

KALIELGOLD PLLC
Jeffrey D. Kalief (SBN 238293)
1100 15th Street NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 280-4783
jkaliel@kaliellpllc.com

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
6/24/2026 5:28 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By S. Trinh, Deputy Clerk

KALIELGOLD PLLC
Sophia G. Gold (SBB 307971)
490 43rd Street, No. 122
Oakland, CA 94609
Telephone: (202) 350-4783
sgold@kalielgold.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

CHARLES WANG, MARILEE
BOGAERT, ROBERT ALLAN PERKINS,
JR., CARISSA RECCO, CHRISTINE BAK,
DENISE SZNITKO, and JESSE STOUT, on
behalf of themselves and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GRUBHUB, INC., and DOES 1-50,
inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 23STCV24118
Assigned to: Hon. Timothy Patrick Dillon
Dept. 15

**DECLARATION OF BRIAN YOUNG
REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF
NOTICE**

**[Notice of Motion; Supplemental
Memorandum of Points and Authorities;
[Proposed] Order filed concurrently
herewith]**

**Hearing Date: August 10, 2026
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Department: 15**

Complaint Filed: October 10, 2024
Trial Date: None

DECLARATION OF BRIAN YOUNG

I, Brian Young, hereby declare and state as follows:

1. I am a Senior Project Manager employed by Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”), the Court-appointed Settlement Administrator for the above captioned case. I have more than 8 years of experience managing all aspects of settlement administration.

2. The statements in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge and information provided to me by my colleagues in the ordinary course of business, and if called upon, I could and would testify competently thereto.

3. I submit this Declaration to advise the Parties and the Court regarding the implementation of the Court-approved Notice Program.

4. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order entered on January 12, 2026, Epiq was appointed as the Class Action Settlement Administrator to provide notice and claims administration services including dissemination of notice, administration of the Settlement Website and toll-free phone number, processing Claim Forms, tracking requests for exclusion and objections, performing Settlement Award calculations, and issuing related email notifications.

INITIAL SETTLEMENT CLASS LIST

5. For purposes of administering the Settlement, on January 26, 2026, Defendant provided Epiq with a single electronic file containing the Settlement Class List, which included 6,913,105 rows of data for potential Settlement Class Member records. The file included, where available, Settlement Class Members' names, mailing addresses, and email addresses.

6. Epiq loaded the data into a secure database created for the administration of the Settlement and assigned unique identifiers to each record to track them throughout the administration process. After performing deduplication and hygiene on the potential Settlement Class Member records, Epiq determined that there were 6,870,678 unique Class Member account records included in the Settlement Class List.

- 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
- 27
- 28

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

27

11. Before dissemination of the Notice, Epiq established a dedicated post office box for Settlement Class Members to contact Epiq by mail with any specific requests or questions.

SUPPLEMENTAL SETTLEMENT CLASS LIST

12. After the Parties informed Epiq that certain Class Member records had been inadvertently omitted from the Initial Settlement Class List, Defendant provided Epiq with a new electronic file on April 21, 2026, for purposes of administering the Settlement. The new file included 9,708,130 rows of data for potential Settlement Class Member records and, where available, Settlement Class Members' names, mailing addresses, and email addresses.

13. Epiq loaded the new data into a secure database for analysis and, after identifying records that were also included in the Initial Settlement Class List, determined that there remained 2,843,169 rows of data for new potential Settlement Class Member records. After performing deduplication and hygiene on the potential Settlement Class Member records, Epiq determined that there were 2,794,700 unique new Class Member account records included in the Supplemental Settlement Class List.

14. Epiq loaded the new unique Class Member account records into the existing secure database created for the administration of the Settlement and, consistent with the initial records, assigned unique identifiers to each record to track them throughout the administration process.

Dissemination of the Updated Notice to New Class Members by Electronic Mail

15. Pursuant to the Court's Amended Order Amending Preliminary Approval Order and Resetting Fairness Hearing, entered on May 5, 2026, Epiq updated the previously Court-approved Electronic Mail Notice to include the June 23, 2026, deadline to request exclusion from or object to the Settlement, the August 7, 2026, Claims Deadline, and the Final Approval Hearing date of August 10, 2026. Epiq disseminated the updated Electronic Mail Notice to new Class Members for whom a valid email address was provided. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a template of the Notice sent to the new Class Members via email.

16. The Supplemental Electronic Mail Notice campaign commenced on May 7, 2026, during which, after excluding 123,836 invalid email addresses from dissemination, Epiq sent a total

1 of 2,670,864 Electronic Mail Notices. As part of standard notice procedures, Epiq conducted up to
2 3 additional follow-up email transmissions to addresses that were not successfully noticed, resulting
3 in a total of 414,911 re-email attempts. After all attempts, a total of 2,249,999 Electronic Mail
4 Notices were successfully sent without being returned as undeliverable.

5 ***Settlement Website Updates***

6 17. On May 6, 2026, Epiq updated the Settlement Website to reflect the updated deadlines
7 to request exclusion from or object to the Settlement, the updated deadline to file a Claim, and the
8 Final Approval Hearing date on the home page and within the frequently asked questions. The claim
9 filing module was reset to allow Claims to continue to be filed through the updated August 7, 2026,
10 deadline to file a Claim, and the May 5, 2026, Amended Order Amending Preliminary Approval
11 Order and Resetting Fairness Hearing was added to the Important Documents section of the
12 Settlement Website.

13 18. As of June 23, 2026, the Settlement Website received 207,888 unique visitors and
14 587,265 total page views. Epiq will continue to maintain and update the Settlement Website
15 throughout the Settlement administration period.

16 ***Toll-Free Number Updates***

17 19. On May 6, 2026, Epiq updated the toll-free FAQ to reflect the updated deadlines to
18 request exclusion from or object to the Settlement, the updated deadline to file a Claim, and the
19 Final Approval Hearing date. As of June 23, 2026, the toll-free phone number had received 1,123
20 calls totaling 2,213 minutes. Epiq will continue to maintain and update the line throughout the
21 administration of the Settlement.

22 ***Status of Claims Process***

23 20. The updated deadline for Settlement Class Members to file a Claim is August 7, 2026.
24 As of June 23, 2026, Epiq has received 72,355 Claims from Initial Settlement Class Members and
25 31,881 Claims from Supplemental Settlement Class Members, resulting in a total of 104,236 Claims
26 received through the Claims Process. Because the Claims Deadline has not passed, the current Claim
27 count is preliminary and remains subject to continued processing, reconciliation, and audit by Epiq.
28

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
27
28

Requests for Exclusion and Objections

21. As of June 23, 2026, Epiq has received 11 timely and 1 late Objection from Initial Settlement Class Members prior to the expiration of the original Objection/Exclusion Deadline on March 30, 2026. Epiq has also received 3 Objections from Supplemental Settlement Class Members. Epiq will continue to receive and process Objections from Supplemental Settlement Class Members through the June 23, 2026, deadline to object to the Settlement.

22. A summary table and copy of all Objections submitted are attached hereto as Exhibit C.

23. As of June 23, 2026, Epiq has received 10 timely and 1 late request for exclusion from Initial Settlement Class Members prior to the expiration of the original Objection/Exclusion Deadline on March 30, 2026. Epiq has also received 6 requests for exclusion from Supplemental Settlement Class Members. Epiq will continue to receive and process requests for exclusion from Supplemental Settlement Class Members through the June 23, 2026, deadline to opt out of the Settlement.

24. A list of individuals who submitted a Request for Exclusion is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

25. Epiq will provide a supplemental declaration by August 14, 2026, with an update on the status of the activities documented in this Declaration.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed June 23, 2026.



BRIAN YOUNG

EXHIBIT A

If you made a food delivery order and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California, you may be entitled to an award from a class action settlement.

A state court has authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

Use your Claim ID Number <<UniqueID>> to file an easy online claim [here](#).

What is this About? A Settlement has been reached to resolve a class action lawsuit against Grubhub Inc. (“Grubhub” or “Defendant”), relating to allegations that Grubhub made false or misleading representations regarding delivery fees, service fees, and menu prices on orders made between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California. Grubhub denies these allegations and denies any wrongdoing. The Court has not decided who is right. Instead, the parties have agreed to the Settlement.

Who is included? You received this email because Grubhub provided information under the Settlement indicating you likely are a Class Member. You are a Settlement Class Member if you ordered and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California.

What does the Settlement Provide? As a Settlement Class Member, you can file a Claim to receive a Settlement Award in the form of a \$10.00 Grubhub site credit for use on the Grubhub App or website.

How To Get Benefits. You can use your Claim ID number shown at the top of this email to file your claim online [here](#) at the settlement website, www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. The deadline to file a claim online is **11:59 p.m. PST on May 12, 2026**. You must file a claim to receive a Settlement Award.

Your Other Options. If you do not want to be legally bound by the Settlement, you must exclude yourself by **March 30, 2026**. If you do not exclude yourself, you will release your claims against Grubhub. You may object to the Settlement by **March 30, 2026**. The Long Form Notice available on the website explains how to exclude yourself or object. The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing on **April 29, 2026**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, up to \$1,000,000 for attorneys’ fees, plus litigation costs, incentive awards of up to \$1,000 each for the Class Representatives, as well as any objections. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you do not have to. For more information, visit www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. You may also call 1-877-522-2081.

EXHIBIT B

If you made a food delivery order and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California, you may be entitled to an award from a class action settlement.

A state court has authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

Use your Claim ID Number <<UniqueID>> to file an easy online claim [here](#).

What is this About? A Settlement has been reached to resolve a class action lawsuit against Grubhub Inc. (“Grubhub” or “Defendant”), relating to allegations that Grubhub made false or misleading representations regarding delivery fees, service fees, and menu prices on orders made between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California. Grubhub denies these allegations and denies any wrongdoing. The Court has not decided who is right. Instead, the parties have agreed to the Settlement.

Who is included? You received this email because Grubhub provided information under the Settlement indicating you likely are a Class Member. You are a Settlement Class Member if you ordered and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California.

What does the Settlement Provide? As a Settlement Class Member, you can file a Claim to receive a Settlement Award in the form of a \$10.00 Grubhub site credit for use on the Grubhub App or website.

How To Get Benefits. You can use your Claim ID number shown at the top of this email to file your claim online [here](#) at the settlement website, www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. The deadline to file a claim online is **11:59 p.m. PST on August 7, 2026**. You must file a claim to receive a Settlement Award.

Your Other Options. If you do not want to be legally bound by the Settlement, you must exclude yourself by **June 23, 2026**. If you do not exclude yourself, you will release your claims against Grubhub. You may object to the Settlement by **June 23, 2026**. The [Long Form Notice](#) available on the website explains how to exclude yourself or object. The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing on **August 10, 2026**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, up to \$1,000,000 for attorneys’ fees, plus litigation costs, incentive awards of up to \$1,000 each for the Class Representatives, as well as any objections. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you do not have to. For more information, visit www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. You may also call 1-877-522-2081.

EXHIBIT C



Wang v Grubhub
Objection Report
Report Date: 6/23/2026

Objection Status	Tracking Number	Settlement Class List	First Name	Last Name	Address 1	Address 2	City	State/Territory	Zipcode	Country
LATE	413846	INITIAL	JILLIAN	AMBLER	61 PRISM		IRVINE	CA	92618-3148	US
TIMELY	888287	INITIAL	BENJAMIN	WEINSHEL	5032 FORBES	AVE # 1040	PITTSBURGH	PA	15289	US
TIMELY	1518267	INITIAL	BEE	BLACK	12501 W 6TH AVE	APT C201	AIRWAY HEIGHTS	WA	99001-9124	US
TIMELY	1524472	INITIAL	ERIC	ROSEN	801 28 AVENUE		SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94121	US
TIMELY	1654654	INITIAL	RICHARD	MARKUSON	419 NASCA WAY		SACRAMENTO	CA	95831	US
TIMELY	2278939	INITIAL	STEPHEN	CROFT	UNIVERSITY DR	OUTSIDE CAMPBELL HALL	BERKELEY	CA	94720	US
TIMELY	4122329	INITIAL	DANIEL	TOM	14959 CROSBY ST		SAN LEANDRO	CA	94579-1461	US
TIMELY	4351646	INITIAL	JAMES	SNIDER	206 UCLID AVE	402	LONG BEACH	CA	90803	US
TIMELY	4382255	INITIAL	APRIL	MEYER	8908 KIEFER BLVD		SACRAMENTO	CA	95826	US
TIMELY	4655029	INITIAL	PAVLO	ASTASHONOK	9023 FORBES AVE		NORTHBRIDGE	CA	91343	US
TIMELY	4829228	INITIAL	ALMA	SHUMAKE	2955 SADDLEWOOD DR		BONITA	CA	91902-2001	US
TIMELY	6912686	INITIAL	CEJI	BOURGEOIS	7381 LA TIJERA BLVD	UNIT 45663	LOS ANGELES	CA	90045	US
TIMELY	7604131	SUPPLEMENTAL	SAMUEL	GOLDSTONE	5365 ROD CT	UNIT 101	LAS VEGAS	NV	89122	US
TIMELY	9414263	SUPPLEMENTAL	JOSEPH	PLANTE	1317 POPLAR AVE		SUNNYVALE	CA	94087	US
TIMELY	9643929	SUPPLEMENTAL	ARTHUR	MATEOS	1390 VETERAN AVE	APT 3	LOS ANGELES	CA	90024	US

I am Jillian Ambler and I am a Settlement Class Member of Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No.

23STCV24118. My address is 61 Prism, Irvine CA 92618 and my telephone number is 310-847-9791.

I object to the settlement. A payout does not prevent false or misleading representations.

If a payout is made, however, it should not be in the form of credit for Grubhub's own service. The members of the settlement class won't be able to use this \$10 credit without giving more than \$10 to Grubhub. This can be evidenced by attempting to order food (or other product) priced under or up to \$10.

Simply, any usage of the credit will cost the consumer more than \$10. Thus, this credit form is actually a benefit to Grubhub.

The Court should deny approval of the Settlement, continue the lawsuit, and decide.

I do not intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing.

I have made no other objections in the last 10 years.

I have included a receipt from June 1, 2025 as proof I am a member in the Settlement Class.

I have moved addresses since the date of the receipt, but I lived in California then and live in California now.

- Jillian Ambler

Ike's Love & Sandwiches

Estimated Delivery

1:47pm - 1:57pm

Ike's Love & Sandwiches

606 W Huntington Dr (626) 249-3350

Delivery (ASAP) to:
jillian a,
2373 E Villa St Pasadena, CA
91107
(310) 847-9791

Delivery instructions

Utensil and napkin preference

Yes, include utensils, napkins,
etc.

Contact-free delivery

Drop-off location

Front door of my house/apartment unit

Notification

Text me

leave on top black table up front stairs

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

[Print receipt](#)

Order #62913000-8494988

Jun 1, 2025 1:08pm

1301. VEGAN HANDSOME OWL

\$17.85

SOURDOUGH, Lettuce, Tomato, Red Onion, Pickles, Banana Peppers, NO Wasabi Mayo, LIGHT Vegan
Dirty Sauce

SOURDOUGH, NO VEGGIES, NO Vegan Dirty, Avocado, Mushrooms

Items subtotal
\$41.40
Delivery fee
\$0.00
Service fee
\$6.21
Sales tax
\$5.30
Driver tip
\$2.00
Driver Benefits Fee
\$3.00

Total

\$57.91


•••• 9084
Need help?

Jillian Ambler
61 Prism
Irvine CA 92618

SANTA ANA CA 926
26 MAY 2026 PM 4 L



Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



Benjamin Weinshel
5032 Forbes Ave # 1040
Pittsburgh PA 15289

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

March 11, 2026

Subject: Objection to Settlement for Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118

To whom it may concern:

I write to object to the settlement in Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118.

