, and/or Class Counsel, including over any claim to any monetary part of the Settlement and/or to Class Counsel's fees, costs or expenses; and/or (ii) any dispute between the Settlement Class Members, Class Counsel and/or any governmental authority with respect to this Settlement Agreement. This Settlement Agreement shall constitute, and may be pleaded by ABM and the Released Parties as, a complete and total defense to any such dispute or claim.

Section 2.7 Procedures for Objecting to the Settlement

2.7.1 The Notice of Settlement shall provide that Settlement Class Members and persons purporting to act on behalf of any Settlement Class Members who wish to object to this Settlement Agreement must submit to the Claims Administrator a written statement objecting to this Settlement

Agreement. Such objection and any supporting briefs or other materials must be received by the Claims Administrator no later than the last day of the Notice Period. An objection must state the objector's name, current address and telephone number, and the basis for the objection.

- 2.7.2 Promptly upon receipt of any objections, the Claims Administrator shall forward the objections and any supporting briefs or other materials to counsel for the Parties.
- 2.7.3 Counsel for the Parties shall file any responses to any objections at the time the Motion for Final Approval is filed.
- 2.7.4 ABM shall not be responsible for the fees, costs, or expenses incurred by Class Counsel or the Settlement Class Members arising from or related to any Settlement Class Members who submit objections or otherwise purport to object to this Settlement Agreement or related to any appeals thereof.

Section 2.8 Preparation and Mailing of Notice to the Class

- 2.8.1 Within five business days of entry of the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Settlement, but subject to the Claims Administrator providing adequate and contractual assurances with respect to confidentiality and data security, ABM shall provide the Claims Administrator with the following information for the Settlement Class Members in the form of an Excel spreadsheet or similar sortable electronic format: names, last-known mailing addresses from ABM's records, Social Security numbers, and, for each Settlement Class Member, the number of weeks that person was employed by ABM during the Class Period. Class Counsel will not be provided the Social Security numbers for any Settlement Class Members in connection with this Settlement or Settlement Agreement. The data provided to the Claims Administrator will remain confidential and will not be disclosed to any outside party, except as required to applicable tax authorities, or with the express written consent of ABM, or by order of the Court. The data provided under this Section 2.8.1 shall be used only for the purpose of administering this Settlement.
- 2.8.2 The Notice of Settlement, in materially the form attached hereto as **Exhibit B** and as approved by the Court, shall be sent by the Claims Administrator to the Settlement Class Members, by First Class Mail (in English and Spanish) to those addresses provided, as soon as practicable but in any event within ten days after receipt of their contact information from ABM. The Notice of

Settlement shall set forth a brief description of the Action, provide the definition of the Settlement Class, inform the Settlement Class Members of the nature and scope of the settlement of claims, set forth the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs, disclose the Service Awards that will be requested by certain Named Plaintiffs, inform the Settlement Class Members of their opportunity to be heard at the Final Approval Hearing, and inform the Settlement Class Members of their right to submit an objection to any term of the Settlement. The Notice of Settlement will set forth contact numbers for Class Counsel, counsel for ABM, and direct class members to call the toll free number established by the Claims Administrator to answer any questions that the Settlement Class Members may have.

- 2.8.3 The Claims Administrator will attempt to locate any Settlement Class Members whose Notice of Settlement is returned by the Post Office by performing a National Change of Address search on the entire list of Settlement Class Members and if needed, conducting one skip trace search regarding any returned Notice of Settlement.
- 2.8.4 If an envelope has not been returned within twenty-one days of the mailing, it shall be conclusively presumed that the person to whom the envelope was addressed received the Notice of Settlement.

Section 2.9 Final Approval Hearing

2.9.1 The Parties will request the Court to conduct a Final Approval Hearing on or about the date set forth in the Order Granting Preliminary Approval and to determine if the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and if so, enter a final order and judgment granting Final Approval of Settlement, which will (a) approve the Settlement, adjudging the terms thereof to be fair, reasonable and adequate, and directing consummation of its terms and provisions; (b) approve in whole or in part Class Counsel's application for an award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs; (c) approve in whole or in part any requests for Service Awards; and (d) permanently bar and enjoin all members of the Settlement Class Members from prosecuting any Released Claims against ABM or any Released Parties.

Section 2.10 Additional Undertaking, Funding the Settlement Amount and Distribution

2.10.1 Following execution of this Settlement Agreement, ABM will use commercially reasonable efforts to obtain and file with the Court an additional undertaking on appeal pursuant to

13

14 15

17 18

16

20 21

19

22 23

24

252627

28

California Code of Civil Procedure section 917.1 for the difference between the Settlement Amount and the undertakings in the amount of \$94,197,352.88 currently in place in the Action.

- 2.10.2 The Settlement Fund shall be deposited at the times specified in this Section 2.10 into the Escrow Account, which shall be maintained by the Escrow Agent. Within seven days after the Effective Date, the Claims Administrator shall cause the Escrow Agent to convert the Escrow Account into a checking account from which the Claims Administrator shall distribute all Courtapproved payments.
- 2.10.3 The Parties agree to treat the Settlement Fund as a "qualified settlement fund" within the meaning of Treasury Regulation § 1.468B-1, and the Claims Administrator, as administrator of the Escrow Account within the meaning of Treasury Regulation § 1.468B-2(k)(3), shall be responsible for filing tax returns for the Escrow Account and paying from the Escrow Account any and all taxes, including any interest or penalties thereon (the "Settlement Fund Taxes"), owed with respect to the Escrow Account, to the extent necessary. In addition, the Claims Administrator shall timely make such elections as necessary or advisable to carry out the provisions of this Section 2.10, including if necessary the "relation-back election" (as defined in Treas, Reg. § 1.468B-1) back to the earliest permitted date. Such elections shall be made in compliance with the procedures and requirements contained in such regulations. It shall be the responsibility of the Claims Administrator to timely and properly prepare and deliver the necessary documentation for signature by all necessary parties, and thereafter to cause the appropriate filing to occur. All Settlement Fund Taxes arising with respect to the income, if any, earned by the Settlement Fund (including any Settlement Fund Taxes that may be imposed upon ABM with respect to any income earned by the Settlement Fund for any period during which the Settlement Fund does not qualify as a "qualified settlement fund" for federal or state income tax purposes) shall be paid out from the interest earned on the Settlement Fund.
 - 2.10.4 Any expenses and costs incurred in connection with the payment of Settlement Fund Taxes pursuant to this Section 2.10, including, without limitation, expenses of tax attorneys and/or accountants and mailing, administration, and distribution costs and expenses relating to the filing or the failure to file all necessary or advisable tax returns (the "Settlement Fund Tax Expenses"), shall

be paid to the Claims Administrator as part of the Administrative Costs. The Escrow Agent will either be paid from the interest earned on the Settlement Fund, or will agree to waive any fees incurred by it related to the Escrow Account, and thus any such fees will not be paid from or otherwise diminish the Settlement Fund. ABM shall not have any liability or responsibility for the Settlement Fund Taxes or the Settlement Fund Tax Expenses.

2.10.5 The Claims Administrator shall timely and properly file all informational and other tax returns necessary or advisable with respect to the Settlement Fund and the distributions and payments therefrom, including, without limitation, the tax returns described in Treas. Reg. § 1.468B-2(k), and to the extent applicable, Treas. Reg. § 1.468B-2(1). Such tax returns shall be consistent with the terms herein, and in all events shall reflect that all Settlement Fund Taxes on the income earned by the Settlement Fund shall be paid out of the interest earned on the Settlement Fund. The Claims Administrator shall also timely pay Settlement Fund Taxes out of the interest earned on the Settlement Fund. The Claims Administrator is authorized to withdraw from the interest earned on the Settlement Fund in the Escrow Account amounts necessary to pay any Settlement Fund Taxes. The Parties hereto agree to cooperate with the Escrow Agent, the Claims Administrator, each other, and their tax attorneys and accountants to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out the provisions of this Settlement Agreement. Neither the Parties nor their counsel shall have any responsibility or liability for the acts or omissions of the Escrow Agent or Claims Administrator.

2.10.6 ABM will pay \$55,000,000.00 of the Settlement Amount by either April 1, 2017 or within fourteen days after Final Approval, whichever date is later. ABM will pay the remainder of the Settlement Amount by either September 1, 2017 or within fourteen days after Final Approval, whichever date is later. All funds shall be paid into the Escrow Account.

2.10.7 No funds from the Escrow Account, except for any necessary Administrative Costs or Settlement Fund Taxes, shall be disbursed until after the Effective Date.

2.10.8 Within fourteen days after the Effective Date, all Court-approved payments will be made by the Claims Administrator to the Settlement Class Members, the Named Plaintiffs receiving a Service Award, and Class Counsel (provided that Class Counsel has provided a completed W-9 to the Claims Administrator). The approval or denial of a Settlement Payment to any Settlement Class

Members under the terms of this Settlement Agreement will be conclusive and binding, subject to the dispute resolution provisions of this Settlement Agreement as set forth in Sections 2.4.5(g) and 2.15. All payments called for under this Section 2.10 shall be made solely from the Settlement Fund.

Section 2.11 Obligations of the Parties Prior to Court Approval

- 2.11.1 Once finalized, the Parties shall promptly submit this Settlement Agreement to the Court for an Order of Preliminary Approval and determination by the Court as to its fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.769. Promptly upon execution of this Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs will file a Motion for Preliminary Approval seeking the following:
- (a) Approval of the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to the Settlement Class Members;
 - (b) Approval as to form and content of the proposed Notice of Settlement;
 - (c) Approval of the plan of allocation of the Settlement Fund.
- (d) Directing the mailing of the Notice of Settlement by First Class Mail to the Settlement Class Members by the Claims Administrator;
 - (e) Appointing CPT Group, Inc. as Claims Administrator;
 - (f) Preliminarily approving this Settlement Agreement; and
- (g) Scheduling a Final Approval Hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement should be finally approved.
- 2.11.2 The Parties will use their best efforts to ensure that the Motion for Preliminary Approval is filed by Wednesday, February 8, 2017, or as soon thereafter as possible. The Parties agree to coordinate and cooperate on determining the filing date of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, and Plaintiffs agree that they shall not file the Motion for Preliminary Approval unless they have obtained ABM's consent to the filing.
- 2.11.3 Prior to the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs will submit a proposed Order of Final Approval that (a) approves the Settlement, adjudging the terms thereof to be fair, reasonable and adequate, and (b) directs consummation of the Settlement Agreement's terms and provisions.