I am a member of the Settlement Class, having ordered items on GrubHub for delivery in California between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026. I have enclosed an order confirmation for an order dated Nov 4, 2022 to demonstrate my membership in the class.

I do not believe that the proposed "coupon settlement" is fair, reasonable, and adequate for class members. This is a "pure coupon settlement" as defined in *Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.*, 162 Cal. App. 4th 43, 53 (2008): class members receive a coupon that partly defrays the cost of making a new purchase from the defendant, which "may actually produce a net benefit for the defendant." Unlike in *Chavez*, where class members received a free month of service without being required to make a new purchase, class members must spend additional money with GrubHub to realize any value from the settlement. As such, in effect, this settlement benefits GrubHub more than the class, as class members would be required to generate more revenue for GrubHub to make use of the settlement.

The actual value to class members of the proposed settlement is smaller than \$10. In the purchase confirmation enclosed, I paid a \$5.02 "service fee" and \$1.00 "driver benefits fee". If I was to use the proposed settlement coupon to pay for that order, over 60% of the proposed settlement amount would go back to GrubHub in the form of fees, in addition to any commission charged on the item price. I would prefer a cash (or cash equivalent) payment, even if it was a smaller amount (i.e., I would prefer a \$5.00 cash payment to a \$10.00 coupon).

I do not intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing or call any persons in support of my objection. I have not filed any objections to other class action settlements in the last ten years.


Benjamin Weinshel

Claim ID number 96E6P2P377
5032 Forbes Ave # 1040
Pittsburgh PA 15289
(952) 423-6369

Enclosures:
Order confirmation dated Nov 4, 2022

1 [REDACTED]	\$10.99
Items subtotal	\$33.46
Service fee	\$5.02
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Sales tax	\$3.36
Tip	\$3.00
Grubhub+ — Free Delivery	Free delivery
Total charge	\$45.84
Payment Method	
GH+ Free Delivery, Credit Card - [REDACTED]	\$49.33

Grubhub Guarantee

We've got your back.
Find a lower price?
Order arrived late?

[Let us know](#)



Unlock unlimited \$0 delivery fees

Grubhub+ makes ordering
from your faves even better.

[Learn more](#)



Track your order with the app:



Any changes you make to your order after it has been placed may result in additional charges.

To provide the best experience, we add a commission fee to restaurants for our services.


We sent you this email to give you the latest information about your Grubhub order. Please don't reply to this email.

Need more help? Check out our FAQs.

© 2021 Grubhub Inc.
111 W. Washington St., Suite 2100,
Chicago, IL, 60602, USA

Thanks for your [redacted] order

From: Grubhub <orders@eat.grubhub.com>
Reply-To: orders@eat.grubhub.com
To: grubhub@mail.weinshel.net
Subject: Thanks for your [redacted] order
Date: Friday, November 04, 2022 11:14 PM
Size: 37 KB



Thank you for ordering, Ben

Your delivery order from [redacted] is being prepared. Your food should arrive between 8:54pm – 9:04pm.

Track your order

[redacted]

Total: \$45.84

Ordered: Nov 04, 2022 8:14:24pm
Order number: #36162061-3942210
Contact Restaurant: [redacted]

 Delivery to

Ben W
[redacted] San Francisco, CA
[redacted]

1	[redacted]	\$5.49
1	[redacted]	\$2.99
1	[redacted]	\$13.99

5032 Furber Ave #640
Pittsburgh PA 15284

PITTSBURGH PA 150
11 MAR 2026 PM 2 L



Roy Lichtenstein

Grub Hub Ouliny Fee Settlement Objections
PO Box 2349
Portland OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



3/11

To Wang et al v Grubhub, Inc

I would like to object to this settlement, my account was hacked & Grubhub did not help me with my account recovery as well as - I do not believe this is fair I can't use a 10\$ voucher.
Thank you.

I.D. #67QFF26966

Bee Black

BiaBluck@gmail.com



Brittney Black
12501 W 6Th Ave Apt C201
Airway Hgts WA 99001-9124

SPOKANE WA 990

18 MAR 2026 PM 3 L



Grubhub Delivery Fee
Settlement Administrator
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR
97208-2349

97208-234949



Eric H. Rosen
801 28 Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121

February 21, 2026

Class Action Administrator
GrubHub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
Portland, OR
P.O. Box 97208-2349

Class Action Claim ID Number TA9273C744

To whom it may concern regarding the lawsuit Wang et. al. V. Grubhub Inc. Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles case number 23STCV24118.

My full name is Eric Harris Rosen. I live at 801 28th Ave., San Francisco, CA 94121-3553. My cell phone number is 650-438-4008.

I would like to object to the GrubHub settlement on the grounds that the compensation is inadequate in relation to the actual value of the economic damage done to me by GrubHub through fraudulent credit card charges. Between April 2022 - February 2023 I received recurring charges for \$10.86 on the 4th of each month for membership in a frequent buyers club which I was totally unaware of and did not wish to participate in which totaled \$130.32 in credit card charges to my visa card from Grubhub, Inc.

I would like to submit as evidence bank statements that the fraudulent charges were made dating from between April 2022 - February 2023.

I, Eric Harris Rosen am the sole party to this objection.

I would be willing to appear in a court to testify against Grubhub, Inc.

I have never filed a class action lawsuit before.

My Claim ID Number is TA9273C744.

Kind Regards,



Eric Rosen
801 28 Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
United States
+1 (415) 387-0517

Acct# S/L ID	Posting Date	Effective Date	Category	Source	Tran/Adj	Description	Gross Amount	New Balance
 0000116563 L 0092	03/10/2023	03/10/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBCINDERELLABAKE GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2530	41.05	652.97
0000116563 L 0092	03/04/2023	03/04/2023	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN8300	10.86	568.35
 0000116563 L 0092	02/15/2023	02/15/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBCINDERELLABAKE GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	28.57	1,522.42
0000116563 L 0092	02/04/2023	02/04/2023	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	1,914.37
 0000116563 L 0092	02/03/2023	02/03/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBHUMMUSBODEGA GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2530	33.01	1,903.51
 0000116563 L 0092	01/17/2023	01/17/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBCINDERELLABAKE GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN8100	30.56	1,839.61
 0000116563 L 0092	01/16/2023	01/16/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBHONGKONGLOUNGE GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN8100	45.22	1,451.67
 0000116563 L 0092	01/15/2023	01/15/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBDRAGONBEAUX GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2530	39.02	835.97
 0000116563 L 0092	01/06/2023	01/06/2023	Advance	Credit card		GRUBHUBDRAGONBEAUX GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	39.02	287.01
0000116563 L 0092	01/04/2023	01/04/2023	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	190.40
0000116563 L 0092	12/04/2022	12/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	10.86
0000116563 L 0092	11/04/2022	11/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN8100	10.86	10.86
0000116563 L 0092	10/04/2022	10/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	10.86
0000116563 L 0092	09/04/2022	09/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN8300	10.86	1,428.30
0000116563 L 0092	08/04/2022	08/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	1,254.98
0000116563 L 0092	07/04/2022	07/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	969.47
0000116563 L 0092	06/04/2022	06/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	1,250.32
0000116563 L 0092	05/04/2022	05/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	1,357.61
0000116563 L 0092	04/04/2022	04/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.86	1,415.23
0000116563 L 0092	03/04/2022	03/04/2022	Advance	Bill payment		GRUBHUBGHPLUS GRUBHUB.COM NY MCC 5812 Terminal IN2510	10.94	1,440.44

Eric Rosen
801 28th Avenue #104
San Francisco, CA 94121

SAN FRANCISCO CA 940

23 FEB 2026 PM 2 L



Class Action Settlement Administrator
grubhub delivery Settlement objections
P.O. Box portland, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



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

WANG et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

GRUBHUB, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 23STCV24118

**OBJECTION OF RICHARD MARKUSON TO
PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Objector: Richard Markuson (Pro Se)
Address: 419 Nasca Way Sacramento, CA 95831
Telephone: 916 798 8826

Date: February 21, 2026

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.

This settlement presents the classic warning signs of a coupon-based, claims-made resolution that risks delivering minimal real value to the class while supporting a substantial fee request.

Los Angeles County Superior Court
Case No. 23STCV24118

Mailed To:
Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

I. OBJECTOR INFORMATION

Name: Richard Markuson
Address: 419 Nasca Way Sacramento, CA 95831
Telephone: (916) 538-2360

I am a member of the Settlement Class and submit this objection pro se.

II. STATEMENT OF OBJECTION

I respectfully object to final approval of the proposed settlement because it is not fair, reasonable, or adequate under California law¹. The settlement provides only coupon-style relief of questionable value to class members while permitting class counsel to seek a substantial cash fee. This is precisely the type of settlement structure that courts are required to scrutinize with the “highest level of vigilance.”

III. GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION

¹ See *In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litigation* (9th Cir. 2011) 654 F.3d 935, 946–947 (courts must apply heightened scrutiny where settlement structure raises signs of self-interest); *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 130 (trial court must independently evaluate the realistic value of the settlement to the class).

A. The Settlement Is a Classic Coupon Settlement Providing Illusory Relief

The settlement offers class members only a **\$10 Grubhub site credit**, which operates as a coupon settlement in substance and effect.

Courts have repeatedly warned that coupon settlements are disfavored because they often:

- Inflate the apparent value of relief
- Produce substantial breakage
- Require class members to spend additional money
- Function primarily as a marketing tool for the defendant

See:

- *In re HP Inkjet Printer Litig.*, 716 F.3d 1173 (9th Cir. 2013)
- 28 U.S.C. § 1712
- *Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 130 (court must independently assess actual value)

The proposed Grubhub credit:

- Requires a future purchase
- Is not cash
- Is not freely transferable
- May expire or be subject to restrictions
- Likely cannot be used without paying additional delivery and service fees

This structure strongly suggests the relief is **promotional rather than compensatory**, and therefore of substantially diminished value to the class.

B. The Settlement Fails to Disclose the True Economic Value to the Class

California courts require the trial court to understand the **actual value** of the settlement to the class before granting approval. *Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 133.

Here, the settlement materials fail to provide critical information, including:

- Expected redemption rate of the credits
- Historical redemption data for similar Grubhub credits
- Estimated aggregate value actually expected to reach class members
- Breakage assumptions

Without this data, the Court cannot determine whether the settlement provides meaningful relief or merely the **appearance of relief**.

Courts have rejected settlements where the theoretical maximum value is inflated but the expected realized value is minimal. See *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 944–47.

C. The Settlement Appears Designed to Drive Future Purchases Rather Than Compensate Past Harm

The proposed relief appears structured to:

- Bring customers back to the Grubhub platform
- Generate additional paid orders
- Offset the cost of the settlement through future revenue

Courts have cautioned that such arrangements may primarily benefit the defendant rather than the class. See *HP Inkjet*, 716 F.3d at 1178.

In practical terms, many class members will receive **zero real economic benefit** unless they make additional purchases they otherwise would not have made.

D. The Disproportionate Attorneys' Fee Request Triggers Heightened Scrutiny

Class Counsel intends to seek up to **\$1,000,000 in attorneys' fees and costs**, paid separately by Grubhub.

While labeled as separate, courts recognize that such “clear sailing” arrangements are a recognized warning sign of potential self-dealing. *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 947.

The warning signs present here include:

- Coupon-style class relief
- Substantial cash fee request
- No meaningful cash recovery for the class
- Likely low redemption value

California courts require “heightened scrutiny” where these indicators appear. *Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 130.

The Court should carefully examine whether the settlement disproportionately benefits counsel relative to the class.

E. The Absence of a Cash Option Underscores the Settlement's Inadequacy

The settlement provides **no cash alternative** for class members.

Courts evaluating coupon settlements frequently look for:

- Cash options
- Automatic payments
- Unrestricted credits

The absence of any cash election strongly suggests the relief was structured for defendant convenience rather than class compensation.

F. Incentive Awards Require Careful Examination

The proposed **\$1,000 service awards** to each class representative should be closely scrutinized to ensure they did not create incentives to accept a settlement that provides minimal value to absent class members.

See *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 947.

G. The Claims-Made Structure and \$5 Million Cap Further Undermine the Settlement's Value

The settlement is structured as a **claims-made process** under which class members must submit a claim to receive relief, and the total value of Settlement Awards is capped at \$5,000,000. The notice further provides that if valid claims exceed the cap, individual awards will be **reduced pro rata**.

This structure raises several serious fairness concerns.

First, claims-made settlements routinely produce low participation rates, which can dramatically reduce the actual value delivered to the class. Courts have repeatedly recognized that claims-made structures—particularly when combined with non-cash relief—require careful scrutiny. See *In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litigation*, 654 F.3d 935, 947 (9th Cir. 2011).

Second, the pro rata reduction provision creates uncertainty and potential dilution of relief. Class members are told they will receive a \$10 credit, yet the settlement expressly contemplates that the amount may be reduced. This further diminishes the already modest value of the relief.

Third, the combination of:

- claims-made participation requirements,
- non-cash coupon relief, and

- a hard aggregate cap

creates a substantial risk that the **actual realized value to the class will be far below the headline amount**.

California courts require trial courts to evaluate the **realistic value of the settlement**, not the theoretical maximum. *Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.*, 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 130 (2008).

Here, the record as presented to class members does not disclose:

- the expected claims rate,
- the projected aggregate payout, or
- the expected average recovery per class member after dilution.

Without this information, the Court cannot fulfill its independent duty to determine whether the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

IV. TESTIMONY

I do not intend to call any witnesses.

V. APPEARANCE AT FAIRNESS HEARING

I do **not** intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing.

VI. PROOF OF CLASS MEMBERSHIP

I am a member of the Settlement Class. Attached is proof of my membership in the form of:

- ☒ Settlement notice
- ☒ Claim ID / account email

VII. PRIOR OBJECTIONS

I have filed objections to *Accurso v. Western Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.*, Case No. 24CV017855, pending in the Superior Court of California for the County of Sacramento

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Objector respectfully submits that the proposed settlement does not presently satisfy the Court's independent obligation to ensure that the resolution is fair, adequate, and reasonable to absent class members.

Objector respectfully requests that the Court deny final approval **unless and until the parties provide competent evidence of the expected claims rate and the actual economic value delivered to the class**, and that the Court closely scrutinize the requested attorneys' fees in light of the limited and contingent relief provided to class members.

Objector submits this objection in good faith to assist the Court in its fiduciary role protecting the interests of the absent class.

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

Dated: February 21, 2026

Signature: 

Richard Markuson
Objector, Pro Se

From: Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement GHdeliveryfeesettlement@e.epiqnotice.com
Subject: Wang v Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement
Date: February 13, 2026 at 6:31 PM
To: rmarkuson@me.com

If you made a food delivery order and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California, you may be entitled to an award from a class action settlement.

A state court has authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

Use your Claim ID Number 264T664A37 to file an easy online claim [here](#).

What is this About? A Settlement has been reached to resolve a class action lawsuit against Grubhub Inc. ("Grubhub" or "Defendant"), relating to allegations that Grubhub made false or misleading representations regarding delivery fees, service fees, and menu prices on orders made between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California. Grubhub denies these allegations and denies any wrongdoing. The Court has not decided who is right. Instead, the parties have agreed to the Settlement.

Who is included? You received this email because Grubhub provided information under the Settlement indicating you likely are a Class Member. You are a Settlement Class Member if you ordered and paid for food through the Grubhub or Seamless app or website between January 24, 2019, and January 12, 2026, for delivery to an address in the State of California.

What does the Settlement Provide? As a Settlement Class Member, you can file a Claim to receive a Settlement Award in the form of a \$10.00 Grubhub site credit for use on the Grubhub App or website.

How To Get Benefits. You can use your Claim ID number shown at the top of this email to file your claim online [here](#) at the settlement website, www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. The deadline to file a claim online is **11:59 p.m. PST on May 12, 2026**. You must file a claim to receive a Settlement Award.

Your Other Options. If you do not want to be legally bound by the Settlement, you must exclude yourself by **March 30, 2026**. If you do not exclude yourself, you will release your claims against Grubhub. You may object to the Settlement by **March 30, 2026**. The [Long Form Notice](#) available on the website explains how to exclude yourself or object. The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing on **April 29, 2026**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, up to \$1,000,000 for attorneys' fees, plus litigation costs, incentive awards of up to \$1,000 each for the Class Representatives, as well as any objections. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you do not have to. For more information, visit www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. You may also call 1-877-522-2081.

If rmarkuson@me.com should not be subscribed or if you need to change your subscription information for Wang et al v Grubhub Delivery Fee, [please use this preferences page](#).

Mr. Richard H. Markuson
419. Nasca Way
Sacramento CA 95831
HF0325 0014z000001tZjuw

SACRAMENTO CA 95

21 FEB 2026 PM 5



Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

Stephen Croft
1080 Ardmore Ave
Oakland, CA 94610
Phone: 925 321 0871

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

I am a member of the proposed Settlement Class in Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc. My Claim ID number is TU9396R3R3 and my email address is dr.croft@gmail.com - my full name is Stephen David Croft and the version of my name on my Grubhub account is "Steve Croft".

I submit this written objection to the proposed class settlement. The settlement as structured is not fair, reasonable, or adequate to the class.

I used Grubhub during the class period and paid delivery and service fees on numerous orders. My concern is practical: the proposed settlement does not compensate me for fees I already paid. Instead, it requires me to place another order and spend additional money with the same company to receive any benefit. From a consumer perspective, this does not feel like restitution for past charges, but rather a promotion for future business. I am submitting this objection so the Court understands how the settlement operates in real life for an actual user of the service. I object on the following bases:

1. Coupon Relief

The settlement provides a \$10 Grubhub credit rather than cash compensation. To obtain any benefit, a class member must engage in a future transaction with the defendant. Most purchases on Grubhub cost considerably more than \$10 so the defendant benefits by generating additional revenue from these new transactions.

2. Claims-Made Process

The settlement requires class members to submit a claim form to receive the credit. However, Grubhub already possesses account identities, contact information, and complete order histories. Because class members are identifiable through the defendant's own records, requiring a claims process appears unnecessary and reduces participation.

The Court may wish to consider whether automatic distribution such as direct account crediting or electronic payment would more effectively deliver relief.

3. Flat Compensation

The settlement provides identical compensation to all class members regardless of their usage of the platform. The alleged misconduct concerns transaction-based fees. A person who ordered once receives the same recovery as a person who ordered many times.

Because the defendant maintains detailed transaction records, relief could reasonably be tied to usage or fees paid. The current structure does not attempt to approximate relative harm.

4. Adequacy of Notice

I did not receive effective notice. The email notice was delivered to my spam folder. The defendant maintains ongoing user accounts and regularly communicates with customers through multiple channels. Notice could have been provided through a notification in the Grubhub app, or by postal mail.

Requested Relief

I respectfully request that the Court consider some or all of the following modifications before approving settlement:


1. Provide the choice to be reimbursed in cash instead of with a coupon;
2. Distribute relief automatically to identifiable class members;
3. Provide compensation that reasonably reflects usage or fees paid; and / or
4. Require more effective notice procedures.

I submit this objection in good faith as a class member whose rights will be released by the settlement.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require more information, either at the address above, or by email at dr.croft@gmail.com

I do not intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing. I do not intend to call anyone to testify in support of the objection. I do not have a lawyer, and I have not filed any objections to class action settlements in the last ten years.

Yours sincerely,



Stephen Croft
February 16, 2026

S. Coft
1080 Agdamore Ave
Oakland, CA 94612

OAKLAND CA 945

17 FEB 2026 PM 4 L



Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objection
P.O. Box 2349
PORTLAND, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



D/T Daniel Tom

1 4 9 5 9 C r o s b y S t r e e t
S a n L e a n d r o , C A 9 4 5 7 9

February 17, 2026

+1 510.545.2682

DKLTom@email.com

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

*Re: Wang, et al. v. GrubHub
Los Angeles Superior Court, No. 23STCV24118*

Dear Settlement Administration,

Please find an Objection to Proposed Class Certification, Final Settlement, Representative Incentives, and Counsel Fees pursuant to notification in the referenced matter.

This document should be filed with the Court, a courtesy copy sent to chambers before serving a copy on Class and their counsel.

You may forward an electronic copy of the filed objection to the above email address to reduce expenses.

If you have any comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at +1 510.545.2682.

Best regards,



Daniel Tom

Enclosures

1 DANIEL TOM
2 14959 Crosby Street
3 San Leandro, CA 94579
4 (510) 545-2682

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Objector

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

CHARLES WANG, MARILEE BOGAERT,
AARON ASELTINE, ROBERT ALLAN
PERKINS, JR., CARISSA RECCO,
CHRISTINE BAK, DENISE SZNITKO, and
JESSE STOUT, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GRUBHUB, INC., and DOES 1-50, inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 23STCV24118

Assigned to: Hon. Timothy Patrick Dillon
Dept. 15

CLASS ACTION

**OBJECTION TO PROPOSED CLASS
CERTIFICATION, FINAL SETTLEMENT,
REPRESENTATIVE INCENTIVES, AND
COUNSEL FEES**

Hearing Date: April 29, 2026
Time: 10 a.m.
Department: 15

1 **TO THE COURT, PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD**, I, Daniel Tom, a resident of
2 California and a GrubHub platform user submit this objection to the class certification, settlement
3 fairness, Class Representative Incentives, and Class Counsel's fees.

4 I was notified that I could be an Absent Class Member to this the proposed settlement and "can
5 object to the Settlement if [I] do not agree with any part of it." (Ex. A Email Notice, Long Form Notice
6 at p. 5.)

7 **Plaintiffs Do Not Dispute Their Private Claims Belong In Arbitration**

8 Plaintiff Jesse Stout admits certain claims are subject to arbitration. According to public
9 records, the U.S. District Court for Northern California granted Defendant's motion to compel
10 arbitration Plaintiff's underlying claims and the request for private relief on December 3, 2021. (*Stout*
11 *v. Grubhub Inc.* Order ("Stout Order") (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2021) 21-cv-04745, ECF 39.) The Settlement
12 Agreement admits Plaintiff Jesse Stout filed a Demand for Arbitration on December 14, 2021. Stout
13 admits in arbitration, Grubhub filed a motion to dismiss. However, Plaintiff does not disclose the
14 results of that motion or result of the arbitration on his private claims. (Memorandum of Points and
15 Authorities in Support of Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval ("MPA") at p. 13.) Had Plaintiff
16 prevailed, the District Court order compelling arbitration severed Plaintiff's public injunctive relief and
17 retained the District Court jurisdiction to hear those claims if the private claims were successful.
18 Plaintiff could have returned to the court to pursue those claims. (*Stout Order* at pp. 14-17.) Instead,
19 Plaintiff Stout voluntarily dismissed his case on February 2, 2024 following the filing of this instant
20 consolidated class action.

21 Plaintiff Denise Sznitko admits certain claims are subject to arbitration. Sznitko submitted her
22 claims to arbitration in 2021 with GrubHub prevailing ("*Sznitko I*"). Sznitko successfully appealed the
23 unfavorable arbitration award on non-merit grounds and filed a new state court complaint on August
24 29, 2022. According to public records, the new complaint was removed to U.S. District Court for the
25 Central District of California. Plaintiff has never filed an Opposition to GrubHub's Motion to Compel
26 Arbitration. Accordingly, the U.S. District Court granted Defendant's Motion to Compel Arbitration
27 on November 17, 2022 and ordered parties to file a Joint Status Report by March 1, 2023 and every
28 four months until the arbitration is completed. (*Sznitko v. Grubhub Inc.* Minute Order ("*Sznitko II*")

Minute Order”) (C.D. Cal. Nov. 17, 2022) CV 22-7318, ECF 28.) Plaintiff has failed to file a required Joint Status Report in compliance to the order or any other document. Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement does not inform absent class members whether discovery beyond the first arbitration was conducted and/or if the matter was submitted to the “So Ordered” second arbitration. (MPA at pp. 13-14.) The District Court warned Plaintiff that “[f]ailure to file a required Joint Status Report may, without further warning, result in a dismissal of this action without prejudice.” (*Sznitko II* Minute Order.) This Court should recognize another court’s order and consider Sznitko’s claims as being dismissed as prescribed in that order for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with that 2022 court order.

Plaintiffs admit they submitted evidence in *Stout* and *Sznitko I* in arbitration, and if the arbitrators found neither Plaintiff’s claim were meritorious (and it can be inferred that both Plaintiffs failed), those claims should be dismissed with prejudice and should not be a subject to the settlement. Plaintiffs have chosen to keep the Court and Absent Class Members in the dark and are hoping this court will ignore the obvious omission that their private threshold claims had been adjudicated and denied on the merits.

Plaintiffs Charles Wang, Marilee Bogaert, Robert Allan Perkins, Jr., Carissa Recco, Christine Bak admit some of their Alameda Superior case claims may be subject to arbitration. According to public records, the U.S. District Court for Northern California granted the parties stipulation to stay the action and continue the motion to compel arbitration pending mediation on May 3, 2023. Plaintiffs did not file a status report regarding any mediation with the court as ordered, rather the action was voluntarily dismissed on September 25, 2023 and the instant consolidate class action was filed on October 3, 2023.

All Plaintiffs’ actions amount to is forum shopping to avoid the consequences of arbitration which they all concede was proper for their private claims. Plaintiffs are hoping this court will award them a pound of salt when their claims may have been proven to amount to collection of dust bunnies. This court should not reward Plaintiffs if the Arbitrators and Mediator found nothing but leaky buckets.

Class Representatives Failed to Represent the Interest of Absent Class Members

Claims allegedly involve Grubhub+ subscribers, hidden service fees, and higher menu prices. All complain about different prices listed on a restaurant's own website, on GrubHub, and possibly other platforms. But higher menu prices are outside of GrubHub's control, and the complaints fail to name any of the indispensable party who sets their own menu prices. GrubHub is a marketplace. The Settlement Agreement does not bind the unnamed indispensable parties who are responsible for setting their own menu prices to set a singular price. Therefore, a restaurant could and probably would be free to set two or more menu prices for the same item offered on different platforms. What is the settlement resolving and for whom? The Class Definition is so broad that it will dissolve other's legitimate rights and claims.

The proposed settlement to the absent class members would not even amount to the state sales tax owed on a transaction as the proposed award will be subject to be "decreased pro rata such that the total value of all Settlement Awards paid to all Settlement Class Members who submit a Valid Claim does not exceed Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000 USD)." (Settlement Agreement at p. 13, Long Form Notice at p. 3.) The Settlement Class Members are also responsible for paying any taxes due on such Settlement Award. (Settlement Agreement at p. 13.)

A \$10.00 credit voucher barely scratches the surface of the alleged "higher menu prices for online delivery ranging from 15% to 10%" or any "hidden 'Service Fee.'" If Plaintiffs' allegations are believed, the Class Representatives' example of \$3.38 in hidden service fees and the prices of the items Plaintiff ordered were 15-20% higher, would be consumed by one transaction over 34% of the proposed absent member \$10 settlement award. (Kaliel Dec. ¶ 5.) There are no proposed changes to GrubHub's practices. GrubHub cannot compel restaurants to charge uniform prices between what the restaurant charges on its own menus, what it charges on GrubHub, and what it may charge on another platform. Such examples make this settlement worthless to the Absent Class Members.

Class Counsel admit there is realistically more than 500,000 potential Absent Class Members. "According to Grubhub's records, approximately 6.8M distinct email addresses were used in connection with delivery food orders made during the Class Period." (Kaliel Dec. ¶¶ 19, 30.) The Settlement Agreement limits Settlement Awards "shall not exceed Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000

1 USD)” and that Awards “may be decreased pro rata such that the total value of all Settlement Awards
2 paid to all Settlement Class Members does not exceed Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000 USD).
3 (Settlement Agreement at p. 13.) This admission that there is a possibility that no Absent Class Member
4 would realize anything near the proposed \$10.00 credit voucher, more likely \$0.735, highlights there
5 is a lack of value to the Absent Class Members. To be blunt, mailing an objection costs more in postage
6 than the likely \$0.735 award.

7 At least one court has observed “[i]f the class settlement does not provide ‘effectual relief’ to
8 the class and its ‘principal effect’ is to ‘induce the defendants to pay the class’s lawyers enough to make
9 them go away,’ then the class representatives have failed in their duty.” (*In re Aqua Dots Products*
10 *Liability Litigation* (7th Cir. 2011) 654 F.3d 748, 752–753.) “No class action settlement that yields
11 zero benefits for the class should be approved, and a class action that seeks only worthless benefits for
12 the class should be dismissed out of hand.” (*In re Walgreen Co. Stockholder Litigation* (7th Cir. 2016)
13 832 F.3d 718, 724:)

14 Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement does not
15 inform absent class members whether discovery was conducted in *Wang*, and/or if the matter was
16 submitted to arbitration or adjudicated as ordered. *Stout* and *Sznitko*, the Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion
17 for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement infers but does not state whether discovery in
18 *Stout* was conducted or the *Stout* arbitration was based on *Sznitko*, and to is silent to whether discovery
19 beyond *Sznitko*’s first arbitration was conducted and/or if the matter was submitted to the ordered
20 second arbitration. All discovery references in the motion are related to what was propounded on
21 GrubHub or informally provided by GrubHub.

22 That the Settlement is the product of two separate vigorous and non-collusive mediation
23 sessions does not elevate the agreement and the proposed settlement amount to fair and beneficial. At
24 the end of the day, Absent Class Members will receive pennies, and pennies “settlement[s] [are not] in
25 the best interests of those whose claims will be extinguished ... and are [not] also robust” (Kaliel Dec.
26 ¶¶ 22, 27.)

27 Based on the scant information Class Representatives and Counsel chose to voluntarily provide
28 on Counsel’s controlled website (www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com), absent class members cannot

1 determine whether class representatives fairly and adequately protect[ed] the interests of the class. If
2 arbitrators found the claims of *Stout* and *Sznitko I* not meritorious, no Class Representative Incentive
3 Award should be granted. At least one class representative failed to convince an arbitrator, even if that
4 award was vacated on other grounds. Nearly all other Class Representatives have not demonstrated
5 justification for an incentive award to each Class Representative in an amount not to exceed One
6 Thousand Dollars (\$1,000 USD) each.

7 **Class Counsel Seek 20% of the Maximum Settlement Award**

8 Class Counsel proposed a settlement of little to no value to the Class. Instead of doing Class
9 Counsel's job by seeking discovery to determine if any of the suits and claims have merit, Class
10 Counsel cite "the current state of the law, the expense, burden and time necessary to prosecute the
11 Action through trial and possible appeals, the risks and uncertainty of further prosecution of the Action
12 considering the defenses at issue, the sharply contested legal and factual issues involved, and the
13 relative benefits to be conferred upon Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members pursuant to this
14 Agreement" as their reason for proposing a meaningless settlement. (Settlement Agreement at p. 6.)
15 What Class Counsel complains about is the inherent nature and risks of plaintiff litigation work.