2.11.4 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to seek to execute upon and/or take any steps to collect upon the Judgement while the Settlement is pending approval by the Court, including during the pendency of any appeal, writ or other appellate proceeding challenging an Order of Final Approval.

Section 2.12 Communications

- 2.12.1 The terms of this Settlement shall remain confidential until they are presented to the Court in connection with the Motion for Preliminary Approval, except for (a) any disclosure necessary to comply with any state or federal law (including the federal securities laws) or rules and regulations of any securities exchange upon which ABM's stock is listed, (b) the communication by ABM to the California Supreme Court contemplated in Section 2.13.1, (c) the issuance of a press release by ABM regarding the Settlement, and (d) with the consent of ABM, communications with the Court for the limited purpose of obtaining a hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval.
- 2.12.2 Following the Order Granting Preliminary Approval, the Parties and their counsel will direct inquiries from Settlement Class Members to the Claims Administrator to ensure consistent and accurate communication with Settlement Class Members.
- 2.12.3 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to disparage or comment negatively about ABM, its officers, management, and/or current or former employees.
- 2.12.4 Nothing in this Settlement Agreement shall limit ABM from communicating with its counsel regarding this Settlement Agreement, or Settlement Class Members from communicating with Class Counsel regarding this Settlement Agreement.

Section 2.13 Resolution of the Pending Appeal of the Judgment

2.13.1 Following execution of this Settlement Agreement, ABM will inform the California Supreme Court that (a) the Parties have reached this Settlement, which is contingent on trial court approval, (b) ABM has reserved the right to pursue further appellate review until the Settlement is finally approved, and (c) ABM is not withdrawing either its petition for rehearing or conditional motion to stay issuance of the remittitur. The Parties agree to coordinate and cooperate on the

content of this communication and the date on which it will be delivered to the California Supreme Court.

- 2.13.2 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to oppose any application by ABM to extend the deadline to file a petition for a writ of certiorari in the U.S. Supreme Court by up to sixty days.
- 2.13.3 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel expressly agree that ABM will not waive its right to seek any further appellate review of the Judgment until the Effective Date.

Section 2.14 Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court

2.14.1 The Parties agree that the Court shall retain jurisdiction over the Parties, and over this Settlement Agreement, in order to: (i) monitor and enforce compliance with this Settlement Agreement, Final Approval and/or any related order of this Court; and/or (ii) resolve any disputes over this Settlement Agreement or the administration of the benefits of this Settlement Agreement, including, disputes over entitlement to payments sought by Class Counsel.

Section 2.15 Dispute Resolution

2.15.1 Except as otherwise authorized herein and in Section 2.4.5(g) with regard to Class Member disputes regarding Settlement Payments, all disputes concerning the interpretation, implementation, calculation, or payment of the Settlement Amount or other disputes regarding compliance with this Settlement Agreement will be resolved by the Court.

Section 2.16 Parties' Authority

2.16.1 The signatories hereto hereby represent that they are fully authorized to enter into this Settlement Agreement and bind the Parties hereto to the terms and conditions hereof.

Section 2.17 Mutual Full Cooperation

2.17.1 The Parties agree to fully cooperate with each other to accomplish the terms of this Settlement Agreement as expeditiously as possible, including but not limited to, execution of such documents and to take such other action as may reasonably be necessary to implement the terms of this Settlement Agreement and obtain Final Approval. The Parties to this Settlement Agreement shall use their best efforts, including all efforts contemplated by this Settlement Agreement and any other efforts that may become necessary by order of the Court, or otherwise, to effectuate this Settlement Agreement and the terms set forth herein. As soon as practicable after execution of this Settlement

Agreement, Class Counsel shall, with the assistance and cooperation of ABM and its counsel, take all necessary steps to secure the Court's Final Approval of this Settlement Agreement. Class Counsel will also notify counsel for ABM if they are subpoensed or receive any other request for documents or information regarding any other action filed or potential action against ABM or the Released Parties that covers or includes any Settlement Class Members.

Section 2.18 No Prior Assignments

2.18.1 The Parties hereto represent, covenant, and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly, assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign, transfer, or encumber to any person or entity any portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action or rights herein released and discharged except as set forth herein.

Section 2.19 No Admission

- 2.19.1 Nothing contained herein, nor the consummation of this Settlement Agreement, is to be construed or deemed an admission of liability, culpability, negligence, or wrongdoing on the part of ABM or any of the Released Parties, and they expressly deny liability or wrongdoing. ABM further denies, for any purpose other than settling this lawsuit, that this lawsuit is appropriate for class or representative treatment. This Settlement Agreement is not, shall not be deemed to be, and may not be used as, an admission or evidence of the appropriateness of this or similar claims for class action certification or administration other than for the purposes of administering this Settlement Agreement. Each of the parties hereto has entered into this Settlement Agreement with the sole purpose and intention to avoid further disputes and litigation with the attendant inconvenience and expenses. In the event this Settlement Agreement is not approved by the Court or otherwise does not become final, ABM does not waive any defenses or rights. This Settlement Agreement is a settlement document and shall, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 408, California Evidence Code section 1152, and any and all analogous state laws, be inadmissible in evidence in any proceeding, except an action or proceeding to approve, interpret, or enforce this Settlement Agreement.
- 2.19.2 Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Settlement, nor any of its terms, nor any document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to this Settlement Agreement including without limitation any motions for preliminary and final approval of the Settlement and any

documents submitted in support of such motions, nor any reports or accounts thereof, shall in any event be disclosed, referred to or offered or received in evidence against any of the Parties, in any further proceeding in the Action, or any other civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding except for purposes of settling the Action or enforcing the Released Claims contained herein pursuant to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.

Section 2.20 Enforcement Actions

2.20.1 In the event that one or more of the Parties to this Settlement Agreement institutes any legal action, arbitration, or other proceeding against any other party to enforce the provisions of this Settlement Agreement or to declare rights and/or obligations under this Settlement Agreement, the successful party shall be entitled to recover from the unsuccessful party reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, including expert witness fees incurred in connection with any enforcement actions.

Section 2.21 Notices

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2.21.1 Unless otherwise specifically provided herein, all notices, demands, or other communications given hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class:

Drew E. Pomerance Michael B. Adreani ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250 Woodland Hills, California 91367

To ABM:

Keith Jacoby LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 2049 Century Park East, 5th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067

Theane Evangelis GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071

Section 2.22 Construction

2.22.1 The Parties hereto agree that the terms and conditions of this Settlement Agreement are the result of lengthy, intensive arms-length negotiations between the Parties and that this Settlement Agreement shall not be construed in favor of or against any party by reason of the extent to which any party or his, her or its counsel participated in the drafting of this Settlement Agreement.

Section 2.23 Captions and Interpretations

2.23.1 Paragraph titles or captions contained herein are inserted as a matter of convenience and for reference, and in no way define, limit, extend, or describe the scope of this Settlement Agreement or any provision hereof. Each term of this Settlement Agreement is contractual and not merely a recital.

Section 2.24 Modification

2.24.1 This Settlement Agreement may not be changed, altered, or modified, except in writing and signed by ABM, Class Counsel, Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus, and Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis. This Settlement Agreement may not be discharged except by performance in accordance with its terms or by a writing signed by the Parties hereto.

Section 2.25 Integration Clause

2.25.1 This Settlement Agreement contains the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement and transaction contemplated hereby, and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, representations, and statements relating to this Settlement and the transaction contemplated hereby, whether oral or written and whether by a party or such party's legal counsel, are merged herein. No rights hereunder may be waived except in writing.

Section 2.26 Binding on Assigns

2.26.1 The provisions of this Settlement Agreement shall run in perpetuity. This Settlement Agreement shall be binding upon the Parties hereto and their spouses, heirs, administrators, representatives, executors, successors and assigns, and shall inure to the benefit of ABM and the Released Parties, and their predecessors, successors, affiliates, subsidiaries, parent companies, partners, current and past employees, insurers, agents, legal representatives, each of which is entitled to enforce this Settlement Agreement.

Section 2.27 Signatories

2.27.1 It is agreed that because the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous, it is impossible or impractical to have each member of the Settlement Class execute this Settlement Agreement. It is agreed that this Settlement Agreement may be executed on behalf of the Settlement Class by Class Counsel, Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus, and Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis; and shall have the same force and effect as if executed by each member of the Settlement Class.

Section 2.28 Incorporation of Exhibits

2.28.1 All exhibits, excluding the Escrow Agreement, attached hereto are incorporated by reference and are a material part of this Settlement Agreement. The Escrow Agreement once reached by the Parties shall also be incorporated by reference. Any notice, order, judgment, or other exhibit that requires approval of the Court must be approved without material alteration from its current form in order for this Settlement Agreement to become effective.

Section 2.29 Reasonableness of Settlement Agreement

2.29.1 The Parties jointly warrant that this is a fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement and have arrived at this Settlement through arms-length negotiations, taking into account all relevant factors, present and potential.

Section 2.30 California Law and Interpretation

2.30.1 All terms of this Settlement Agreement and its exhibits will be governed and interpreted by and according to the laws of the State of California, without giving effect to any conflict of law principles or choice of principles. If the Court determines that the release of claims in Section 2.6.1 above is unenforceable, for whatever reason, this entire Settlement Agreement will become null and void *ab initio*.