16 Plaintiffs admit GrubHub is already prominently displaying itemized fees and that relief sunsets
17 after seven (7) years of the effective date. (Settlement Agreement at p. 6.) Plaintiffs claim this result
18 will create a "freer and fairer marketplace." (MPA p. 9) Plaintiffs do not acknowledge that the
19 marketplace is free and fair because the restaurants are setting their own menu prices, and Plaintiffs are
20 free to choose to utilize GrubHub, alternative platforms, or go to the restaurant themselves. Displaying
21 itemized taxes and fees will not result in a "freer and fairer marketplace," and thus "yields zero benefits
22 for the class." (*In re Walgreen Co.*, 832 F.3d at p. 724.) Rather than moving the claims to arbitration
23 as ordered or taking a second bite of the *Sznitko* apple, Class Counsel did little to represent the Absent
24 Class Members.

25 Class Counsel "intend to move the Court for an award of attorneys' fees and costs (inclusive of
26 Notice and Claims Administration Costs paid, if any), to be paid to Class Counsel ... attorneys' fees
27 and costs is less than or equal to 20% of the Maximum Settlement Award," "not to exceed \$1,000,000."
28

1 (Settlement Agreement at p. 15, Long Form Notice at p. 4.) Class Counsel fees “equal to 20% of the
2 Maximum Settlement Award” and “not to exceed \$1,000,000” are not appropriate.

3 Class Counsel has not provided absent class members anything beyond the attorney declaration
4 that “sufficient informal discovery” “from prior arbitral proceedings” was conducted. The only “prior
5 arbitral proceedings” of record is *Sznitko I*. Class Counsel makes no reference if any meritorious
6 discovery was conducted in the *Stout* and *Wang* claims.

7 The *Sznitko II* court noted Class Counsel failed to file an Opposition to the Motion to Compel
8 Arbitration “despite repeated denials of the parties’ efforts to delay resolution of the pending Motion
9 to Compel Arbitration.” (*Sznitko II* Minute Order.) Class Counsel should not be rewarded for its
10 “failure to file any required document, or the failure to file it within the deadline, may be deemed
11 consent to the granting or denial of the motion . . .” (Id.) Class Counsel failed to file notices upon the
12 conclusion of the *Stout* arbitration and *Wang* mediation. Instead, Class Counsel filed the instant
13 consolidated class action and dismissed the pending individual cases in federal court.

14 “Class Counsel concluded that a Settlement with Defendant on the terms set forth herein is fair,
15 reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class in light of all known facts and
16 circumstances,” (Settlement Agreement at p. 6.) The only inferred discovery of “known facts and
17 circumstances might be the *Sznitko* claims. There is no indication that any discovery on claims or
18 arbitration/mediation had been conducted in *Stout* or *Wang*, nor any further attempt to re-arbitrate the
19 *Sznitko* private claims. The *Stout* or *Wang* dockets show the claims were ordered to arbitration and the
20 case was dismissed a couple of months later, and no activity since the November 17, 2022 order sending
21 *Sznitko* back to arbitration. (“The Court orders the parties to file a Joint Status Report within two weeks
22 of the completion of arbitration or other disposition of Plaintiff’s claims.” (*Sznitko II* Minute Order).)


23 Therefore, a reasonable person can infer the “settlement do[es] not benefit the class in any
24 meaningful way ... [the] settlement acknowledges as much.” (*In re Subway Footlong Sandwich*
25 *Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (7th Cir. 2017) 869 F.3d 551, 557.) “[A] class settlement
26 that results in fees for class counsel but yields no meaningful relief for the class “is no better than a
27 racket.” (*In re Walgreen Co.*, 832 F.3d at p. 724.) The parties reached a worthless class-wide settlement
28 rather than pursue resolution on the merits and Class Counsel seeks a windfall payment upward to

1 \$1,000,000 for dereliction of their duty from the Defendant. This is Plaintiffs' and Class Counsel's
2 best evidence and effort; the court should not certify the class and dismiss the claims with prejudice.

3 Conclusion

4 Absent Class Members are intentionally ill-informed. Class Counsel omitted all vital
5 documents except for the Settlement Agreement and Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class
6 Action Settlement and Certification of the Class For Settlement Purposes, and Long Form Notice. The
7 procedural history is an executive summary without any conclusion. Notably absent are the MPA,
8 declarations and facts supporting the motion for class action settlement. The average Absent Class
9 Member would not know where to locate the background documents spanning eight dockets in five
10 jurisdictions, not including the private arbitrations. The added costs to obtain the documents
11 independently and expense to evaluate the documents are not proportional to the proposed settlement
12 award. Class Counsel cherry-picked the documents and hid from public view documents that revealed
13 the true value and adverse to the fairness of the proposed settlement.

14 Absent Class Members are not even causally informed whether a \$10.00 voucher credit for a
15 total settlement award does not exceed Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000 USD). The Settlement
16 Agreement also allows the proposed Class Member Settlement Award to be decreased pro rata, which
17 it shall, and therefore, cannot be fair and equitable for any of the various Plaintiff claims. No facts have
18 been presented by Class Representatives or Class Counsel to the contrary.



28 <https://www.ghdeliveryfeesettlement.com/Home/Documents>, Last visited on February 17, 2026.

1 Hidden from Absent Class Members view is Class Representatives and Class Counsel
2 admission there are potentially 6.8M distinct email addresses and claimants. (Kaliel Dec. ¶¶ 19, 30.)
3 The Absent Class Members are unable to determine whether the \$10.00 offer, or more likely \$0.735,
4 credit voucher to each potential class member versus the \$1,000.00 per class representative is
5 proportionately fair and equitable. It is not. Likewise, Class Counsel should not be awarded attorneys'
6 fees and costs [even] less than or equal to 20% of the Maximum Settlement Award, not to exceed
7 \$1,000,000 (minus Settlement Administrator fees). Any Class Representative Incentive Awards and
8 Class Counsel fees awarded should therefore be reduced proportionately to what Absent Class
9 Members might actually realize. Further, Class Counsel should not be rewarded for their failure to file
10 documents pursuant to the civil procedures and court orders.

11 The Plaintiffs and Class Counsel presented to Arbitrators, a Mediator, this Court, and Absent
12 Class Members their best case for settlement. It is apparent they failed to meet their burden of proof
13 with the Arbitrators and Mediator. Class Counsel and Plaintiffs should not be permitted to cure their
14 deficiencies and further delay resolution as they did in *Sznitko* and simultaneously deprive Absent Class
15 Members the right to object or comment regarding new documents and cursory conclusions. "Because
16 the settlement yields fees for class counsel and 'zero benefits for the class,' the class should not [be]
17 certified and the settlement should not [be] approved. (*In re Subway Footlong Sandwich*, 869 F.3d at
18 p. 557 (quoting *In re Walgreen Co.*, 832 F.3d at p. 724).) "Because these consolidated class actions
19 seek only worthless benefits for the class, they should have be dismissed out of hand." (*Id.*, cleaned
20 up.)

21
22 Date: February 17, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

23
24 
25 Daniel Tom
26 Objector
27
28

as any objections. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you do not have to. For more information, visit www.GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. You may also call 1-877-522-2081.

If dkltom@email.com should not be subscribed or if you need to change your subscription information for Wang et al v Grubhub Delivery Fee, [please use this preferences page](#).

AM308_v02

D.K. Tom
14959 Crosby Street
San Leandro, CA 94579



Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

9720832349 8002



Objection to Proposed Class Action Settlement

I, James Snider, submit this formal objection to the proposed class action settlement in the matter involving Grubhub Inc. concerning alleged false or misleading representations regarding delivery fees, service fees, and menu pricing for orders delivered within the State of California between January 24, 2019 and January 12, 2026.

I am a member of the settlement class because I placed one or more delivery orders during the relevant time period to a California address.

Basis for Objection – Settlement Amount Is Inadequate

I object to the proposed settlement because the monetary relief provided to class members is unreasonably small in comparison to the scope and duration of the alleged misconduct.

The allegations in this case concern representations about delivery fees, service fees, and menu pricing over a period of approximately seven years. If the allegations are accurate, consumers may have paid inflated or misleading charges on numerous transactions. The potential aggregate harm across millions of transactions could be substantial.

However, the proposed recovery per class member appears minimal and does not reasonably approximate the financial impact suffered by consumers. The settlement risks providing only nominal compensation while requiring class members to release potentially valuable legal claims.

Additionally, if attorneys' fees and administrative costs constitute a significant portion of the settlement fund, the actual recovery to consumers may be further diluted. A settlement

that primarily benefits counsel rather than affected consumers does not meet the standard of being fair, reasonable, and adequate.

Fairness and Adequacy Concerns

Under governing legal standards, a class action settlement must fairly compensate class members relative to the strength of the claims and the potential damages at issue. Based on the information currently available, the proposed settlement does not appear to satisfy this requirement.

The limited monetary relief fails to:

- Reflect the multi-year duration of the alleged conduct;
- Account for repeat customers who may have incurred numerous allegedly misleading fees;
- Provide compensation proportionate to the alleged overcharges; and
- Adequately deter similar conduct in the future.

Request to the Court

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Court:

1. Deny final approval of the settlement in its current form; or
2. Require the parties to renegotiate terms that provide more substantial monetary relief to class members.


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

Date: February 23, 2026

Name: James S. Snider

Address: 206 Euclid Avenue, #402, Long Beach CA 90803

Email: sniderjs21@gmail.com

Signature: 

~~Answer Item # : 1/2/2026~~

JAMES SNIDER
2652 MONOGHAN
LB, CA 90815

LOS ANGELES CA 900
LOS ANGELES CA 900
9 MAR 2026 PM 11 L
9 MAR 2026 PM 11 L

\$0.74
US POSTAGE
FIRST-CLASS IMI
063512388460
90803
089022001



GRUBHUB DELIVERY FEE SETTLEMENT OBJECTION
P.O. BOX 2349
PORTLAND, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



P.O. Box 2349

Portland, OR 97208-2349

Dear Sir/Madam

Reg: Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118

My objection to final ruling:

an adjustment toward continuing business with Grubhub.

After review of court docs: My questions/statement to litigators;

Why are claimants subjected to take a payment to be used within the Grubhub Business;

I paid in good faith, cash, for my purchases. It would seem fair for settlement to be paid as such, in cash. Why, after so many "settlements" from Grubhub cases within just the last 10yrs. am I being forced to use my settlement portion to return business to Grubhub.

I usually do not return my business to someone after I have been used/abused by them.

***Plaintiffs' class action attorneys and government agencies often choose not to initiate legal proceedings against those businesses that have taken an effective, proactive approach to IC compliance."

***<https://www.independentcontractorcompliance.com/?s=grubhub>

This statement bewilders me: taking an effective approach to compliance?

Why is it not being compliant, as mandated, toward any of these cases?

Perhaps now would be a good time to review and make it a mandated ruling of this case for Grubhub to comply to IC compliance; as so many cases failed to do so previously, leaving the door open for Grubhub to continue to abuse the consumers while using their service and the skirting of the mandate/law.

It may solve the possibility of any cases yet to be brought before a judge/court if compliance were met, not approached.

Reg: Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118

***this information obtained through a simple search online:

***~Grubhub has faced numerous lawsuits and regulatory actions over the past 10 years (roughly 2015–2025), primarily focused on worker misclassification, deceptive fee practices, and the listing of restaurants without consent. While the exact total count of all individual lawsuits is high, key litigation and settlements in the last decade include:

~Driver Misclassification (Lawson v. Grubhub): A major, decade-long class action lawsuit filed in 2015 regarding whether California drivers should be classified as employees rather than independent contractors. This resulted in a proposed \$24.75 million settlement in 2025.

~FTC & Illinois AG Settlement (\$25 Million): In December 2024, Grubhub agreed to a \$25 million settlement with the Federal Trade Commission and the Illinois Attorney General to resolve accusations of deceptive practices, including "hidden fees," false advertising, and listing restaurants without permission.

~Non-Partnered Restaurant Lawsuits: Multiple lawsuits were filed starting around 2020 by restaurants alleging Grubhub listed them on their platform without consent, often with incorrect menus and prices. A \$7.15 million+ settlement was reached in 2026 to resolve claims related to this practice.

~Consumer Fee Class Actions: In 2026, a \$5 million settlement was reached to resolve claims that Grubhub misled California customers regarding delivery fees, service fees, and menu prices.

~Data Breach Lawsuits: Following a 2025 data breach, class action lawsuits were filed alleging failures to protect user information.

~Antitrust Litigation: Grubhub, along with other delivery apps, has been sued for alleged anti-competitive behavior and forcing higher prices on consumers.

www.independentcontractorcompliance.com

True Fairness after an abuse, to those that use a service, should be repaid in kind.

Not forced to accept a "coupon" toward return to do business with said service.

Reg: Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118

In summary, over the last decade:

Grubhub has faced at least 4-5 major, widespread class-action or state/federal-level lawsuits, alongside numerous smaller or consolidated actions, resulting in tens of millions of dollars in settlements.

How many of those settlements were also subjected to coupons to return business to Grubhub.

Please advise:

April Meyer

8908 Kiefer Blvd

Sacramento, Ca. 95826

916-753-2657

7 March 2026

8908 Kiefer Blvd
Hermesburg, Ca
95826



GrubHub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections

P.O. Box 2349

Portland, OR 97208-2349

Objection To Grubhub Settlement Proposal

Pavlo Astashonok
9023 Forbes Ave
Northridge, 91343, CA
8187988078
p.astashonok@gmail.com

2/22/2026

Grubhub Delivery Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR97208-2349

Re: Objection to Proposed Class Action Settlement
Case: *Wang et al. v. Grubhub*, Superior Court of the State of California, Case No.
23STCV24118

To the Honorable Court and All Parties:

I, Pavlo Astashonok, respectfully submit this objection to the proposed class action settlement in the above-captioned matter.

I am a member of the Settlement Class. I subscribed to and/or used Grubhub's services during the class period, and I was subjected to the allegedly deceptive and misleading practices that are the subject of this lawsuit. Enclosed with this objection is proof of my class membership: copies of order confirmations.

Grounds for Objection

1. Inadequate and illusory relief in the form of in-kind Grubhub credit

The proposed \$10 settlement relief is provided solely in the form of non-transferable Grubhub credit that can only be used on Grubhub's own platform. This is fundamentally inadequate and unfair for multiple reasons:

- It forces class members to engage again with the very company whose deceptive practices gave rise to this litigation in order to obtain any benefit from the settlement. The supposed "relief" is conditioned on continued use of Grubhub, which many class members understandably no longer trust or wish to patronize.
- For those class members who stopped using Grubhub precisely because of its misleading and unfair practices, the settlement offers them effectively nothing. They must either abandon their principles and return to a platform they believe deceived them, or forfeit any recovery.
- The credit is not cash, is likely subject to expiration and other conditions, and cannot be freely used like money. In practice, it functions primarily as a marketing

tool to drive future business to Grubhub, not as meaningful compensation for past harm.

This structure turns a settlement that should compensate victims into a mechanism that benefits the wrongdoer by incentivizing former customers to return. It is, in effect, a coupon-style settlement that shifts value back to Grubhub rather than making class members whole.

2. Lack of meaningful compensation relative to the harm and deterrence goals

The alleged deceptive practices at issue in this case caused real financial harm to consumers, including inflated fees, misleading representations, and other unfair charges. A \$10 credit, usable only on Grubhub, does not come close to compensating that harm:

- Many class members likely paid far more than \$10 in excess or inflated fees over the class period.
- Even for those whose individual harm cannot be precisely quantified, the nominal \$10 credit trivializes the seriousness of the misconduct and undermines deterrence.
- A settlement that provides only in-kind credits to the defendant's own service fails to send a meaningful message that deceptive practices will have real financial consequences.

Settlements in consumer protection class actions serve not only to compensate victims but also to deter future misconduct. A token, conditional credit does neither. It risks normalizing deceptive behavior by demonstrating that, at worst, a company may have to fund promotional credits to drive additional traffic to its own platform.

3. The structure of the settlement is degrading and humiliating to affected consumers

The nature of this relief is not merely inadequate; it is humiliating to those who were deceived and misled.