Section 2.31 Counterparts

2.31.1 This Settlement Agreement may be executed in counterparts and/or by facsimile signature ("counterpart"), and when each party has signed and delivered at least one such counterpart, each counterpart shall be deemed an original, and, when taken together with other signed counterparts, shall constitute one Settlement Agreement, which shall be binding upon and effective as to all Parties.

Section 2.32 Entire Agreement Ī 2.32.1 After this Settlement Agreement is fully executed by the Parties, it will constitute the 2 entire agreement of the Parties. No oral representations, warranties, inducements, or writings have 3 been made by any Party concerning this Settlement Agreement, other than those expressly stated 4 5 herein. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus, Named Plaintiff Emanuel 6 Davis, ABM, Class Counsel, and ABM's counsel have executed this Settlement Agreement as of the 7 8 date(s) indicated on the lines below. 9 NAMED PLAINTIFF JENNIFER AUGUSTUS Dated: March ___, 2017 10 11 Jennifer Augustus 12 13 NAMED PLAINTIFF EMANUEL DAVIS 14 Dated: March ___, 2017 15 16 Emanuel Davis 17 Dated: March 2017 DEFENDANT ABM SECURITY SERVICES, 18 INC. 19 20 21 Miranda Tolar Vice President & Deputy General Counsel 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416

		· e	
1	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:		
2	Dated: March 5, 2017	ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE ADREANI LLP	
3			
4	ř.	Bu ///	
5		Michael B, Adreani Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and Lead Counsel for the Rest Break Class	
6		and Lead Counsel for the Rest Break Class	
7	. /	COURT OOL IS & ASSOCIATION APC	
8	Dated: Marchy 4, 2017	SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC	
9		Scott Edward Cole Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis	
10		and Counsel for the Rest Break Class	
11		⊛	
12		· ·	
13	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:		
15	Dated: March, 2017	LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.	
16			
17		By:	
18		Keith Jacoby Attorneys for Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc.	
19		WDIM profilith per along the	
20	Dated: March, 2017	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP	
21			
22		By: Thean's Evangelis	
23		Attorneys for Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc.	
24		· many as a second for many and and	
25			
26		*	
27			
28			
		32	
	AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416		

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:	*
2	Dated: March, 2017	ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP
3		
4		By:
5		Michael B Adreani
б		Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and Lead Counsel for the Rest Break Class
7		THE SET OF A SECONDARIES AND
8	Dated: March, 2017	SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
9		By: Scott Edward Cole
10		Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis and Counsel for the Rest Break Class
11		
12		
13	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:	
14	43 8	LITTLER MENDELSON, Q.C.
15		TOTAL A A / /
16 17		ву:
18		Keith tacody Attorneys for Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc.
19		ABM Security Services, Inc.
20	Dated: March, 2017	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
21		*
22		Ву:
23		Theane Evangelis Attorneys for Defendant
24		ABM Security Services, Inc.
25		
26		
27		
28		
		22
	AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLES	32 MENT AND RELEASE – CASE NO. BC336416

1	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:		
2	Dated: March, 2017	ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP	
3			
4		By	
5		By:Michael B. Adreani Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus	
6		Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and Lead Counsel for the Rest Break Class	
7		THOMBOOK BOLLOGOOVERS INC	
8	Dated: March, 2017	SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC	
9		By:Scott Edward Cole	
10		Attorneys for Named Plaintiff Emanuel Davis and Counsel for the Rest Break Class	
11			
12			
13	ADDROVED AS NO HODALAND CONTENT.		
14	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:	LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.	
15	Dated: March, 2017	MA 4 A MARK \$1000 ()	
16		Bu	
17		By: Keith Jacoby Attorneys for Defendant	
18		Attorneys for Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc.	
19	14	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP	
20	Dated: March 1, 2017	Official Polity & Office Applied Pri	
21		Pour Pour	
22		By: Theane Evangelis Attorneys for Defendant	
23		ABM Security Services, Inc.	
24		4	
25			
26			
27			
28			
		32 MONT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416	
	AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE - CASE NO. BC336416		

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JENNIFER AUGUSTUS, Individually and on Behalf of All Similarly Situated Individuals,

Plaintiff,

٧.

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, a wholly owned subsidiary of ABM INDUSTRIES INC.; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Consolidated Case:

EMANUEL DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

٧.

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive.

Defendants.

Consolidated Case:

DELORES HALL and CARLTON ANTHONY WAITE,

Plaintiff,

٧.

AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. BC336416 (C/W CG5444421; C/W BC345918; Related to BC388380)

Case Assigned for All Purposes to Judge John Shepard Wiley, Jr. Department CCW-311

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL HEARING REGARDING LAWSUIT AGAINST DEFENDANT ABM SECURITY SERVICES, INC.

Page 1 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

THIS LEGAL NOTICE MAY AFFECT YOUR RIGHTS. PLEASE READ IT CAREFULLY.

TO: All persons who are or were employed by Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc. d/b/a American Commercial Security Services, Inc. ("ABM") in any security guard position in California at any time during the period from July 12, 2001 through July 1, 2011 who:

- (a) worked a shift exceeding four (4) hours or major fraction thereof without being authorized and permitted to take an uninterrupted rest period of ten (10) minutes per each four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked and who was not paid one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided;
- (b) did not work at a location for which ABM was granted a permit for exemption from the rest period requirements of the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 4-2001; and
- (c) previously did not opt out from participating in this Action.

The people who fall in the above definition are "Settlement Class Members."

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Summary of the Lawsuit

Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus filed her class action complaint against ABM in the Superior Court of California, the County of Los Angeles, on July 12, 2005, alleging that ABM failed to provide its California security guards meal periods and rest breaks in accordance with California law. Plaintiff brought her claims on behalf of herself and other current and former security guard employees of ABM in California. The following actions were eventually consolidated with *Augustus* (collectively, with *Augustus*, the "Action"):

- Emanuel Davis v. American Commercial Security Services Inc., et. al, Case No. CGC5444421, filed August 26, 2005 (San Francisco County Superior Court); and
- Delores Hall & Carlton Anthony Waite v. American Commercial Security Services, Inc., et. al, Case No. BC345918, filed January 17, 2006 (Los Angeles County Superior Court).

On February 27, 2009, the Court certified two classes, one for the meal period claims and the other for the rest period claims. The Court appointed the firm of Roxborough, Pomerance, Nye & Adreani LLP as Lead Counsel for the classes. Additional counsel who filed actions which were consolidated or related include: Scott Cole & Associates, APC, Knapp, Petersen & Clarke, and Initiative Legal Group (hereinafter referred to, along with Lead Counsel, as "class counsel" or "Class Counsel").

On December 23, 2010, the Court decertified the meal period class. On that same day, the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for summary adjudication of the rest break claim.

On August 11, 2011, the Court amended the definition of the rest break class such that the class period was defined as July 12, 2001 through July 1, 2011 (the "Class Period").

On July 6, 2012, the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment of the rest break claim.

Page 2 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

On July 31, 2012, the Court entered a judgment awarding to Plaintiff Jennifer Augustus and the rest break class \$55,887,565.00 under California Labor Code section 226.7 and California Business & Professions Code section 17200, \$31,204,465.00 in pre-judgment interest, and \$2,650,096.00 under California Labor Code section 203.

On February 22, 2013, the Court entered an amended judgment that awarded class counsel 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees and \$184,020.33 in reimbursable costs from the common fund, plus an additional award of attorneys' fees and costs in the amount of \$4,455,336.88 under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

ABM appealed the judgments, but did not challenge on appeal the award of costs and 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees, which was not opposed by ABM and has never been the subject of any appeal by any party, and is therefore final. Following ABM's appeal of the judgments, Class Counsel hired Jeffrey I. Ehrlich as special appellate counsel.

On December 31, 2014, the California Court of Appeal issued a unanimous decision in which it reversed the orders granting summary adjudication and summary judgment, and the award of attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5. The Court of Appeal, however, upheld the order certifying the rest break class.

Plaintiffs' sought review from the California Supreme Court, which was granted on April 29, 2015. On December 22, 2016, the California Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeal's judgment.

On January 5, 2015, ABM asked the California Supreme Court to either grant rehearing or modify its opinion. ABM argued that disputed issues of facts meant that it was not proper to award all class members damages via a motion for summary judgment and thus without holding a trial. ABM also argued that the Supreme Court should make its decision apply only to future cases. ABM further requested that, at a minimum, the Court should remand the case to the Court of Appeal for it to address arguments that neither the Court of Appeal nor the Supreme Court had resolved. On March 15, 2017, the California Supreme Court denied ABM's petition for rehearing, but modified its opinion by remanding the matter to the Court of Appeal for further proceedings consistent with the opinion.

ABM contends that it has complied with all applicable state and federal laws, and ABM continues to deny each and all of the claims in the Action.

Plaintiffs and ABM have entered into a class action settlement (the "Settlement Agreement") that was preliminarily approved by Judge John Sheppard Wiley on [INSERT DATE], 2017.

Plaintiffs and ABM are represented by the following counsel:

Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class:

Drew Pomerance
Michael B. Adreani
ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI
LLP
5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250
Woodland Hills, California 91367

Defendant:

Keith Jacoby LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 2049 Century Park East, 5th Floor Los Angeles, California 90067

Theane Evangelis
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
333 South Grand Avenue

Page 3 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

Los Angeles, CA 90071

2. Why Did I Receive This Notice?

ABM's records indicate you were employed by ABM during the Class Period and thus might be a Settlement Class Member entitled to receive an settlement payment under the distribution formula described in section C.2.

3. Benefits to the Settlement Class Members

This litigation has been ongoing for eleven years and has involved extensive discovery and litigation. Class counsel vigorously prosecuted the Action since the outset, having conducted an investigation into the facts of the Action and Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' claims, including through formal discovery, informal disclosures between the parties, and other investigations undertaken by counsel for Plaintiffs. Furthermore, the parties have engaged in extensive motion practice, including multiple motions for summary judgment and motions relating to class certification. The case went all the way through the trial court to final judgment, but the case did not end there. Thereafter, the case went to the appellate courts, where the parties also vigorously litigated the various rulings in the Action, both at the Court of Appeal and the California Supreme Court. The parties have also engaged in extensive negotiations with mediator Mark Rudy.

As a result, class counsel has concluded that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is in the best interest of the Settlement Class Members in light of all known facts and circumstances, including the likely damages, risk of significant delay, and appellate risk. In particular, class counsel acknowledges the risks that the California Supreme Court could either grant rehearing or modify its opinion, which in turn could mean that the amounts awarded to the class would be reduced or eliminated. In addition, there is a risk that the U.S. Supreme Court could grant review in this case and reverse the California Supreme Court's judgment and the class may lose on appeal. ABM has raised many defenses to Plaintiffs' claims and those defenses could significantly reduce or even eliminate any liability or damages owed to the Settlement Class Members.

Plaintiffs and ABM disagree as to whether there is any liability, including but not limited to, whether the Settlement Class Members are owed any unpaid wages, compensation, or penalties, and the amount of wages or penalties owed, if any. ABM denies each and all of the claims in the Action, but acknowledges the risk that, if the California Supreme Court or U.S. Supreme Court do not act, it would have to satisfy the judgment entered in the Action and that Plaintiffs will seek to collect post-judgment interest in addition to the amounts awarded in the judgment. Nevertheless, while ABM has further options for potentially overturning or reducing the judgment, ABM has concluded that further litigation of the Action would be lengthy and expensive.

The settlement ends the continued expense of further litigation, the risk and uncertainty of possible negative future outcomes and attendant delay. The terms of the settlement were reviewed by the Court and preliminarily approved as being fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class Members.

B. YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS

1. How Do I Get a Settlement Payment?

To claim your share of the settlement, you do not need to do anything.

Page 4 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

2. Right to Object

Any Settlement Class Member may object to the final approval of the proposed settlement by submitting a written statement objecting to the settlement to the Claims Administrator. The objection and any supporting documents or other materials must be received by the Claims Administrator no later than [INSERT DATE].

Your objection must include (1) the case name and case number shown on page 1, (2) state your name, current address and telephone number, and (3) state the basis for the objection. If you wish to speak to the Court about your objection at the final settlement approval hearing, you must state clearly in your written objection that it is your intention to appear at the final settlement approval hearing. You may enter an appearance through your own attorney if you so desire.

C. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

1. The Proposed Settlement Fund and Distributions of the Settlement Fund

Without admitting any fault, ABM has agreed to pay one hundred and ten million (\$110,000,000.00) (the "Settlement Fund") to fully resolve the claims in the Action. The Settlement Fund is the total and maximum amount ABM is required to pay for any and all purposes under the Settlement Agreement, and in connection with the termination of the Action.

Subject to Court approval, the Settlement Fund will be divided as follows:

First, service award payments to named plaintiffs Jennifer Augustus and Emanuel Davis. The service award for Jennifer Augustus will not exceed \$50,000.00 and will not exceed \$25,000 for Emanuel Davis.

Second, payments of attorneys' fees and costs to class counsel. The Court has already awarded class counsel 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees for work performed up through entry of judgment and \$184,020.33 in reimbursable costs from the common fund. Class counsel will request from the Court an additional award of 5% of the common fund, plus additional reimbursable costs in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, to compensate for fees and costs incurred for work performed on appeal, including work at the California Supreme Court, as well as the work remaining to be performed in complying with terms of the Settlement.

Third, payment to the claims administrator for the costs of administration (which are estimated to be \$100,000.00).

Fourth, the remaining amount will be distributed to Settlement Class Members as described in section C.2.

2. Calculation of Your Settlement Share

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you will be entitled to a settlement payment based on the formula described in the Settlement Agreement, which is described below.

Your settlement payment will be calculated by taking the amount remaining after payment of any service awards, attorneys' fees and costs, and costs of administration, and dividing that amount by the total number of weeks worked by all Settlement Class Members. The result will be the "Work Week Settlement Amount."

The "Work Week Settlement Amount" will be multiplied by the number of weeks that you were employed by

Page 5 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

ABM during the Class Period. ABM's records will be used to calculate the number of work weeks you were employed by ABM. The claims administrator then will subtract the employee portion of all applicable tax withholdings including, but not limited to, FICA, FUTA, and other employment related taxes and withholding of federal, state, and local income taxes. The remaining amount will be paid to you.

Based on information provided by ABM to the Claims Administrator, the number of work weeks that you were employed by ABM has been calculated to be: [INSERT WORK WEEKS]

3. Right to Dispute Your Work Weeks / Settlement Share

In the event you dispute the number of work weeks identified above, you must notify the Claims Administrator of such dispute and provide any materials or evidence in support of the dates of employment and/or work weeks for which you contend you are entitled to compensation no later than [INSERT DATE] The Claims Administrator will promptly notify counsel for the parties of any dispute and forward the materials and evidence you provided. Lead Class Counsel will make a determination regarding the dispute and advise you of a decision within seven (7) days of receipt of the dispute. If you and Lead Class Counsel do not reach a resolution of the dispute, Lead Class Counsel will notify the Court of the dispute at the time of filing the Motion for Final Approval and the dispute will be resolved by the Court.

4. Tax Withholdings

Fifty percent of your settlement payment share will be treated as wages that are subject to payroll taxes, withholdings, and IRS Form W-2 reporting. The remaining fifty percent will be treated as non-wage interest not subject to payroll taxes and will be reported on IRS Form 1099.

You are solely and exclusively responsible for paying to state and/or federal taxing authorities any applicable other taxes due and shall hold ABM and the Released Parties harmless for any taxes, penalties, interest, liabilities, costs and expenses caused by any such taxing authority relating in any way to your tax treatment of payments made to them or failure to timely or properly pay any taxes owed on your Settlement Payment.

ABM and Class Counsel do not make any representations about the tax implications of any amount paid under this Settlement. If you have any questions about the tax implications, you can and should consult a tax expert.

5. Attorneys' Fees and Costs

Despite litigating this case on behalf of the class for almost 12 years, class counsel has not been paid for their services or out-of-pocket expenses. The Court has already awarded class counsel 30% of the common fund as attorneys' fees for work performed up through entry of judgment and \$184,020.33 in reimbursable costs from the common fund, and that order was not challenged on appeal and is now final.

Class counsel will request from the Court an additional award of 5% of the common fund plus additional reimbursable costs incurred since entry of judgment in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, to compensate class counsel for work done on appeal, including work at the California Supreme Court, and all remaining work to be performed in connection with the Settlement. Class counsel will file a motion with the Court to approve payment of attorneys' fees to class counsel, all of which would be paid to class counsel from the Settlement Fund. The attorneys' fees and costs must be approved by the Court. These fees will compensate class counsel for their efforts achieving the settlement for the benefit of the Settlement Class Members and for the risk in undertaking this representation on a contingency basis. Class counsel has already spent many hours litigating

Page 6 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

this case, conducting discovery, investigating Settlement Class Members' claims, engaging in extensive motion practice, litigating appeals, engaging in mediation, and negotiating the Settlement Agreement.

D. RELEASE OF CLAIMS

The Participating Settlement Class Members, including their heirs, assigns, and estates, shall be deemed to fully forever, irrevocably and unconditionally release, and discharge ABM and the Released Parties, as defined below and in the Settlement Agreement, from any and all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, guarantees, penalties, costs, expenses, attorneys' fees, damages, liquidated damages, action or causes of action whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, contingent or accrued, against ABM or the Released Parties or any of them, under any state, or municipal statute, ordinance, regulation, order or common law, arising out of or related to ABM's provision of rest breaks or alleged failure to provide rest breaks during the Class Period, including but not limited to claims under California Labor Code section 226.7, California Business & Professions Code section 17200, California Labor Code section 203, and any related claims for interest (whether pre- or post-judgment) and/or attorneys' fees and costs.

Further, upon the effective date of the settlement, Plaintiffs will promptly file with the Court an acknowledgment of satisfaction of judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 724.010 et seq. indicating that the amended judgment entered on February 22, 2013 in the Action has been satisfied with respect to Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class Members, and class counsel.

"Released Parties" means ABM, including all of ABM's past and present successors, subsidiaries, investors, parents, holding companies, sister and affiliated companies, divisions and other related entities, as well as the successors, predecessors, shareholders, subsidiaries, investors, parent, sister and affiliated companies, officers, directors, partners, assigns, agents, employees, principals, heirs, administrators, attorneys, vendors, accountants, auditors, consultants, fiduciaries, insurers, reinsurers, employee benefit plans, and representatives of each of them, both individually and in their official capacities, past or present, as well as all persons acting by, through, under or in concert with any of these persons or entities.

E. FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a final settlement approval hearing in the California Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, Central Civil West Courthouse, 600 South Commonwealth, Los Angeles, California, 90005, on [INSERT DATE], 2017 at [INSERT TIME] to decide whether to finally approve the settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate. At that time, the Court also will be asked to approve class counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs, and the service awards to the named Plaintiffs. You may appear and speak to the Court at the hearing regarding any objection to the settlement. It is possible that the hearing date or time will be changed, so you should check the Court's calendar before attending, if you plan to attend. If you mail written objections, it is not necessary for you to appear at this hearing.

The pleadings and other documents in this lawsuit may be examined during regular business hours at the Office of the Clerk, 600 South Commonwealth, Los Angeles, California, 90005.

This notice has been reviewed and approved by the California Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles. If you have any questions regarding this lawsuit, how it affects your rights, please contact that claims administrator at [INSERT CLAIM ADMINISTRATOR CONTACT INFORMATION].