- Class members who were victims of Grubhub's alleged "scam" practices are now told that their remedy is to go back and use Grubhub again for a small discount.
- This communicates that the harm they suffered is unimportant and that their only recourse is to continue doing business with the same company, effectively rewarding Grubhub with additional orders and revenue.
- Rather than offering neutral, fungible compensation (cash) that respects class members' autonomy, the settlement binds them to the very platform they may have left in disgust.

For many consumers, being asked to return to Grubhub in order to access their settlement benefit is a further insult: it turns the settlement from an act of restitution into a form of coerced brand loyalty.

4. The settlement fails basic principles of fairness and reasonableness compared to a cash alternative

A fair and reasonable settlement in this case should provide cash or cash-equivalent relief, not restricted platform credits:

- Cash payments do not require class members to transact with the defendant, and they permit individuals to decide how best to use their compensation.
- Cash relief more accurately reflects the economic nature of the harm (excess payments and fees), whereas Grubhub credit is a restricted, conditional benefit largely under Grubhub's control.
- By choosing credits over cash, the settlement shifts the balance of benefit from class members to Grubhub, which will likely recapture much of the face value of the credits through additional orders, service fees, and breakage (unused or expired credits).

In effect, the proposed structure treats class members as a captive customer base to be re-monetized, rather than individuals entitled to genuine restitution for past wrongdoing.

5. Concerns about actual value and likely redemption

Although I do not have access to internal redemption projections, it is well-understood in such "credit" or "coupon" settlements that:

- A significant proportion of class members will never redeem the credit due to lack of notice, distrust, lack of interest in using Grubhub again, or credit expiration/conditions.
- The real, delivered value to the class is therefore far less than the nominal face value of the credits.
- Meanwhile, Grubhub obtains favorable publicity for "settling" the case and the opportunity to re-engage former customers at limited real cost.

A settlement that appears generous on paper but delivers far less value in practice is not fair, reasonable, or adequate to the class as a whole.

Relief Requested

For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that the Court:

1. Reject the current proposed settlement in its present form; and
2. Require the parties to renegotiate a settlement that provides meaningful cash (or comparable cash-equivalent) compensation to class members, unconditioned on future use of Grubhub's services; or, at a minimum,
3. Provide class members with a choice between cash and Grubhub credit, so that those who do not wish to use Grubhub again are not compelled to do so in order to receive relief.

Documents Relied Upon

This objection is based on:

- The publicly available settlement agreement and related notices;

- The pleadings and filings in this case; and
- My personal experience as a Grubhub user during the class period.

If additional briefs or supporting documents are required by the Court, I will provide them upon request.

Witnesses

At this time, I do not intend to call any witnesses to testify in support of this objection.

Intention to Appear at the Fairness Hearing

I do not intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing but respectfully request that this written objection be considered by the Court.

Proof of Class Membership

Enclosed as Exhibit A is proof of my membership in the Settlement Class, consisting of Grubhub order confirmations:

Grubhub Order #32912923-6274118

Grubhub Order #32912923-6276776

Grubhub Order #74983126-3193683

Prior Objections in the Last Ten Years

I have not filed any objections to class action settlements in the last ten years.

Representation

I am not represented by counsel in connection with this objection.

Respectfully submitted,

Pavlo Astashonok

2/22/2026


Thanks for your Ara's Shawarma order

From Grubhub <orders@eat.grubhub.com>
Date Sun 10/5/2025 2:07 PM
To suncatcher19@outlook.com <suncatcher19@outlook.com>



Thank you for ordering, Pavlo

Your delivery order from Ara's Shawarma is being prepared. Your food should arrive between 2:45pm – 3:00pm.



Ara's Shawarma
Total: \$23.51

Ordered: Oct 05, 2025 2:07:44pm
Order number: #74983126-3193683
Contact Restaurant: 747.254-1808

Delivery to
Pavlo Astashynok
18014 Sherman Way , #276 , Los Angeles, CA
(504) 456-9095

1 French Fries	\$7.99
1 Pork Shawarma Plate	\$17.99
• Rice	
Items subtotal	\$25.98
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$2.00
Service fee	\$2.70
Sales tax	\$2.09
Tip	\$0.00
Promo code	-\$2.00
Total charge	\$23.51
Payment Method	
Credit Card - 9623	

Thanks for your Kobe Factory order

From Grubhub <orders@eat.grubhub.com>

Date Sun 3/16/2025 12:38 PM

To suncatcher19@outlook.com <suncatcher19@outlook.com>

GRUBHUB

Thank you for ordering, Pavlo

Your delivery order from **Kobe Factory** is being prepared. Your food should arrive between 1:16pm – 1:31pm.

Track your order

Kobe Factory

Total: \$19.70

Ordered: Mar 16, 2025 12:38:42pm

Order number: #32912923-6276776

Contact Restaurant: (818) 909-2593

Delivery to

Pavlo Astashonok

18014 Sherman Way , #276 , Los Angeles, CA

(504) 459-9095

1 Chicken and beef	\$17.99
--------------------	---------

Items subtotal	\$17.99
----------------	---------

Delivery fee	\$0.00
--------------	--------

Service fee	\$2.00
-------------	--------

Driver Benefits Fee	\$3.00
---------------------	--------

Sales tax	\$1.71
-----------	--------

Tip	\$0.00
-----	--------

Promo code	-\$5.00
------------	---------

Total charge	\$19.70
--------------	---------

Payment Method

Credit Card - 9623

Grubhub Guarantee

We've got your back.

Find a lower price?

Order arrived late?

Let us know



Thanks for your Halal Kitchen Cafe order

From Grubhub <orders@eat.grubhub.com>

Date Sun 3/16/2025 11:48 AM

To suncatcher19@outlook.com <suncatcher19@outlook.com>

GRUBHUB

Thank you for ordering, Pavlo

Your delivery order from Halal Kitchen Cafe is being prepared. Your food should arrive between 12:11pm – 12:26pm.

Order # 32912923

Halal Kitchen Cafe

Total: \$26.89

Ordered: Mar 16, 2025 11:47:59am

Order number: #32912923-6274118

Contact Restaurant: (818) 885-6103

Delivery to

Pavlo Astashonok

18014 Sherman Way, #276, Los Angeles, CA

(561) 459-9095

1 Supreme GYRO	\$8.99
• Lamb Mix	
1 Housemade Dough	\$3.00
3 Pita Bread100	\$4.50
1 Chicken GYRO	\$8.99
Items subtotal	\$25.48
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$3.07
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Sales tax	\$2.34
Tip	\$0.00
Promo code	-\$5.00
Total charge	\$26.89

Payment Method
Credit Card - 9623


Grubhub Guarantee

We've got your back.
Find a lower price?
Order arrived late?

Let us know



From: PAVLO ASTASHONOK
9023 Forbes Ave
Northridge, CA
91343



Santa Clarita P3DC 01-91343

MON 23 FEB 2026 PM

To: Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement
Exclusions
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

February 19, 2026

To: Superior Court of the State of California
County of Los Angeles

Re: Wang et al. v. Grubhub
CASE No. 23STCV2411B

From: ALMA D. SHUMAKE (ALMA Dorothy Shumake)
2955 Saddlewood Drive
Brentwood, CA 91902-2001
(619) 889-6449


I'm objecting to the \$10.00 Grubhub credit that forces injured parties to be further harmed, by spending even more money to benefit (or not) from the settlement with the offending company. Seems a cruel punishment, not a recovered benefit. I ask that you (the court) please reconsider this approval.

I shall not attend the hearing, no documents submitted, no witnesses listed.

Alma D. Shumake

AIMA D. SHUMAKE
2955 Saddlewood Dr.
Bonita, CA 91902-2001

SAN DIEGO CA 920
20 FEB 2026 PM 5 L



Class Action Settlement Administrator
GrubHub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections

P.O. Box 2349

Portland, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



March 29, 2026

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections

P.O. Box 2349

Portland, OR 97208-2349

Case: *Wang et al. v. Grubhub*, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles

Case Number: 23STCV24118

Official Written Objection

Class Member Information:

- Name: Cej Bourgeois
- Mailing Address: 7381 La Tijera Blvd, #45663, Los Angeles, CA 90045
- Phone Number: 323-992-8326

Objection Statement: I, Cej Bourgeois would like to be a part of the settlement class, but will not accept a \$10 GrubHub credit as my sole settlement amount. I am seeking the maximum of \$1,000.00 (equivalent to a representative) plus the overage difference of ~~\$104.56~~ ^{\$104.56} Since GrubHub was overcharging patrons for deliveries. Once monies are disbursed, please mail my check to my mailing address mentioned in the "class member information" section of this email.

Enclosed on the following pages are copies of proof which the objection is based:

- Receipts
- Overcharge overview with prices differences and menu page links with actual costs

Person to be called to testify in support of the objection (if necessary): Cej Bourgeois (self)


Proof of Membership in the Settlement Class:

- Claim ID Number: X64UC9D4X

Statement of whether you intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing: I do not plan to, but will if necessary

Objections filed by me or my attorney(s) to any and all class action settlements in the last ten years: None

Signature:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cej Bourgeois', is written over a horizontal line.

Restaurant Deliveries 2026	Address	Delivery Date	GrubHub Items Subtotal	Restaurant's Actual Menu Subtotal	Overage
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant	6081 Center Dr #203, Los Angeles, CA 90045	1/8/26	\$ 33.87	\$ 31.65	\$ 2.22
Alberto's Mexican Food	1127 S Sanderson Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	12/31/25	\$ 45.97	\$ 38.97	\$ 7.00
Denny's	2675 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	12/25/25	\$ 61.86	\$ 50.47	\$ 11.39
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant	6081 Center Dr #203, Los Angeles, CA 90045	12/16/25	\$ 36.12	\$ 33.75	\$ 2.37
Halal Guys	98 8th Street NW, Atlanta, GA 30309	11/3/25	\$ 11.99	\$ 10.99	\$ 1.00
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	10/23/25	\$ 24.49	\$ 21.49	\$ 3.00
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	10/15/25	\$ 87.46	\$ 77.96	\$ 9.50
California Fish Grill	6150 Slauson Ave Suite 107, Culver City, CA 90230	9/18/25	\$ 32.55	\$ 28.23	\$ 4.32
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	9/17/25	\$ 24.49	\$ 21.49	\$ 3.00
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	8/26/25	\$ 22.99	\$ 21.49	\$ 1.50
Rubio's Coastal Grill	400 N Pacific Coast Highway, Suite C, El Segundo, CA 90245	8/20/25	\$ 16.26	\$ 12.99	\$ 3.27
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant	6081 Center Dr #203, Los Angeles, CA 90045	8/19/25	\$ 46.77	\$ 43.70	\$ 3.07
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	8/16/25	\$ 22.99	\$ 21.49	\$ 1.50
Five Guys	6000 Sepulveda Blvd, Culver City, CA 90230	8/2/25	\$ 15.35	\$ 12.99	\$ 2.36
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	7/21/25	\$ 22.99	\$ 21.49	\$ 1.50
Hilltop Coffee + Kitchen	170 N La Brea Ave, Inglewood, CA 90301	7/6/25	\$ 37.05	\$ 34.50	\$ 2.55
Bossa Nova	4460 W Rosecrans Ave, Hawthorne, CA 90250	7/2/25	\$ 35.10	\$ 29.99	\$ 5.11
American Deli	425 E Manchester Blvd E, Inglewood, CA 90301	6/19/25	\$ 22.99	\$ 21.49	\$ 1.50
Red Robin	1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	6/12/25	\$ 19.59	\$ 16.79	\$ 2.80
Chili's	2100 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	4/24/25	\$ 89.55	\$ 79.16	\$ 10.39
Red Robin	1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	4/4/25	\$ 59.57	\$ 50.97	\$ 8.60
Holy Guacamole	2906 Main St, Santa Monica, CA 90405	3/31/25	\$ 45.92	\$ 39.85	\$ 6.07
Dragon Chinese Restaurant	10814 Jefferson Blvd, Culver City, CA 90230	3/16/25	\$ 37.97	\$ 35.97	\$ 2.00
Red Robin	1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92545	3/15/25	\$ 59.97	\$ 51.47	\$ 8.50
Total			\$ 913.86	\$ 809.34	\$ 104.52

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of California, Los Angeles
case # 23STCV 24118
ID Claim # X64UC9D4X

Please Note:

The following pages are in small print. Due to the large amount of pages, we won't be stamping an AS-IS stamp on each one.

Document Control

Please Note:

The following pages are in small print. Due to the large amount of pages, we won't be stamping an AS-IS stamp on each one.

Document Control

Ordered from
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant
Estimated Delivery
6:03pm - 6:13pm
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant
6081 Center Dr #203 (310) 641-5524

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 14 N, Jcalyptus, /e, 209, glewood, A 90302, 23) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food at the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order		Order #29233222-3212823
Jan 8, 2026 5:15pm		
1	Miso Soup	\$4.01
1	Truffle Yellowtail Roll	\$19.21
1	Chicken Wing Karaage	\$10.65
Items subtotal		\$33.87
Delivery fee		\$0.00
Service fee		\$5.08\$2.71
Sales tax		\$3.66
Driver tip		\$6.00
Driver Benefits Fee		\$2.00\$1.00
Total		\$47.24

 Amazon Pay

Wang et al v Grubhub, Superior Court of CA Los Angeles
Case # 23STC V24118

Ordered from
Albertos Sanderson & Stetson Hemet

Estimated Delivery
5:01pm - 6:11pm

Albertos Sanderson & Stetson Hemet
1127 S Sanderson Ave (951) 658-6770

Delivery (ASAP) Delivery instructions

to:
B,
1589 Erin Dr
Hemet, CA 92544
(951) 992-8326

Contact-free delivery
Drop-off location
Front door of my house/apartment unit

Notification
Text me

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order		Order #31513214-1494707
Dec 31, 2025 5:15pm		
1 SUPER FRIES		\$17.99
YES I NEED UTENSILS, ASADA, NO CHEESE, NO SOUR CREAM, NO COTIJA		
1 2 BIRRIA TACOS 8 oz Consome		\$16.99
"No onions, no cilantro"		
1 2 SHREDDED CKHN ENCH		\$10.99
"No beans"		
Items subtotal		\$45.97
Service fee		\$6.90\$3.68
Sales tax		\$4.51
Delivery fee		\$2.49\$0.00
Driver tip		\$6.00
Driver Benefits Fee		\$3.00\$2.00
Adjusted total		\$62.16

Wing et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
Denny's
Estimated Delivery
1:22pm - 1:32pm
Denny's
2675 W Florida Ave (951) 652-1346

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 1589 Erin Dr San Dimas, CA 95444 (951) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #48813207-6293939
Dec 25, 2025 12:25pm	
1 Super Bird® Seasoned Fries	\$22.18
1 Cali Club Sandwich No Side	\$18.89
1 Single Cheeseburger No Cheese, French Fries	\$20.79
Items subtotal	\$61.86
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$9.28\$4.95
Sales tax	\$6.02
Driver tip	\$7.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$3.00\$2.00

Wang et al. v Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant
Estimated Delivery
3:25pm - 6:35pm
Kabuki Japanese Restaurant
6081 Center Dr #203 (310) 641-5524

Delivery address (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 14 N, Eucalyptus Ave 209, Glendale, CA 90302 (310) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food at the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #19533199-6610935
Dec 16, 2025 5:38pm	
1 Yellowtail Carpaccio	\$15.52
1 Alaskan Roll	\$16.59
1 Miso Soup	\$4.01
Items subtotal	\$36.12
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$5.42\$2.89
Sales tax	\$3.90
Driver tip	\$6.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$2.00\$1.00
Total	\$49.91

 Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
The Halal Guys (Midtown, GA)
Estimated Delivery
11:19pm - 11:29pm
The Halal Guys (Midtown, GA)
95 8th St NW Ste 200 (404) 748-4311

Delivery (ASAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 5 Ivan Allen Jr Blvd NW Hotel - Residences Atlanta, GA 30308 (404) 992-8326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave food at front desk I

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #87123156-7910441
Nov 3, 2025 10:41pm	
1 Chicken Wings 8-Piece, White Sauce	\$11.99
Items subtotal	\$11.99
Delivery fee	\$1.99
Service fee	\$1.80
Sales tax	\$1.41
Driver tip	\$3.44
Grubhub+ Credit	-\$1.22
Total	\$19.41
 Amazon Pay	

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
American Deli
Pickup Estimate
2:09pm - 2:19pm

American Deli
425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

Pickup (ASAP) for: **Utensil and napkin preference**
B
Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order **Order #61453144-3660641**

Oct 23, 2025 1:54pm

1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo **\$24.49**
YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke

Items subtotal **\$24.49**
Sales tax **\$2.51**
Tip **\$2.00**

Total \$29.00

 Amazon Pay

Need help?