Page 7 of 7
NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Objections Must Be Submitted by [INSERT DATE], 2017

EXHIBIT "B"

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2
3
4
   VARDAN KARAPETYAN, an
    individual appearing
    individually and on behalf
5
    of others similarly situated,
                                       No. CV15-08313 GW (Ex)
6
                     Plaintiff,
7
             VS.
8
    ABM INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED,
    a Delaware Corporation, ABM
9
    SECURITY SERVICES, INC., a
    California Corporation, and
10
    DOES 1 - 50, inclusive,
11
                     Defendants.
12
13
14
              VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF NEDY WARREN
15
                    Woodland Hills, California
16
                           July 13, 2016
17
                              Volume 1
18
19
20
    Pages 1 - 199
21
22
23
24
    Reported by:
    MONA GARCIA
25
    CSR No. 2766
                                                            1
```

```
Deposition of NEDY WARREN, Volume 1, taken
1
   on behalf of Plaintiff at 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250,
2
   Woodland Hills, California, commencing at 9:04 a.m. on
3
   Wednesday, July 13, 2016, before Mona Garcia, Certified
4
5
   Shorthand Reporter No. 2766.
6
7
8
   APPEARANCES:
9
   For Plaintiff Vardan Karapetyan and the Classes:
10
             ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP
             BY: MICHAEL B. ADREANI
11
             Attorney at Law
             5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250
12
             Woodland Hills, California 91367
             818,992,9999
13
             FELAHY TRIAL LAWYERS, APC
14
             4000 Cover Street, Suite 100
             Long Beach, California 90808
15
             562,499,2121
16
             CHAKMAKIS & ASSOCIATES
             301 N. Canon Drive, Suite 315
17
             Beverly Hills, California 90210
             310.550.1555
18
    For Defendants ABM Industries Incorporated, a Delaware
19
        Corporation, ABM Security Services, Inc., a
        California Corporation, ABM Onsite Services - West,
20
        Inc., a Delaware Corporation, and ABM Onsite
        Services, Inc., a Delaware Corporation:
21
              GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
22
              BY: KATHERINE V.A. SMITH
              BY: BRADLEY J. HAMBURGER
23
              Attorneys at Law
              333 South Grand Avenue
24
              Los Angeles, California 90071-3197
              213,229.7000
25
                                                          2
```

MS. SMITH: And I didn't want to interrupt 1 the witness but I do want to object that the 2 question -- object to the form of the question on 3 the grounds that it's vague and ambiguous. 4 BY MR. ADREANI: 10:49AM What do you mean "generally did not"? 6 Q There was a point where this type of form 7 Α no longer existed in the new hire packet so they 8 were no longer provided to new hire employees but 9 there still may have been some in existence for 10 10:49AM employees that continued to be employed by ABM 11 Onsite Services, Inc., if that makes sense. 12 13 Q Yes. 14 Α Okav. At what point did the on duty meal period b:50AM 15 Q waiver stop being part of the new hire handbook? 16 I believe it was late -- mid to late 2013. 17 It was around the period of time when I started 18 supporting Security before the Onsite transition. 19 And why did they -- I will come back to 20 10:50AM this page 62, but why did the on duty meal break 21 waivers stop being part of the new hire packet? 22 23 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 24 THE WITNESS: Our HR group or department was guided by our in-house counsel to do so and the 25 10:50AM 78

ABM entity employing security guards in California 1 2 was called what? ABM Security Services. 3 Going forward how would you like me to 4 refer to that entity? And I am speaking to the 11:05AM 5 witness and counsel. ABM Security? Is that okay? 6 I am okay with that. 7 MS. SMITH: Yes. 8 BY MR. ADREANI: 9 So if I say ABM Security, I am referring to 11:05AM 10 the entity, the ABM entity, who employed security 11 guards in California which was the only ABM entity 12 that employed security guards in California from 13 October 6th, 2010 until December 31st, 2013. 14 that fair? 11:05AM 15 For today's purposes, sure. 16 Okay. As of January 1st, 2014, the only 17 entity, the only ABM entity that employed security 18 guards in California was called what? 19 ABM Onsite Services - West, Inc. 11:06AM 20 So if I call that entity Onsite - West, is 21 22 that fair? 23 Α Or just Onsite. Q Onsite. 24 A I will know what you mean. 11:06AM 25 85

MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 1 THE WITNESS: I don't think I understand 2 3 your question. BY MR. ADREANI: 12:41PM Well, ABM has a -- ABM Security utilized an on duty meal period waiver for my client, right? 6 7 Correct. And that's based upon the fact that ABM 8 believes that the nature of the work prevented him from having an off duty meal break, right? 10 12:41PM 11 Correct. MS. SMITH: I am going to object to the 12 form of the question. It lacks foundation. 13 BY MR. ADREANI: 14 Did that same nature of the work exist 12:41PM 15 during the times he was taking rest breaks as 16 17 opposed to meal breaks? MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 18 THE WITNESS: I would say generally yes. 19 So his job description? Is that what you are 2:41PM 20 21 talking about? BY MR. ADREANI: 22 The nature of his work. 23 Q Well, I don't think the nature of his work 24 Α or his job duties changed drastically throughout an 25 12:42PM 106

```
1
           eight-hour shift.
                    And that's the same for any security guard,
       2
       3
           right?
                    MS. SMITH: Objection to the form, and can
           we limit it to California during the class period?
12:42PM
       5
                    MR. ADREANI: Sure.
       6
                    THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think that's a -- I
        7
           think that would be a fair statement for any of us,
        8
           Maybe I am not understanding your question.
        9
           BY MR. ADREANI:
12:42PM
       10
                Q I think you did.
       11
                    This Exhibit 7 -- well, strike that.
       12
                    I am going to attach another exhibit. This
       13
           will be No. 8.
       14
                     (Whereupon Plaintiff Exhibit 8
       15
12:43PM
                     was marked for identification.)
       16
           BY MR. ADREANI:
       17
                    What I have attached as Exhibit 8 is from
       18
           the caption "Defendant ABM Security Services, Inc.'s
       19
           Responses to Plaintiff's Interrogatories (Set No.
12:43PM
       20
       21
           One."
                     Do you see that on the front page?
       22
                     I do.
       23
                 Α
                    Will you turn to page 87 of that document.
       24
           I'm sorry. 86.
12:44PM 25
                                                                107
```

this question that may not have triggered that. The 1 way it's written here is different. 2 BY MR. ADREANI: 3 Did something change at ABM Security in the 5 middle of 2013 that prompted the change to the new 01:01PM hire packet which eliminated the meal break waiver? 6 MS. SMITH: I am going to object to the 7 form of the question. I am going to ask the witness 8 not to divulge any information that is attorney/ client privilege or would divulge attorney work 01:01PM 10 11 product. THE WITNESS: No, I don't recall any 12 changes with ABM Security in that time frame that 13 14 you mentioned. BY MR. ADREANI: 15 01:01PM Was there a change in the security industry 16 itself which prompted the elimination of the meal 17 18 break waivers from the new hire packet? MS. SMITH: Same objection and same 19 01:01PM 20 instruction. THE WITNESS: I couldn't say. I don't 21 22 know. 23 BY MR. ADREANI: Did the elimination of the meal break 24 01:02PM 25 waivers from the new hire packet in the middle to 114

late 2013 have anything to do with litigation 1 2 against ABM? MS. SMITH: Counsel, you have asked what 3 the reason was many times and the witness has 4 testified that she can't tell you why due to the 01:02PM attorney/client privilege, so these questions that 6 seem to be aimed at trying to get the same 7 information that we have already stated was 8 attorney/client privilege are not well-taken. I will assert the same objection and again 01: 02PM 10 instruct the witness not to respond to the extent 11 that it would divulge attorney/client privileged 12 communications or attorney work product. 13 BY MR. ADREANI: 14 So is that the case, then, that to the 01:02PM 15 extent some event prompted the elimination of these 16 waivers from the new hire packet that it is 17 completely encompassed within an attorney-client privilege that you can't answer the question? 19 Correct. The question that you have asked 01:03PM 20 21 me, correct. Back to page 21 of Exhibit 8 and I have for 22 the record replaced now the unsigned versions with 23 signed versions. The reporter now has a signed 24 version of Exhibit 8 and so do counsel and the 25 01:03PM 115

BY MR. ADREANI: 1 If they were employed by ABM Security at 2 the same time, they would have the same meal break 3 waiver, right? I would say that's fair. 01:19PM With the exact same language? Q 6 7 Α Correct. But you just haven't seen that yet to Q 8 prepare for today, right? 9 Correct. If there is another one other 01:20PM 10 than this and possibly the other one that I saw 11 which I can't remember what it was attached to, I 12 haven't seen the world of versions of this form as ${\bf I}$ 13 14 sit here today. And prior to mid to late 2013, every single 01:20PM 15 Q employee who applied for and got a job at ABM 16 Security received as part of their new hire handbook 17 a meal period waiver, correct? 18 MS. SMITH: Objection. New hire handbook? 19 20 BY MR. ADREANI: 01:20PM Packet I think is the right word. 21 Q Α Correct, packet. 22 MS. SMITH: I am going to object to the 23 24 form. THE WITNESS: I would say generally, yes. 01:21PM 25 130

BY MR. ADREANI: Why do you say "generally, yes"? 2 Just in the off chance that a recruiter 3 forgot a form but generally that was the practice. And aside from a recruiter possibly missing 01:21PM a form or some outlier like that, every single guard 6 who was hired by ABM was given the meal period waiver as part of their new hire handbook; is that 8 right? ABM Security in California during -- prior 01:21PM 10 Α 11 to 2013. Q That's right. 12 MS. SMITH: Prior to what time? 13 THE WITNESS: Mid to late 2013? 14 BY MR. ADREANI: 15 01:21PM Prior to the time that the waiver was 16 17 eliminated from the packet. 18 Α Correct. And at any given point in time every single 19 guard who applied for and got a job at ABM Security 20 01:21PM during that time frame would have received the exact 21 22 same meal period waiver, right? MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 23 THE WITNESS: I think I understand your 24 question. On any given day the forms are the same, 01:22PM 25 131

correct. 1 BY MR. ADREANI: 2 3 Q Yes. 4 Α Yes. You got it. 01:22PM Q And that new hire packet and that meal 6 period waiver encompassed within it was the same no 7 matter if the guard was applying for a multiple 8 guard site or a single guard site, right? 10 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 01:23PM THE WITNESS: That's correct. 11 BY MR. ADREANI: 12 Q In fact, it was the same no matter what 13 site they were working on or they were applying to 14 be -- strike that. 15 01:23PM In fact, it was the same no matter what 16 type of site it was whether it was a petroleum site 17 like you mentioned earlier or temperature of milk 18 site that you mentioned earlier or the monitor site, 19 01:23PM 20 right? MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 21 THE WITNESS: Correct. 22 BY MR. ADREANI: 23 And virtually every single guard who was 24 presented with that meal period waiver signed it, 25 01:23PM 132

1 Q 0h. It doesn't have to be right now. 2 Well, then let me ask then -- no problem, 3 Q and I'm sorry for talking over you. I just want to close the loop if I can really quickly on ABM 01:30PM 5 Security with regard to the meal breaks. Is it true that between mid 2013 and the 7 end of 2013 that -- you can correct me if I'm 8 wrong -- it sounds like there was a holding pattern 9 or something where no new hires were given meal 01:31PM 10 break waivers. Is that accurate? 11 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 12 THE WITNESS: I don't know if I would 13 phrase it that way. There was a -- I wouldn't say 14 there was a holding pattern. There was a hard stop. 15 01:3 PM BY MR. ADREANI: 16 17 Q Thank you. So there was a hard stop and so it would be 18 very unlike -- is it true that it would be very 19 unlikely to see a new hire between the middle of 01:31PM 20 2013 and the end who was hired by ABM Security who 21 received an on duty meal break waiver? 22 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 23 THE WITNESS: Yeah and probably closer to 24 the end, and that's probably where I may have 01:31PM 25 138

new hire packets, right? 1 Α 2 Yes. Okay. After the surveys came back, were 3 meal break waivers at any location inserted back into the new hire packets? 02:13PM 6 Α No. sir. Were meal break waivers used after the 7 Q surveys came back at any locations thereafter? 8 9 MS, SMITH: Objection to the form. THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware. 02:13PM 10 BY MR. ADREANI: 11 Okay. So from the time the surveys came 12 Q back in early 2014 until the business was moved to 13 UPS at the end of 2015, almost two years, were there 14 any new hire security guards who received a meal 02:14PM 15 16 break waiver? 17 MS, SMITH: Objection to the form. No. After the hard stop and THE WITNESS: 18 19 after the surveys, there were no newly hired 0 : 14PM 20 employees who received an on duty meal period 21 waiver, correct. 22 BY MR. ADREANI: So really as between ABM Security and ABM 23 Onsite, the hard stop at the end of 2013 was the end 24 of meal period waivers for guards at ABM, right? 02:14PM 25 155

post January 2014. 1 BY MR. ADREANI: 2 So as far as you know, in California all 4 ABM entities that had security guards no longer had meal break waivers for new hires from the end of 02: 6PM 2013 on? MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. THE WITNESS: That would be correct. 8 9 BY MR. ADREANI: Now, with regard to meal break waivers that 10 02:16PM were in existence already at the time of the hard 11 stop, were any of those subsequently terminated or 12 revoked as a result of the survey? 13 MS. SMITH: Objection as to form, and could 14 you repeat the question. 02:16PM 15 Can I have it read back. 16 17 (Record read.) MS. SMITH: Okay. I am going to object to 18 the form and I am not sure I fully understand the 19 02:17PM 20 question. 21 But if you understand it, all I would say is instruct you not to divulge any attorney/client 22 23 privilege, any information or attorney work product. 24 THE WITNESS: I am not aware of any 25 agreements that were revoked or terminated as a 02:17PM 157

I don't think we established that or if you 1 did I missed it. 2 3 Let me start over. 4 Α Okay. You have an ABM Onsite location post survey 02:48PM 5 in 2014. Okay? Two guards on duty at the same time. One guard, guard A, is a remnant guard who 7 has a meal break waiver in his file. Okay? 8 Guard B is a new hire post survey who does 9 10 02 48PM not. 11 Α Okay. Guard B definitely has to have an off duty 12 30-minute unpaid meal break, right? 13 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 14 THE WITNESS: Are we talking about a 336 02:48PM 15 type shift where it's three shifts eight hours each? 16 BY MR. ADREANI: 17 Let's say they are both full-time 18 employees. I don't know if they are eight hours or 19 7 1/2 or 8 1/2. I just want to confirm that guard B 02:49PM 20 being a full-time employee needs to have an off duty 21 30-minute unpaid meal break, right? 22 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 23 THE WITNESS: Well, I think I am confused 24 because if -- the needs of the site really dictate 02:49FM 25 170

how that works, so if you have got these two guards 1 and it's a three -- let me get my math right, 336 2 type shift where you have got two guards 24/7 3 coverage, even if they are taking an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break, it's generally paid because 02:49PM 5 that is covered in that eight-hour shift. 6 So when you say off duty unpaid meal break, 7 in practice that didn't generally happen even if 8 they may have been entitled to it but that would apply to guard A as well. 02:49PM 10 BY MR. ADREANI: 11 So both of those guards in that scenario 12 Q are being paid through their meal break? 13 Generally in this hypothetical, yes. 14 After the survey, guards that were hired, 15 02:50PM new hires at ABM Onsite after the survey were hired 16 with the understanding that they would be paid 17 through their meal break? 18 That generally was the practice, yes, 19 because of the way the accounts are set up, the way 02:50PM 20 21 the scope of work is laid out, and the shifts are generally that way, either a 168 where it's three 22 guards on a 24-hour shift, eight hours each seven 23 days a week. 24 That's pretty common, and then if you have 25 02:50PM 171

MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 1 THE WITNESS: In this hypothetical, yes, 2 they are entitled to the same thing. 3 BY MR. ADREANI: And in this hypothetical -- actually not 02:53PM 5 the hypothetical. You said that these new hires 6 were also paid for the 30 minutes. It wasn't off 7 the clock. 8 Α Correct. 9 Did ABM have any new hire guards after 2014 02 53PM 10 who had off the clock unpaid meal breaks? 11 It's possible but I am not aware of any. 12 Q You testified earlier that the guards who 13 still had the remnant meal break waivers that those 14 waivers weren't revoked or terminated, right? 02:54PM 15 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. 16 THE WITNESS: I think what I answered was 17 they weren't revoked or terminated as a result of 18 the surveys and they weren't pulled from the files. 19 BY MR. ADRÉANI: 02:54PM 20 Well, it's an agreement between -- a meal 21 break waiver is an agreement between the employee 22 23 and the employer, right? 24 Α Sure. Q It's like a contract, right? 02:54PM 25 174

policy is on meal and rest breaks. 1 And is that above-and-beyond aspect of this 2 policy in writing anywhere? 3 MS. SMITH: Objection to the form. THE WITNESS: Not that I have seen. 03:17PM 5 BY MR. ADREANI: 6 Why do you do that? 7 Why do I do what? 8 Why does ABM Onsite have this above and-9 beyond policy that's not in writing? 03:18PM 10 Practice you mean? Α 11 Sure. Practice. Q 12 I think part of it may have been at some 13 point industry-driven. I think a lot of it has to 14 do with the fact that it doesn't -- it's not 15 03:18PM detrimental to the employees. If anything, the 16 employees appreciate that they're working eight 17 hours and they can take a lunch break and they are 18 paid for that time. 19 Clients are willing to pay for a paid meal 03:18PM 20 period for the guards because they have that 24/7 21 coverage for their property. 22 So I suppose the why is multi-faceted, 23 It's something that all parties are either amenable 24 to or -- yeah. I'd say amenable is probably a good 03:18PM 25 189

ERRATA SHEET

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any changes in form or substance which you wish to make to your deposition testimony shall be entered upon the deposition transcript.

To assist you in making such corrections, please use the form below. If additional pages are necessary, please furnish them and attach them to this errata sheet.

I have read the foregoing testimony of the pages of this deposition and hereby certify it to be a true and correct transcript subject to the corrections, if any, listed below.

Page/Line Number	From	То	Reason
6:23	Kathryn Smith	Katherine Smith	Typographical error.
78:17	I believe it was late mid to late 2013.	I believe it was January 2014.	Correction to conform with later testimony.
100:7-8	Yeah. I don't know if I'd say that.	Yeah, I don't know if I'd say that.	Typographical error.
189:20-22	Clients are willing to pay for a paid meal period for the guards because they have that 24/7 coverage for their property.	Clients were willing to pay for a paid meal period for the guards because they had that 24/7 coverage for their property.	Misspoke.

X SUBJECT TO THE ABOVE CHANGES, I CERTIFY THAT THE TRANSCRIPT IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

NO CHANGE HAS BEEN MADE. I CERTIFY THAT THE TRANSCRIPT IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Nedy Warren

August 30, 2016

Date

EXHIBIT "C"

4-	A
() THE	ORIGINAL
~~~	<b>CHICHIANT</b>

Page 1

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION

VARDAN KARAPETYAN, an	)	
individual appearing		
individually and on	)	
behalf of others	)	
similarly situated,	)	
	)	No. CV 15-08313-GW (Ex)
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
ABM INDUSTRIES,	)	
INCORPORATED, a Delaware		
Corporation, et al.,		
	)	
Defendants.		
	_)	

DEPOSITION OF: VARDAN KARAPETYAN TAKEN ON: SEPTEMBER 7, 2016

REPORTED BY:
PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400



Page	2
1.	
2	DEPOSITION OF VARDAN KARAPETYAN,
3	taken on behalf of the Defendants,
4	at 333 South Grand Avenue,
5	Los Angeles, California,
6	commencing at 10:04 A.M. on
7	September 7, 2016, before
8	PATRICIA L. HUBBARD, CSR #3400, a
9	Certified Shorthand Reporter in
10	and for the State of California,
11	pursuant to Notice.
12	
13	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
14	
	For the Plaintiff:
15	
	ROXBOROUGH POMERANCE NYE & ADREANI
16	BY: MARINA N. VITEK, ESQ.
	5820 Canoga Avenue
17	Suite 250
	Woodland Hills, California 91367
18	818.992.9999
	mnv@rpnalaw.com
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



Page	38	
1	A.	Yeah.
2	Q.	What about the carpet cleaner position?
3		Why did you leave why did you leave
4	that posit	ion?
5	A.	It was hard for me physically, yeah.
6	Q.	Are you currently employed?
7	A.	Now, yes.
8	Q.	Where do you work now?
9	A.	I'm a limo service driver.
10	Q,	Who is your employer?
11	A.	Music Express.
12	Q,	Have you held any jobs since you left
13	ABM and be	fore you worked at Music Express?
14	A,	No.
15	Q.	When did you begin working at Music
16	Express?	
17	A.	Since November 2015.
18	Q.	When did you leave your employment with
19	ABM?	
20	A.	October 2013.
21	Q.	So, you were unemployed from October
22	2013 to No	ovember 2015?
23	A.	Yes.
24	Q.	Were you looking for work during that
25	time?	