*Wang et al v Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
Case # 23 STCV 24118*

3/27/26, 5:02 PM

Receipt - American Deli - Order #583baf0-aa15-11f0-baf1-e75eb15d1fcd

Ordered from

American Deli

Pickup Estimate

3:42pm - 3:52pm

American Deli

425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

Pickup (ASAP) for:

B

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Oct 15, 2025 3:27pm

[Print receipt](#)

Order #90313136-5984694



1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo

\$24.49

NO Onion, NO Mushrooms, NO Green Bell Peppers, YES CELERY, Honey BBQ with Lemon Pepper Sprinkles, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Barq's Root Beer



1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo

\$24.49

YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke



1 Wings and Fries Combo

\$24.99

10 Pieces Combo, YES CELERY, Hot, COMBO FRIES (included), American Deli Seasoning Salt, Ranch (4 oz.), Arnold Palmer



1 Beef Philly Only

\$13.49

Items subtotal

\$87.46

Sales tax

\$8.96

Tip

\$4.82

Grubhub+ Credit

-\$2.21

Total

\$99.03

Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
Case # 23STCV24118

California Fish Grill

2025-09-18

8:19pm - 8:29pm

California Fish Grill

QUESTIONS

Delivery	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
ISAP) to: B, 14 N eucalyptus Ave 209 glewood, CA 9302 (23) 992-8326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food and the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order


Sep 18, 2025 7:40pm

Print receipt

Order #62300110 7047050

	2 Swai a la Carte Half Cajun/Half Garlic Butter • Light Sauce	\$13.38
	1 LEMONS	\$0.00
	1 UTENSILS	\$0.00
	1SWAI (WHITE/FISH) Half Cajun/Half Garlic Butter • On-Side • Light Sauce, Cauliflower Rice, Upgrade House Salad • Ranch	\$19.17

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court, CA, Los Angeles,
 Case # 23STCV 24118



1 TARTAR SAUCE

\$0.00

Items subtotal	\$32.55
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$4.88\$2.60
Sales tax	\$3.80
Driver tip	\$5.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00

Total **\$44.95**

 Amazon Pay

Need help?

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case# 23STV24118

3/27/26, 4:59 PM

Receipt - American Deli - Order #3810920-941c-11f0-b921-8db8228ecfa7

Ordered from

American Deli

Estimated Delivery

4:55pm - 5:05pm

American Deli

425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
Delivery instructions Delivery (SAP) to: B, 14 N Jucalyptus Ave 209 glewood, CA 9302 (23) 992-8326 Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food and the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off	Utensil and napkin preference Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Print receipt
Sep 17, 2025 4:16pm	Order #55343108-5090928
 1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo	\$24.49
YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Strawberry Fanta	

Items subtotal	\$24.49
Service fee	\$3.67\$1.96
Sales tax	\$2.62
Delivery fee	\$0.49\$0.00
Driver tip	\$4.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$34.07

 Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118

3/27/26, 4:58 PM

Receipt - American Deli - Order #5d4df180-82eb-11f0-b181-f7305b79b56f

Ordered from

American Deli

Estimated Delivery

8:02pm - 8:12pm

American Deli

425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 14 N Jacalypus Ave 209 glewood, CA 9302 23) 992-8326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food and the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Aug 26, 2025 7:17pm

Print receipt

Order #38243087-7803063



1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo

\$22.99

YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke

Items subtotal	\$22.99
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$3.45\$1.84
Sales tax	\$2.45
Driver tip	\$4.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$32.28

Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
~~Case #23STCV2404118~~
Case #23STCV24118

3/27/26, 4:57 PM

Receipt - Rubio's Coastal Grill - Order #ca829400-7e3f-11f0-9401-23cf313f6d88

Ordered from

Rubio's Coastal Grill

Estimated Delivery

9:25pm - 9:35pm

Rubio's Coastal Grill

400 N Sepulveda Blvd Ste C (310) 615-9960

Delivery	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
(SAP) to:		
B,		
14 N	Contact-free delivery	
Jacalyptus Ave	Drop-off location	Yes, include utensils,
209	I'll specify in the notes for the driver	napkins, etc.
glewood, CA	Notification	
9302	Text me	
(23) 992-8326		

Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food and the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Aug 20, 2025 8:45pm

[Print receipt](#)

Order #50183081-1017476



1 Jalapeno and Carrots

\$0.00



1 Classic Shrimp Burrito

\$16.24

Customize · Mexican Rice - Recommended · No Beans · Chips



2 Mild Salsa

\$0.00



2 Tomatillo Salsa

\$0.00

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118



1 Burrito Especial With Grilled All Natural Chicken
As Is

\$14.99

Items subtotal	\$31.23
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$4.68\$2.50
Sales tax	\$3.47
Driver tip	\$5.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$2.00

Adjusted total **\$44.20**

 Amazon Pay



Wang et al vs. Grebhub, Superior Court. of CA, Los Angeles,
Case # 2357CV24118

3/27/26, 4:56 PM

Receipt - Kabuki Japanese Restaurant - Order #08d47ab0-7d6f-11f0-bab1-d17fd917728c

Ordered from

Kabuki Japanese Restaurant

Estimated Delivery

8:34pm - 8:44pm

Kabuki Japanese Restaurant

6081 Center Dr #203 (310) 641-5524

Delivery	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
ASAP) to:		
B,		
4 N Eucalyptus	Contact-free delivery	
/e	Drop-off location	Yes, include utensils,
:09	I'll specify in the notes for the driver	napkins, etc.
glewood, CA		
1302	Notification	
23) 992-8326	Text me	
Use code *0530 to unlock the door to the building, leave food and the door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off		

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Aug 19, 2025 7:47pm

[Print receipt](#)

Order #91713080-4718693

	1 Chicken Wing Karaage	\$10.65
	1 Alaskan Roll	\$16.59
	1 Yellowtail Carpaccio	\$15.52
	1 Miso Soup	\$4.01

Items subtotal	\$46.77
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$7.02\$3.74

Wang et al v. Facebook, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles,
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from

American Deli

Estimated Delivery

3:20pm - 3:30pm

American Deli

425 E Manchester Blvd

Delivery (ASAP) Delivery instructions

B,
4 N Eucalyptus
e
09
glewood, CA
302
23) 992-8326

Contact-free delivery
Drop-off location
I'll specify in the notes for the driver
Notification
Text me

Utensil and napkin
preference

Yes, include utensils,
napkins, etc.

Please use code *0530 to unlock door to the building, deliver to my doorstep and text
once it's been dropped off

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Aug 16, 2025 2:44pm

Print receipt

Order #35393076-1977180



1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo

\$22.99

YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke

Items subtotal	\$22.99
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$3.45\$1.84
Sales tax	\$2.45
Driver tip	\$3.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$31.28

Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. Gubshub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118

Ordered from

Five Guys

Estimated Delivery

4:55pm - 5:05pm

Five Guys

6000 Sepulveda Blvd

Delivery address	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
Delivery to: B, 14 N Eucalyptus Ave 209 Beverlywood, CA 90023 (310) 992-8326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Call me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.
Please enter code *0530 in callbox to unlock the door, leave at the front door of my unit and text me once it's been dropped off		

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Print receipt
Aug 2, 2025 4:18pm	Order #00883062-0222156
1 Cheeseburger Mayo (+110 calories), Lettuce (+5 calories), Pickle (+5 calories), Tomato (+10 calories), Onions (+10 calories), Ketchup (+30 calories), Napkin, Knife	\$15.35
Items subtotal	\$15.35
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$2.30 \$1.23
Sales tax	\$1.84
Driver tip	\$3.00
Grubhub+ Credit	-\$2.34
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$20.08

 Amazon Pay

Wong et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
American Deli
Estimated Delivery
9:07pm - 9:17pm
American Deli
425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

elivery (ASAP)

Delivery instructions

14 N Eucalyptus
re
209
glewood, CA
J302
23) 992-8326

Contact-free delivery

Drop-off location

I'll specify in the notes for the driver

Notification

Call me

Utensil and napkin
preference

Yes, include utensils, napkins,
etc.

Please call upon arrival and I will give you the code to unlock
the door

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. Learn more

Your order	Order #11673051-6381278
Jul 21, 2025 8:24pm	
1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo	\$22.99
YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke	
Items subtotal	\$22.99
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$3.45\$1.84
Sales tax	\$2.45
Driver tip	\$1.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$29.28
pay Amazon Pay	

Ordered from

Hilltop Coffee + Kitchen

Preorder

Closed. Next delivery at 8:30am tomorrow

Estimated Delivery

1:03pm - 1:13pm**Hilltop Coffee + Kitchen**

4427 W Slauson Ave (323) 815-9833

Delivery instructions

(SAP) to:

B,
315 W
2nd St
Los Angeles,
CA 90008
(23) 992-
326

Contact-free delivery
Drop-off location
Front door of my house/apartment unit

Notification
Text me

**Utensil and
napkin
preference**

Yes, include
utensils,
napkins, etc.

Walk the small walkway between the pink and grey buildings. The unit is located on the left, please ring doorbell for 2615, leave food at front door and text me once it's been dropped off

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Order #54323035-4732672

Jul 6, 2025 12:25pm

1 Bangin' Breakfast Sandwich Over Easy Egg	\$15.60
1 COFFEE CRUMB DONUT	\$5.85
1 Bangin' Breakfast Sandwich Fried Hard Egg	\$15.60

Items subtotal	\$37.05
Offer	-\$5.00
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$4.81
Sales tax	\$2.56
Driver tip	\$3.86
	\$5.00

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118*

Ordered from

Bossa Nova Inc

Estimated Delivery

4:28pm - 4:38pm

Bossa Nova Inc

4460 W Rosecrans Ave (310) 409-1973

Delivery (ASAP) to:

B,
14 N Eucalyptus Ave
209
glewood, CA 90302
23) 992-8326

Delivery instructions

Contact-free delivery

Drop-off location

I'll specify in the notes for the driver

Notification

Call me

Please call upon arrival and I will give you the code to unlock the door

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Order #23883031-9726076

Jul 2, 2025 3:46pm

1 Seafood Pasta

\$35.10

Fettuccine!, NO Capers

Items subtotal

\$35.10

Offer

-\$5.00

Delivery fee

\$0.00

Service fee

\$4.52 \$2.41

Sales tax

\$4.26

Driver tip

\$5.00

Driver Benefits Fee

\$3.00

Adjusted total

\$44.77

 Amazon Pay

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118*

Ordered from
American Deli

Estimated Delivery
7:21pm - 7:31pm

American Deli
425 E Manchester Blvd (424) 800-2136

Delivery (ASAP)	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 14 N Eucalyptus Ave 209 glewood, CA 90302 (323) 992-8326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location I'll specify in the notes for the driver Notification Call me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.
Please call upon arrival and I will give you the code to unlock the door		

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #82533019-9246767
Jun 19, 2025 6:38pm	
1 Chicken Philly and 5 Wings Combo	\$22.99
YES CELERY, Hot, Ranch (4 oz.), NO FRIES - NO SEASONING, Coke	
"No ice in soda"	
Items subtotal	\$22.99
Offer	-\$10.00
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$3.45\$1.84
Sales tax	\$2.45
Driver tip	\$4.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00
Total	\$22.28

 Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
CASE # 23STCV24118

<https://partner-web.grubhub.com/account/history/fd82e8e0-4d76-11f0-a8e1-d1be618ded40>

Ordered from
Red Robin
Estimated Delivery
9:24pm - 9:34pm
Red Robin
1900 W Florida Ave

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 1589 Erin Dr Bemet, CA 9544 (23) 992- 326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #04823012-2402998
Jun 12, 2025 8:45pm	
1 Clucks & Fries®	\$19.59
Everything Caesar Salad - No Croutons, Add a Side Sauce - (2) Ranch Dressing	
Items subtotal	\$19.59
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$2.94
Sales tax	\$1.57
Driver tip	\$1.96
Driver Benefits Fee	\$4.00
Total	\$1.30
Total	\$28.42

 Amazon Pay

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118*

Ordered from

Chili's

Estimated Delivery

8:58pm - 9:08pm

Chili's

2100 W Florida Ave (951) 652-2777

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 1589 Erin Dr San Ramon, CA 94544 (925) 992- 326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Order #71152963-4669637

Apr 24, 2025 8:12pm

1 Ultimate Cajun Pasta	\$24.69
No Garlic Toast, Diced Tomatoes, Cajun Spice, Green Onions, Parmesan, Alfredo Sauce	
1 Chicken Bacon Ranch Quesadillas	\$24.78
Bacon Crumbles, House-made Pico de Gallo, Ranch, Cajun spice, Sour Cream, Chicken Enchilada Soup	
1 Nashville Hot Chicken Crispers® Combo	\$21.79
5ct Nashville Hot Crisper® Combo · Ranch · Fries · White Cheddar Mac & Cheese	
1 Brisket Quesadillas	\$18.29
NEW! House BBQ, Fire-Roasted Jalapeños, House-made Pico de Gallo, Sour Cream	

Items subtotal	\$89.55
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$13.43
Sales tax	\$7.16
	\$8.65

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles, CA

<https://partner-web.grubhub.com/account/history/67867180-2180-11f0-b181-5d917272ceb3>

Case #23STCV24118

Ordered from
Red Robin

Estimated Delivery
2:11pm - 2:21pm

Red Robin
1900 W Florida Ave

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 1589 Erin Dr Bemet, CA 95444 (23) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #30682942-2301452
Apr 4, 2025 1:30pm	
1 Clucks & Fries® Steak Fries, Add a Side Sauce · (2)Ranch Dressing	\$19.59
1 Clucks & Fries® Steak Fries, Add a Side Sauce · (2)Whiskey River® BBQ Sauce	\$19.59
2 Get Saucy! Ranch Dressing	\$0.00
2 Get Saucy! Tartar Sauce	\$0.00
2 Get Saucy! Buzz Sauce	\$0.00

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

1 Crispy Chicken Sandwich

\$20.39

Steak Fries

Items subtotal

\$59.57

Delivery fee

\$0.00

Service fee

\$8.94\$4.77

Sales tax

\$5.81

Driver tip

\$6.00

Driver Benefits Fee

\$2.00

Total

\$78.15



Need help?

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of Ct, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118*

Ordered from
Holy Guacamole

Estimated Delivery
11:26am - 11:36am

Holy Guacamole
2906 Main St (310) 314-4850

Delivery (ASAP) to: Delivery instructions

B,
320 Santa Monica
Ave
30
Santa Monica, CA
90404
(310) 992-8326

Contact-free delivery
Drop-off location
I'll specify in the notes for the driver
Notification
Text me

Utensil and napkin preference

Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please come to suite 600 and text me once you're in the lobby to deliver the food

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order **Order #52812938-8062418**

Mar 31, 2025 10:48am

1 Asada Burrito	\$21.19
Add Extra Sour Cream, Add Extra Cheese	
"No beans, easy rice"	
1 Chicken Super Burrito	\$24.73

Items subtotal	\$45.92
Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$6.89
Sales tax	\$5.52
Driver tip	\$5.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$1.00

Total **\$64.33**

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court, of CA, Los Angeles
case # 23 STCV 24118*

Ordered from
Dragon Chinese Restaurant

Estimated Delivery
4:06pm - 4:16pm

Dragon Chinese Restaurant
10814 Jefferson Blvd (310) 838-9868

Delivery address (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 14 N, Eucalyptus Ave 209, Glendale, CA 90302 (213) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Outside my building door Notification Text me The intercom is broken so please leave food behind bush on left side of the door and text me once it's been dropped off	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order	Order #84542923-1505780
Mar 16, 2025 3:26pm	
1 Beef with Chinese broccoli	\$15.99
1 178. Shrimp Fried Rice	\$13.99
1 2. Chicken Egg Rolls	\$7.99
Items subtotal	\$37.97
Offer	-\$5.00
Sales tax	\$3.38
Delivery fee	\$4.00\$0.00
Tip	\$6.20
Total	\$42.55

 Amazon Pay
Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles

Case # 23STCV24118

Ordered from
Red Robin

Estimated Delivery

1:20pm - 1:30pm

Red Robin

1900 W Florida Ave

Delivery (SAP) to:	Delivery instructions	Utensil and napkin preference
B, 1589 Erin Dr Bemet, CA 95444 (23) 992-326	Contact-free delivery Drop-off location Front door of my house/apartment unit Notification Text me	Yes, include utensils, napkins, etc.

Please leave at the front door and text once it's been dropped off. Do not ring doorbell (the dog will go crazy)

Your health and safety is our priority, from restaurant to doorstep. [Learn more](#)

Your order

Order #51692922-6048019

Mar 15, 2025 12:37pm

1 Clucks & Fries®	\$19.59
Steak Fries, Add a Side Sauce · (2) Ranch Dressing	
1 Get Saucy!	\$0.00
Ranch Dressing	
1 Crispy Chicken Sandwich	\$20.39
Steak Fries	
1 Banzai	\$19.99
Turkey Patty, Steak Fries, Add To-Go Silverware · Napkin · Fork · Knife	
2 Get Saucy!	\$0.00
Buzz Sauce	

Items subtotal

\$59.97

<https://partner-web.grubhub.com/account/history/20bee000-01d4-11f0-a001-ddee3a716858>

Page 1 of 2




Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

Delivery fee	\$0.00
Service fee	\$9.00\$4.80
Sales tax	\$5.85
Driver tip	\$6.00
Driver Benefits Fee	\$2.00
Total	\$78.62

 Amazon Pay

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court, CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23 STCV 24198

Need help?



FISH TACO
Deep fried beer battered fish, cabbage, pico & chipotle sauce

\$4.99

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118

ENCHILADAS

All enchiladas are topped with enchilada sauce cheese lettuce & sour cream



2 CHEESE ENCH
Cheese enchiladas, topped with enchilada sauce,
lettuce, cheese & sour cream

\$7.99

+

2 SHREDDED BEEF ENCH
Shredded beef enchiladas topped with enchilada
sauce, lettuce, cheese & sour cream

\$8.99

+

2 SHREDDED CKHN ENCH
Shredded chicken (mild) enchiladas topped with
enchilada sauce, lettuce, cheese & sour cream

\$8.99

+

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles,

~~Case # 23STCV24118~~ Case # 23STCV24118

Albertos Mexican Food | Sanderson & Stetson


1127 South Sanderson Avenue, Hemet, CA

 Delivery Pickup Pickup from 1127 South Sanderson Ave... ASAP • Pickup in 10 - 15 min >**BREAKFAST ALL DAY** AGUAS FRESCAS NATURALES FOUNTAIN DRINKS FRIES CALDOS/SOUPS BURRITOS Search**Featured Items****TACOS (REG SIZE TORTILLA)**

Asada, Carnitas, Grilled Chicken, or Al Pastor, on a soft corn or flour tortilla, Topped with guac & pico.

\$4.99

+

**32 oz HORCHATA DE FRESA**

*Strawberry horchata: a sweet and creamy drink blending fresh strawberries with traditional horchata...

\$5.99

+

**ASADA FRIES**

French fries, cheddar & monterrey jack cheese, guacamole, sour cream Topped with your choice of...

\$15.99

+

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #BSTCV241118

American Deli®

Sign In / Sign Up

0



American Deli

425 E Manchester Blvd, Inglewood, CA 90301, USA - [Change Location](#)

Online ordering hours: 11:00 AM - 9:35 PM

23 min
ready for pickup


Delivery

Pickup

Featured Items




BONELESS Wings and Fries
Combo
\$11.99



Chicken Philly and 5pc Wings
Combo
\$21.49



Beef Philly and Fries Combo
\$17.49



Beef Philly Only
\$11.99



Large Fries
\$7.29


Full Menu

11:00 am - 9:35 pm

[Most Ordered](#) [Wings](#) [Boneless Wings](#) [Philly](#) [Fried Rice](#) [Burger](#) [Gyro](#) [Tilapia](#) [Shrimp](#) [Chicken Tenders](#) [Chicken Tender Sandwich](#) [5](#)

Most Ordered

The most commonly ordered items and dishes from this store



Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 24STCV24118

X

 Pick up • Inglewood, CA
425 East Manchester Boulevard, Inglewood, CA

 Ready in 20 mins



Wings and Fries Combo

10pc Combo, YES CELERY, -Hot, COMBO
FRIES (included) w/ Seasoning Salt, Ranch (4...

 1x +

\$22.99



Chicken Philly and 5pc Wings

Combo

YES CELERY, - Hot, Ranch (4oz), Coke, NO
FRIES

 1x +

\$21.49

YES CELERY, - Hot, Ranch (4oz), Coke, NO FRIES

Chicken Philly and 5pc Wings

Combo

YES CELERY, - Hot, Ranch (4oz), Barq's Root
Beer, NO FRIES

 1x +

\$21.49



Beef Philly Only

\$11.99

 1x +

In case you missed it



Small Fries
\$4.79



Large Fries
\$7.29



Celery Sticks
(5x5 box)
\$2.00

Checkout

\$77.96

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
case # 23STCV 04118



♡ 17 likes



Hollywood

Seafood Pasta

\$29.95

Details


Reviews (3)

Shrimp, Smoked Salmon, Capers, Asparagus and Cream Sauce.

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
Case # 23STCV24118



MY CART



Swai a la Carte

\$11.00

Half Cajun/Half Garlic Butter

— 2 +

Remove

Modify



SWAI (WHITE/FISH)

\$17.23

Half Cajun/Half Garlic Butter | Cauliflower
Rice (\$3.25) | House Salad (\$0.99) |
Ranch

— 1 +

Remove

Modify

*Wong et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23STCV24118*

 MENU REWARDS LOCATIONS GIFT CARDS

Q ⓘ 📱

BACK TO MENU

 Pickup

2100 W. Florida Avenue, Hemet, CA 92345

EDIT

ORDER DETAILS

EDIT

 Pickup

Hemet

2100 W. Florida Avenue, Hemet, CA 92345

ESTIMATED PICKUP TIME

~05:58 PM

Today (Thursday, 3/26/26)

Already a My Chili's member?

LOG IN

ORDER SUMMARY

4 Items

Brisket Quesadillas

\$17.99

Chicken Bacon Ranch Quesadilla

\$17.69

Ultimate Cajun Pasta

▼

\$24.59

Nashville Hot Chicken

▼

\$18.89

Subtotal (4 items)

\$79.16

Wang et al v. Anubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles,
Case #23STCV24118

PICKUP FROM

2475 W FLORIDA AVE
HEMET, CA 92343



REWARDS

FAN FAVORITE

FEATURED

ALL CATEGORIES

COMBOS

CLASSIC SLAMS

SPECIALTY PANCAKES & CREPES

SIGNATURE BREAKFASTS

BREAKFAST SIDES

STARTERS

SALADS

BURGERS

MELTS & HANDHELDS

SIDES

DINNERS & SKILLETS

DENNY'S DEALS

FAMILY PACK

KIDS

55+

DESSERTS

BURGERS



SLAMBURGER™

\$17.99 | Cal 970-1550

Crispy hash browns, an egg* made your way, Applewood-smoked bacon and American cheese stacked high on a golden brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)


BACON AVOCADO CHEESEBURGER

\$18.99 | Cal 1150-1540

Burger dreams come true! Applewood-smoked bacon, fresh avocado, aged white cheddar cheese, mayo, lettuce, tomato, red onions, and pickles on a golden brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)


BOURBON BACON BURGER

\$17.79 | Cal 1020-1410

A mouthful of flavor! Aged white cheddar cheese, Applewood-smoked bacon, sautéed mushrooms, fire-roasted bell peppers & onions, bourbon sauce, lettuce, tomato, red onions and pickles on a golden brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)


DOUBLE CHEESEBURGER

\$19.29 | Cal 1020-1500

Choice of American, Swiss or aged white cheddar cheese with lettuce, tomato, red onions and pickles on a brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)


SINGLE CHEESEBURGER

\$17.29 | Cal 700-1260

Choice of American, Swiss or aged white cheddar cheese with lettuce, tomato, red onions and pickles on a brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)


TRIPLE JUICY BURGER

\$18.99 | Cal 1400-1790

Three quarter pound patties, three strips of Applewood-smoked bacon, three slices of aged white cheddar cheese, topped with signature Diner Q sauce, pickles, onions, tomatoes, and lettuce, all stacked high on a golden brioche bun.

[ORDER NOW](#)

Wong et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118

OUR MENU

PICKUP FROM
2675 W FLORIDA AVE
HEMET, CA 92343



REWARDS

FEATURED

ALL CATEGORIES

COMBOS

CLASSIC SLAMS

SPECIALTY PANCAKES &
CREPES

SIGNATURE BREAKFASTS

BREAKFAST SIDES

STARTERS

SALADS

BURGERS

MELTS & HANDHELDS

SIDES

DINNERS & SKILLETS

DENNY'S DEALS

FAMILY PACK

KIDS

55+

DESSERTS

MELTS & HANDHELDS



BRISKET MELT

\$17.99 | Cal 1600-2210

Our slow-smoked brisket burnt ends, caramelized onions, and scrambled eggs are piled high on premium grilled sourdough bread with melty white cheddar and American cheeses plus our signature Diner Q sauce.

ORDER NOW



BBQ BACON CHICKEN SANDWICH

\$18.79 | Cal 860-1250

This new creation is already a classic. Grilled chicken breast topped with BBQ sauce, two strips of Applewood-smoked bacon, aged white cheddar cheese, lettuce, tomato, red onions and sliced pickles on a grilled brioche bun.

ORDER NOW



POT ROAST MELT

\$16.89 | Cal 1060-1570

Tender slow-roasted beef, caramelized onions and sharp white cheddar on perfectly grilled sourdough bread. Served with wavy-cut fries.

ORDER NOW



CALI CLUB SANDWICH

\$15.69 | Cal 990-1320

Make your day fresh and sunny! Roasted turkey breast, ham, Applewood-smoked bacon, Swiss cheese, fresh avocado, mayo, lettuce and tomato on toasted 7-grain bread.

ORDER NOW



SUPER BIRD®

\$17.49 | Cal 890-1280

Turkey breast with Swiss cheese, bacon and tomato on perfectly grilled sourdough bread. Served with wavy-cut fries.

ORDER NOW



CRISPY BACON RANCH SANDWICH

\$18.29 | Cal 1340-1730

Saddle up with this family favorite. Fried chicken breast topped with aged white cheddar cheese, Applewood-smoked bacon, lettuce, tomato and ranch dressing on perfectly grilled sourdough bread.

ORDER NOW

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
 Case # 23STCV24118*

**FIVE GUYS®**

PICKUP FROM
FIVE GUYS FOX HILLS MALL
6000 Sepulveda Blvd., Culver City, CA 90230

**BURGERS**

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
Case # 23STCV24118

Your Order



Order Type

Carryout

Carryout Time

As soon as possible

Pickup

2906 Main St Santa Monica, CA

Address

90405

#	Item	Price
1	SUPER DELUXE POLLO	\$21.50
	NO SALSA	\$0.00
1	BURRITO ASADA	\$14.95
	ADD CHEESE	\$1.70
	ADD SOUR CREAM	\$1.70
	NO SALSA	\$0.00
Subtotal		\$39.85

Wang et al v. Brubaker, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles,
Case # 23STCV24118

...

SASHIMI SAMPLER

* o

tuna, salmon, yellowtail,
albacore, ama ebi, ikura,
masago
26.95

ASARI CLAMS

Asari Clams Sauteed
with sake, garlic and
butter
14.95

MEAT

FRIED GYOZA
DUMPLINGS

beef and vegetable
dumplings
9.25

CHICKEN WING
KARAAGE

crispy chicken wings,
sweet soy sauce
9.95

YUM YUM
CHICKEN

crispy chicken wings,
sweet, sour, and spicy
11.50

Wang et al v. Greubel, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23 STCV24118

MIXED TEMPURA
lightly battered and
fried shrimps,
vegetables
10.95

YELLOWTAIL
CARPACCIO *
yellowtail, jalapeños,
spicy ponzu sauce
14.50

GOLDEN FRIED
TIGER SHRIMP
deep-fried tiger shrimp
with crispy panko
crumbs
11.50

CALAMARI RINGS
lightly fried calamari,
wasabi mayo, spicy
teriyaki sauce
12.50

TAKOYAKI
Savory octopus cakes,
nori, truffle
mayo, tonkatsu
sauce, with bonito flakes
8.50

IKA KARAAGE
8.25

JUMBO SCALLOPS
WITH
MUSHROOMS

FIRE CRACKER * °
spicy tuna mix,
tomatoes, red onion,
wonton chips
13.25

SALMON
CARPACCIO *
thinly sliced salmon,
onion vinaigrette,
capers

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV 04118*

MENUS

COCKTAIL+BEER+WINE+SAKE SMALL PLATE SALAD

SUSHI & SASHIMI ROLL SPECIALTY ROLL HAPPY HOUR 7 DAYS!

CLASSIC TABLES SIGNATURE DISH NOODLE RICE BOWL

LUNCH SOUP & SIDE KIDS MEAL DESSERT CATERING PLATTERS

MISO SOUP
tofu, green onion
3.75

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case #23JTCV24118*

TRUFFLE
YELLOWTAIL ROLL
*
yellowtail, green onion,
kaiware roll with
yellowtail, and truffle
mayo, lotus and onion
chips
17.95

SPICY TUNA
TEMPURA ROLL * °
tempura-fried spicy
tuna, krab, avocado
14.95

LOBSTER ROLL * °
baked premium lobster
claw meat, smelt egg,
on top of california roll,
served with eel sauce
19.95

KIMCHI CRUNCH
ROLL
sauteed kimchi in
sesame oil, tempura
crunch, with truffle
mayo and flavored
seaweed
14.95

GREEN ROLL
asparagus roll, avocado,
kale sauce
13.95

VEGETABLE
TEMPURA ROLL
lightly battered onion,
sweet potato,
asparagus, avocado,
spicy crunch
12.50

*Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles.
Case #23STCV24818*

HAMACHI SAKE
ROLL *
salmon, asparagus, and
furikake roll wrapped in
yellowtail served with a
truffle spicy ponzu
17.95

LOTUS ON FIRE
ROLL * °
spicy tuna, lotus root,
jalapeños, california roll
16.95

ALASKAN ROLL *
baked salmon, california
roll
15.50

SUNKISSED ROLL *
°
spicy tuna roll, fresh
salmon, avocado
16.95

TIGER ROLL * °
shrimp tempura roll,
spicy tuna, avocado
served with lemon
vinaigrette
17.95

SALMON CRUNCH
ROLL *
Salmon tempura, krab,
cream cheese, avocado
and cucumber with an
onion vinaigrette
topped with onion
crunch and lemon
16.50

*Wang et al v. Brubaker, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCR24118*

MENUS

COCKTAIL+BEER+WINE+SAKE SMALL PLATE SALAD

SUSHI & SASHIMI ROLL SPECIALTY ROLL HAPPY HOUR 7 DAYS!