	**************************************
	Page 39
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Have you ever been convicted of a crime?
3	A. No.
4	Q. Have you ever been in the military?
5	A. Two years in my country.
6	Q. When did you start working at ABM?
7	A. March 16, 2004.
8	Q. How did you learn about a potential
9	position with ABM in 2004?
10	A. I find some company who's training for
11	security job. They train me. I got security
12	card guard card, and they helped me find a job.
13	Q. And what was the name of that company?
14	A Oh, I don't know.
15	Q. You don't remember?
16	A. No.
17	Q. And, let's see. Let's do
18	MS. SMITH: Do you know where the
19	application is?
20	Here we go
21	BY MS. SMITH:
22	Q. Mr. Karapetyan, the thing I should have
23	told you before, and I apologize for not telling you
24	sooner is if you ever need to take a break
25	A. Oh, okay.



	Page 123
1	A. No. Sometimes they losing cars,
2	dealership. They came to us, say "Can you check
3	this number car, who took it and when."
4	Then we check, find who, who took the
5	car.
6	Q. What about the officer daily report?
7	Did anybody review the officer daily
8	reports regularly, if you know?
9	A. Again if something happen, only that
10	time.
11	Q. Did Oscar generally review the officer
12	daily reports?
13	A. I don't know.
14	Q. Were the officer daily reports ever
15	submitted to the branch office?
16	MS. VITEK: Calls for speculation.
17	THE WITNESS: I don't know. Usually
18	Oscar keep them. I don't know.
19	BY MS. SMITH:
20	Q. Oscar took them, you don't know
21	where he
22	A. Yeah.
23	Q. Okay. Let's see.
24	So, you described earlier that at some
25	point 2007 or 2008 the guard shack was built and you



	Page	124	
	1	were relocated to the guard shack?	
1	2	A. Yes, that's correct.	
	3	Q. And you also described that sometime in	
	4	2011 or 2012, I believe, the time sheets had extra	
	5	columns added?	
ń	6	A. Yes, correct.	
	7	Q. Is there anything else that changed	
	8	about the way you did your job between 2004 and your	
	9	last day of work?	
	10	A. Generally no.	
	11	Q. Anything specific that you can remember?	
	12	A. No. I don't remember. I don't think so	
	13	something.	
	14	Q. Do you remember when ACSS became ABM?	
	15	A. No.	
	16	Q. You don't remember that?	
	17	A. No.	
	18	Q. Did it make any any real change to	
	19	what you were doing day-to-day?	
	20	A. Nothing absolutely.	
	21	Q. Okay. Did you take vacation time when	
	22	you worked at Universal City Nissan?	
	23	A. I don't think so, no.	
	24	Q. You never took any vacation?	
	25	A. Never took, yeah.	
			0.0



Page	132
1	Q. And what did you tell him?
2	A. I said I didn't take. That's why I put
3	the "X,"
4	Q. Okay. And when did that happen?
5	A. Nothing.
6	Q. No. When that happen? When did you
7	have that conversation with Oscar?
8	A. Since we start doing this new form.
9	Q. And did you ever tell Oscar strike
10	that.
11	So the beginning of four says,
12	"By initialing the time report
13	sheet, you are certifying that this
14	is an accurate account of the hours
15	worked during this pay period. You
16	are also certifying that you had
17	the opportunity to take 30 minutes
18	of paid nonworking time that day
19	and two rest periods."
20	Did you understand did you ever
21	indicate that you had not taken rest periods on any
22	of these time sheets?
23	A. No. I said only "X." That's it.
24	Q. Okay.
25	A. That's mean I didn't take. I don't have



Page 133 time. 1 What do the -- so your -- by "X" you 2 Q. meant what? Means I didn't take meal break or rest A. 5 break. Means that. And what you told Oscar was -- when he 6 asked what the "X's" meant was what? 7 I explained him I didn't take. That's 8 why I put "X." 9 Q. You didn't take what? 10 A. Meal break or rest break. 11 Okay. What did Oscar say when you told 0. 12 him that? 13 "Please can you do that?" A. 14 I said "No." 15 Please can you do what? 16 Q. Put some time, like you took the break, A. 17 meal break. I said "No." 1.8 Did you understand him to be saying that 19 you should be taking a break or just that you should 20 21 be writing down that you took a break? You should be writing down. 22 A. He didn't expect you to actually take a 23 Q. break? 24 Well, he knows we not able to take the 25 A.



	Page	134
	1	break.
	2	Q. Did he ever tell you that, that he knows
	3	that you were not able to take a break?
	4	A. Yeah.
	5	Q. When did he tell you that?
	6	A. He knows about the same situation
	7	with him.
	8	Q. Did he ever tell you that, though, is my
	9	question?
	10	A. Yes. At that field I told.
	11	Q. When did he tell you that he knows that
	12	you can't take a break?
	13	A. Just put the time, because branch office
	14	need that.
	15	Q. Okay. But I need you to listen to my
	16	question.
	17	A. Yes.
	18	Q. And my question is when did Oscar tell
	19	you that he knows you can't take a break?
	20	A. I not remember.
	21	Q. Okay. Are you sure he told you that, or
	22	are you just assuming that he knew that?
	23	A. I think one time we had that
1	24	conversation.
1	25	Q. You just don't remember when that was?
	1	



Page 135 When that new form get out, yeah. 1 A. 2 Okay. Can we -- can you go to the other time sheet that is in this document. 3 Yeah. A. Yeah, you're at the same one that I am. Q. For the record this is a time sheet in 6 Exhibit 4 that at the top the first handwritten language is "Thursday 09/28/2006." 8 9 A. Yes. So again I just want to ask you about 10 Q. the form, because we already talked about what you 11 wrote in this. 12 Yeah. 13 A. Is this the form that you used from when 14 Q. you started at ACSS until the form changed in 2011 15 or so? 16 Yes. 17 A. And do you see at the top where it says, 18 Q. "I certify that this is an accurate 19 account of the hours worked during 20 this pay period. I also certify 21 that I have taken the rest periods 22 to which I am entitled during this 23 pay period"? 24 25 A. Yes.



## EXHIBIT "D"

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                   CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2
3
4
      VARDAN KARAPETYAN, an
       individual appearing
       individually and on behalf
5
       of others similarly situated,)
                                    )No. CV15-08313 GW (Ex)
6
                    Plaintiff,
7
      vs.
       ABM INDUSTRIES INCORPORATED, )
8
       a Delaware Corporation, ABM
       SECURITY SERVICES, INC., a
9
       California Corporation, and
       DOES 1 - 50, inclusive,
10
11
                    Defendants.
12
13
14
                   DEPOSITION OF OSCAR BEJARANO
15
                     Woodland Hills, California
16
                           July 22, 2016
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
       REPORTED BY:
24
       Lisa DiGiovanni
25 CSR No. 11969, RPR
```

1	Deposition of OSCAR BEJARANO, taken on
2	behalf of Plaintiff at 5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite
3	250, Woodland Hills, California, commencing at
4	10:02 a.m. on Friday, July 22, 2016, before
5	Lisa DiGiovanni, RPR, Certified Shorthand Reporter
6	No. 11969.
7	
8	APPEARANCES:
9	For Plaintiff Vardan Karapetyan and the Classes:
10	ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE, NYE & ADREANI LLP
11	BY: MICHAEL B. ADREANI Attorney at Law
12	5820 Canoga Avenue, Suite 250 Woodland Hills, California 91367
13	(818) 992-9999
14	
15	For Defendants ABM Industries Incorporated, a Delaware Corporation, ABM Security Services, Inc., a
16	California Corporation, ABM Onsite Services-West, Inc., a Delaware Corporation, and ABM Onsite
17	Services, Inc., a Delaware Corporation:
18	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP BY: BRADLEY J. HAMBURGER
19	Attorney at Law 333 South Grand Avenue
20	Los Angeles, California 90071-3197 (213) 229-7000
21	(213) 223 1000
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 Q. And your position at that time was security
- 2 quard?
- 3 A. Yes.
- Q. Or how did it -- or is it security officer?
- 5 A. Security officer.
- 6 Q. Okay. And at what location?
- 7 A. I used to work in different locations for
- 8 ABM when I started working for them. To be specific
- 9 where, I don't recall.
- 10 Q. When did you start working at the Universal
- 11 City Nissan location for ABM?
- 12 A. I don't recall.
- 13 Q. How many locations had you worked at for
- 14 ABM before Universal City Nissan?
- 15 A. I work on different locations.
- 16 Q. Do you recall how many?
- 17 A. I believe three, four locations.
- 18 Q. Did you work at Universal City, do you
- 19 think, for more than ten years?
- 20 A. At Universal City Nissan?
- 21 Q. Yes.
- 22 A. Probably was, like, four years, I believe,
- 23 four, five years.
- Q. So is it possibly from about 2009 until
- 25 2013?

```
1
      right?
2
          Α.
                No.
3
                You didn't have to -- you didn't do a
           Q.
      different meal break waiver document, did you?
4
5
           Α.
                No.
                You didn't get a different training
           Q.
7
       session, did you?
 8
           A.
                No.
                You didn't have to re-do your orientation,
 9
           Q.
       did you?
10
11
           Α.
                No.
12
                But what you are referring to is documents
       specific to Universal City Nissan; right?
13
14
           Α.
                Yes.
                Okay. But that didn't change who your
15
16
       employer was, did it?
17
           Α.
                No.
                Is there -- the documents you were
18
       presented, are they also referred to as post orders?
19
20
           Α.
                Yes.
21
                Okay. So the post orders at Universal City
       Nissan might be different from the post orders at
22
23
       Glendale City Center; right?
24
           Α.
                Yes.
           Q. Did you review what you would describe as
25
```

- 1 Q. And were they also the same when you
- 2 started at Universal City Nissan?
- 3 A. Can you rephrase that?
- Q. When you started at Universal City Nissan,
- 5 you were a supervisor from day one; right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And you were in charge of training new
- 8 employees; right?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. The policies and practices of ABM that you
- learned in 2001 when you were hired, were they any
- 12 different when you were training people at Universal
- 13 City Nissan in 2009?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. Were they any different when you left
- 16 Universal City Nissan in 2013?
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. And you had been training people for those
- 19 four years at Universal City Nissan?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. When you started at ABM -- at Universal
- 24 City Nissan in approximately 2009, how many guards
- 25 worked at that location?

```
1 let the employees know about their rights.
          Q. And were you -- it was part of your
2
      training -- right? That you received to become a
3
      supervisor?
5
          Α.
               Can you be ...
               Strike that. You can forget that question.
6
          Q.
               So in addition to knowing that they would
7
      be on duty during their meal breaks, you would also
      tell them where to take their meal breaks; right?
          Α.
               Yes.
10
               And that was in the shack?
          Q.
11
               Yes.
12
          Α.
               And the same for rest breaks; right?
13
          Q.
14
          Α.
               Yes.
                During the time that they were on their
15
           Q.
       meal breaks, was there anything different -- other
16
       than the 30 minutes versus the 10 minutes --
17
       anything different about the meal breaks and the
18
       rest breaks?
19
           Α.
20
               No.
           Q. And that was the same for all shifts,
21
       again; right?
22
23
           A. For all shifts.
```

Q. For all four years you were there; right?

24

25

Α.

Yes.

```
1 Q. Now, what was expected -- other than the
```

- ability to have their lunch in the shack at that
- 3 time -- what else was expected of the guards during
- 4 their meal breaks?
- 5 A. Can you be more specific?
- 6 Q. Well, they were still watching out for
- 7 customers; right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. They were still remaining vigilant to what
- 10 was going on around them; right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. They were still doing all of the other jobs
- associated with their security guard title; right?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Okay. That's the same for meal breaks and
- 16 rest breaks; right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And that's the same for all three shifts;
- 19 right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. That's the same for all four years that you
- 22 were there?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Are you in contact with Mr. Karapetyan?
- 25 A. No.

- while guards were on their meal breaks, they were
- 2 supposed to remain vigilant; right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. They were supposed to still take care of
- 5 the customers coming and going; right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And that was an expectation of ABM; right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And that's the same for rest breaks, isn't
- 10 it?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. So isn't it true that the guards were doing
- 13 things that security guards do during their meal
- 14 breaks and rest breaks?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 MR. KEARNAGHAN: Calls for speculation outside
- 17 his own personal experience. You didn't lay the
- 18 foundation as to others.
- 19 Q. BY MR. ADREANI: Well, let's assume that
- we're talking about your personal experience.
- 21 That's the same answer?
- MR. KEARNAGHAN: Incomplete hypothetical.
- MR. ADREANI: It's your objection.
- MR. KEARNAGHAN: Right. But then you're saying
- 25 "you assume," so you're presenting a hypothetical to

# EXHIBIT "E"

#### CERTIFIED COPY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JENNIFER AUGUSTUS,	)
PLAINTIFF,	)
$V_{\cdot \epsilon}$	) ) CASE NO. BC 336416
AMERICAN COMMERCIAL SECURITY SERVICES, WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY OF ABM INDUST INC.; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE,	,
DEFENDAN'	rs. ) )

#### **VOLUME ONE**

DEPOSITION OF: <u>FRED SETAYESH</u>
TAKEN: WEDNESDAY, MAY 7TH, 2008

Dalene Court Reporters

16161 Ventura Boulevard, #734 Encino, Galifornia 91436 Telephone: 661.726.0584

Reported By: Magdalone S. Puente CSR 8498



### Case 2:15-cv-08313-GW-E Document 74-1 Filed 06/07/17 Page 101 of 104 Page ID #:2804

DEPOSITION OF FRED SETAYESH, V. 1 1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 3 4 5 JENNIFER AUGUSTUS, 6 PLAINTIFF, 7 V. NO. BC 336416 AMERICAN COMMERCIAL, SECURITY SERVICES, A WHOLLY OWNED 9 SUBSIDIARY OF ABM INDUSTRIES, INC.; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, 10 INCLUSIVE, 11 DEFENDANTS. 12 13 14 15 16 17 DEPOSITION OF FRED SETAYESH, TAKEN 18 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF, AT 19 5820 CANOGA AVENUE, SUITE 250, 20 WOODLAND HILLS, CALIFORNIA, COMMENÇING 21 AT 10:04 A.M., WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2008, 22 BEFORE MAGDALENE S. PUENTE, CSR 8498. 23 24 25

DEPOSITION OF FRED SETAYESH, V. 1_ APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: 2 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: 3 ROXBOROUGH, POMERANCE & NYE, LLP BY: MARINA VITEK, ESQ. 5 5820 CANOGA AVENUE SUITE 250 WOODLAND HILLS, CALIFORNIA 91367 6 818.992.9999 7 8 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: LITTLER MENDELSON, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 9 BY: DOMINIC J. MESSIHA, ESQ. 2049 CENTURY PARK EAST 10 5TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067-3107 11 310.553.0308 12 13 ALSO PRESENT: 14 MATTHEW BAINER, ESQ. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

DEPOSITION OF FRED SETAYESH, V. 1 IN HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT. THEY'RE IN A PARKING LOT. 1 SO SO THAT IS THE FLEXIBILITY THEY HAVE TO TAKE IT 2 AS THEY THINK IT'S -- IT'S PROPER. 3 Ο. OKAY. 4 A. OR THEY NEED IT. SOMETIMES THE PERSON, MAYBE 5 THEY HAVE SOMETHING THAT THEY NEED TO USE THE RESTROOM, 6 FOR EXAMPLE, NOW OR THEY WANT TO MAYBE TAKE IT LATER 7 OR == 8 SO IT'S --9 Ο. A. IT COULD VARY. 10 SO IT'S YOUR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE SECURITY 11 GUARDS ARE TAKING REST BREAKS ON AN IRREGULAR BASIS 12 DURING THEIR SHIFT WHILE STILL CONSCIOUS OF THEIR JOB 13 REOUIREMENTS? 14 IN OTHER WORDS, YOU SAID THEY'RE NOT ENTIRELY 15 RELIEVED OF ALL THEIR JOB DUTIES BUT THEY ARE RECEIVING 16 THEIR REST BREAKS; IS THAT ACCURATE? 1.7 I SAID THEY'RE NOT RELIEVED FROM ALL DUTIES, 18 A. BUT THEY ARE - THEY CAN TAKE THEIR BREAKS. 19 AND THAT APPLIES FOR REST BREAKS AND MEAL 20 Ο, 21 BREAKS? CORRECT. Α. 22 MS. VITEK: WE'VE BEEN GOING FOR ABOUT ANOTHER 23 HOUR. DO YOU WANT TO TAKE A SHORT BREAK? DO YOU WANT 2.4 TO TAKE A LUNCH BREAK? 25

DEPOSITION OF FRED SETAYESH, V. 1 TO A CERTAIN LOCATION? 1 Α. NO. Q. OKAY. DO THE OFFICER -- SECURITY OFFICERS 3 CONTINUE TO PERFORM -- STRIKE THAT. 4 5 PREVIOUSLY YOU SAID THAT SOME OF THE DUTIES OF THE SECURITY OFFICERS ARE PERFORMED CONTINUOUSLY EVEN 6 7 WHILE TAKING REST BREAKS; CORRECT? R A. I SAID THEY WILL NOT BE RELIEVED FROM ALL 9 DUTIES. OKAY. AND WHAT ARE THE DUTIES THAT THEY ARE 10 Q. 11 NOT RELIEVED OF? FOR EXAMPLE, IF THEY HAVE A RADIO, THEY WANT 12 13 TO HAVE THE RADIO ON WHILE THEY'RE HAVING THEIR MEAL; IF THEY HAVE A CELL PHONE, A PAGER, IF THERE IS AN 14 15 EMERGENCY OR SITUATION JUST HAPPEN TO HAPPEN AT THAT 16 MOMENT, THE PERSON CAN ASSIST THE BUILDING OPERATING 17 STAFF AND THEN GO BACK AND FINISH HIS OR HER BREAK. Q. AND IS THAT TRUE FOR OFFICERS AT THE LOCATIONS 18 19 WITH MULTIPLE OFFICERS WHICH ARE NOT LISTED IN THE 20 APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION? 21 A. I WOULD SAY IT VARY BECAUSE IT DEPENDS OF THE 22 NUMBER OF THE MULTI OFFICERS. IF THERE IS 23 I CAN GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE IF YOU WANT ME TO. O. YES, PLEASE. 24 25 Α. YOU REFER TO THE BLUE CROSS HERE, THE PROJECT