CLASSIC TABLES SIGNATURE DISH NOODLE RICE BOWL

LUNCH SOUP & SIDE KIDS MEAL DESSERT CATERING PLATTERS

KABUKI ROLL * °
spicy crunch roll topped
with tuna, salmon,
yellowtail, spicy
albacore, spicy tuna,
smelt egg, salmon egg,
krab
19.25

CILANTRO
ALBACORE ROLL *
shrimp tempura, cream
cheese, albacore, krab
meat, cilantro
vinaigrette, red onion,
soy paper
17.95

SPIDER ROLL * °
soft shell crab, avocado,
krab, smelt egg
17.95

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV2418

HOURS & LOCATION

6081 Center Dr., #203,
Los Angeles, CA 90045
310.641.5524

Monday -Thursday : 11am - 10:00pm
Friday-Saturday : 11am - 11:00pm | Sunday : 11am
- 9:30pm

ADDITIONAL INFO

Manager: Jiro Kim
Parking: Garage, Mall Valet

PICK UP + DELIVERY

*Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24118*

CURBSIDE

1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92345 Edit

Order Type: Curbside

OUR MENU

LIMITED TIME

NEW ITEMS

BIG YUMMM DEALS

BURGERS

DONATOS PIZZA

WRAPS & SANDWICHES

ENTREES

SALADS

VEGGIE & MORE

APPETIZERS

CHICKEN WINGS

KIDS MEALS

FAMILY MEAL DEALS

GOURMET MILKSHAKES

BEVERAGES

DESSERTS

SIDES & SAUCES

ADULT BEVERAGES

FUNDRAISERS (TO-GO)

WRAPS & SANDWICHES**BACON CLUB CRISPY**

\$18.29 | 890 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Smoky
bacon, ranch, lettuce and tomato on a...

ADD TO ORDER

**BUZZ RANCH CRISPY**

\$18.08 | 870 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Frank's
RedHot® Buffalo-style Buzz Sauce, ranch...

ADD TO ORDER

**CRISPY FISH SANDWICH**

\$18.39 | 830 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Hand-
battered crispy white fish with tartar...

ADD TO ORDER

**WHISKEY RIVER® BBQ
CHICKEN WRAP**

\$18.99 | 930 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Grilled
chicken breast, tortilla strips, cheddar...

ADD TO ORDER

**CLASSIC CRISPY**

\$17.99 | 870 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Pickles,
lettuce, tomato and mayo on a brioche...

ADD TO ORDER

**CRISPY CHICKEN WRAP**

\$17.99 | 1180 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Crispy
chicken strips, smoky bacon, cheddar...

ADD TO ORDER

Wang et al v. Brubaker, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV 24118

CURBSIDE

1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92345

Order Type: Curbside**BURGERS****OUR MENU**

LIMITED TIME

NEW ITEMS

BIG YUMMM DEALS

BURGERS

DONATOS- PIZZA

WRAPS & SANDWICHES

ENTREES

SALADS

VEGGIE & MORE

APPETIZERS

CHICKEN WINGS

KIDS MEALS

FAMILY MEAL DEALS

GOURMET MILKSHAKES

BEVERAGES

DESSERTS

SIDES & SAUCES

ADULT BEVERAGES

FUNDRAISERS (TO-GO)

**COWBOY RANCH DOUBLE**

\$14.89 | 600 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Whiskey River® BBQ sauce, American cheese...

ADD TO ORDER

**HAYSTACK DOUBLE®**

\$12.99 | 730 Calories

Served with your choice of side. American cheese, crispy onion straws and Campfire...

ADD TO ORDER

**BACKYARD BBQ PORK BURGER**

\$20.09 | 1290 Calories

Hickory-smoked pulled pork, smoky bacon, crispy onion straws, cheddar...

ADD TO ORDER

**WHISKEY RIVER® BBQ**

\$17.49 | 1160 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Crispy onion straws, cheddar, Whiskey River®...

ADD TO ORDER

**BACON CHEESEBURGER**

\$17.89 | 900-960 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Smoky bacon, your choice of cheese, lettuce...

ADD TO ORDER

**SMASHED AVOCADO N' BACON**

\$18.79 | 930 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Smoky bacon, Swiss, smashed avocado, lettuce...

ADD TO ORDER

**RED ROBIN GOURMET CHEESEBURGER**

\$18.89 | 780-840 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Your...

**BACON 'N' BLEU**

\$18.09 | 1050 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Smoky bacon, crumbled bleu cheese, carameliz...

**BANZAI**

\$17.29 | 950 Calories

Served with your choice of side. Teriyaki-glazed beef patty, fresh grilled pineapple...

Wang et al v. GrubHub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24114

CURBSIDE

1990 W Florida Ave, Hemet, CA 92343 Edit

Order Type: Curbside**ENTREES****OUR MENU**

LIMITED TIME

NEW ITEMS

BIG YUMMM DEALS

BURGERS

DONATOS- PIZZA

WRAPS & SANDWICHES

ENTREES

SALADS

VEGGIE & MORE

APPETIZERS

CHICKEN WINGS

KIDS MEALS

FAMILY MEAL DEALS

GOURMET MILKSHAKES

BEVERAGES

DESSERTS

SIDES & SAUCES

ADULT BEVERAGES

FUNDRAISERS (TO-GO)

**SANTA FE SALMON**

\$22.89 | 290 Calories

Ancho-marinated with salsa-ranch dressing and cilantro. Served with...

ADD TO ORDER

**TERIYAKI SALMON**

\$22.79 | 290 Calories

Teriyaki-glazed. Served with steamed broccoli and your choice of side.

ADD TO ORDER

**GRILLED SALMON**

\$22.79 | 240 Calories

Sea salt and black pepper. Served with steamed broccoli and your choice of side.

ADD TO ORDER

**BLACKENED SALMON**

\$22.79 | 280-760 Calories

Cajun-spiced. Served with steamed broccoli and your choice of side.

ADD TO ORDER

**TWO FOR YOU COMBO**

\$22.79 | 710-2410 Calories

Pick your favorite two entrees! Your choice between Crispy Chicken Strips...

ADD TO ORDER

**CRISPY CHICKEN STRIPS**


\$16.79 | 1480 Calories

Golden-fried served with ranch and Steak Fries.

ADD TO ORDER

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles,
Case # 23STCV24118

BURRITOS



36G PROTEIN

Puerto Nuevo Burrito

Sustainable, wild-caught Langostino Lobster, Mexican rice, pinto beans, drawn garlic butter, salsa fresca and guacamole, creamy chipotle picante sauce wrapped in warm flour tortilla. Served with a side of tortilla chips (210 cal).

1030 CAL | \$14.99

+ Add

Customize



36G PROTEIN

Classic Shrimp Bu

Classic Shrimp Burrito

Now with 25% more shrimp! Pan-seared shrimp with "no-fried" pinto beans™, cheese, Mexican rice, salsa fresca and chipotle lime crema. Served with tortilla chips.

1120 CAL | \$12.99

+ Add

Customize


Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior Court of CA, Los Angeles
Case # 23STCV24113

COPY

Document Control

FROM:

C. Braggion
P.O. Box 5663
Los Angeles, CA 90045



TO:

GrubHub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97209-2349

Expandable Photo Document Mailer
9 3/4" x 12 1/4"

ReadyPost

WRITTEN OBJECTION TO CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

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

Case Name: *Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.*

Case Number: 23STCV24118

Hearing Date: August 10, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. (Courtroom 15)

I. OBJECTOR INFORMATION

- Samuel B. Goldstone
- 5365 Rod Ct. Unit 101 Las Vegas, NV 89122
- 626 416 6274
- **Email Address:** samuelbgoldstone@yahoo.com
- **Class Member Proof:** I am a Settlement Class Member who received a direct email notice regarding this settlement at the email address listed above, containing Claim ID Number: T4V677DV96.

II. NOTICE OF INTENTION TO APPEAR

Pursuant to the court-approved notice, I am filing this written objection to state my views on the proposed settlement.

- **Intent to Appear:** I do not intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing and request the Court evaluate this objection on its written merits.

- **III. GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION**

While I recognize the immense effort required to bring a consumer class action to a resolution, I write to object to the **adequacy and fairness** of the consumer relief component of the proposed settlement. Specifically, I object to the exclusive use of platform credits rather than a cash distribution option.

1. Recognition of Class Counsel's Efficiency and Injunctive Relief

As an initial matter, Class Counsel should be commended for the remarkable speed with which they navigated this litigation. Achieving a settlement structure within approximately three years is highly efficient and spares the class the exhaustion of protracted appellate battles. Furthermore, the negotiated structural platform modifications—requiring Grubhub to transparently break down service fees and restrict deceptive "\$0 delivery" marketing—represent a meaningful victory for forward-looking consumer transparency in California.

2. The \$10.00 Credit Acts as an "Illusion of Relief" and Unjustly Benefits the Defendant

Despite the positive platform adjustments, the \$10.00 Grubhub site credit is fundamentally inadequate to settle seven years of alleged overcharges.

- **Forced Continued Commerce:** A site credit is not true restitution. It legally forces injured consumers to continue doing business with the platform that allegedly deceived them in the first place.
- **Barriers to Real-World Redemption:** Due to Grubhub's existing fee structures, service fees, tip requirements, and minimum order thresholds, a \$10.00 credit is practically incapable of purchasing a full meal. Consequently, class members are forced to spend their own out-of-

pocket cash simply to redeem their legal remedy.

- **Marketing Mechanism as Legal Remedy:** Because a platform credit ensures a 100% return rate of consumer transaction volume back into Grubhub's proprietary ecosystem, the settlement pool functions more like an interactive corporate marketing promotion than a punitive legal remedy.

3. Request for Cash-Equivalent Alternative

A fair, reasonable, and adequate settlement should protect consumer autonomy. If a class member chooses not to continue using Grubhub's services, a digital coupon holds a real-world value of zero dollars. The settlement framework should be amended to offer a cash-equivalent distribution option (e.g., via check or direct digital deposit) to ensure that the recovery holds universal, unrestricted value for the affected class.

IV. PRIOR OBJECTIONS HISTORY

IV. PRIOR OBJECTIONS HISTORY

Pursuant to the procedural requirements of this Court, I hereby disclose that I have consistently engaged with the class action settlement process as a self-represented (*Pro Se*) consumer and worker to ensure corporate accountability. Within the last ten (10) years, I or counsel representing me have filed objections in the following matters:

1. *Abarca v. Werner Enterprises, Inc.*, Case No. 8:14-cv-00319 (U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska) — Objecting to the adequacy of the labor and driver compensation settlement structures.

2. *Lawson v. Grubhub Holdings Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-05128 (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California) — Objecting to driver classification and expense reimbursement settlement terms.

While I have participated as an objector in a limited number of other consumer or contract disputes over the past decade, I do not have the specific case names or docket numbers readily available. I maintain no commercial or profit motive in filing this objection, and my participation has consistently been aimed at advocating for fair recovery structures for class members.

V. SIGNATURE & VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing statements are true and correct, and that I am a member of the settlement class in this action.

Dated: June 15, 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sam Goldstone", written in a cursive style.

Samuel B. Goldstone

Samuel Goldstone
5365 Rod ct. #101
Las Vegas, NV 89122



9589 0710 5270 3800 0338 24

Retail



97208

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LETTER
LAS VEGAS, NV 89121
JUN 15, 2028


\$6.08

RDC 99

S2324M502475-5

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
P.O. Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

97208-234949



Joseph R. Plante
1760 Sycamore Ave
Niceville FL 32578

850-543-3918

Case # 235TCV24118

Former address


1317 Poplar Ave
Sunnyvale Ca 94087

Wang et al v GrubHub,
Superior Court of
California for the
County of Los
Angeles

Dear Superior Court,

I object to the GrubHub settlement.
A \$10 gift card in this economy is not
enough to purchase a Big Mac Meal. After
adding \$10.59 of Big Mac, I am given
a \$2.49 delivery fee and a \$2.49
service fee.

A \$10 gift card does not cover \$15.57,
before taxes. Thank you

Sincerely,
Joe Plante


PS: I will attach a printed version of this
letter because my handwriting is
terrible

Joseph R Plante
1760 Sycamore Ave
Niceville, Florida 32578
Former Address:

850 543 3918

1317 Poplar Ave
Sunnyvale, Ca 94087

Dear Superior Court,

I object to the Grubhub settlement. A \$10 gift card in this economy is not enough to purchase a Big Mac Meal. After adding \$10.49 of Big Mac, I am given a \$2.49 delivery fee and a \$2.49 service fee.

A \$10 gift card does not cover \$15.57, before taxes. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joe Plante

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joe Plante', written over the printed name.

Case # 23 STCV 24118

Wang et al v. Grubhub, Superior
Court of California for the County
of Los Angeles

I do not intend on appearing at the
Fairness hearing in person, but would
happily testify via phone or
Internet



McDonald's



Big Mac® Meal

Medium · French Fries · Diet
Coke® (0 Cal.)

\$10.59

1 +

Include utensils, etc.



Offers or promo code
1 offer available

Items subtotal	\$10.59
Delivery fee	\$2.49
Service fee	\$2.49

\$39.41 away from no fees

Proceed to Checkout

Grubhub order
May 10, 2026

Wang et al v Grubhub
Superior Court of
California for
the County of

> Los Angeles

Case #23STCV24118

Arthur Mateos
1390 Veteran Ave, Apt 3
Los Angeles, CA 90024
acm532@gmail.com
617-800-3945

March 23, 2026

Clerk of the Court
Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles
312 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Courtroom 15

Re: Objection to Proposed Class Action Settlement *Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.*, Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 23STCV24118 — GrubHub Delivery Fees Settlement

NOTICE OF OBJECTION BY CLASS MEMBER

To the Honorable Court:

I, Arthur Mateos, am a member of the Settlement Class in the above-captioned matter. I used GrubHub to order delivery to a California address during the class period (January 24, 2019 through January 12, 2026) and was subject to the allegedly misleading delivery fees, service fees, and/or inflated menu prices described in the Class Action Complaint. I submit this objection pursuant to the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and respectfully urge the Court to decline to approve the proposed settlement as unfair, unreasonable, and inadequate under California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.

While this Court applies a presumption of fairness to settlements reached through arm's-length negotiation under *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, that presumption does not relieve the Court of its independent duty to ensure the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable to absent class members. (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129.)

I. THE SETTLEMENT FAILED TO ADEQUATELY NOTIFY AFFECTED CLASS MEMBERS

The settlement notice process was materially deficient. As of March 23, 2026 — just one week before the objection deadline — I had received no notification from GrubHub or the Settlement Administrator,

despite being a customer during the class period. As I have not placed a GrubHub order from my current address, the delivery address on file with my account is outdated. I have lived at my current address for over four years, so any mail forwarding services have long since ceased. GrubHub nonetheless has my current email address on file, which falls within the “last known available contact information” specified by the Settlement Agreement (Section II.Y). Email outreach was therefore both available and more reliable than mail for reaching class members like me whose addresses may have changed — particularly given that the class period spans seven years.

The claim process then compounds this failure. To file a claim, class members must provide a “Unique ID” received via a notice from the Settlement Administrator (**Exhibit A**). Class members who never received that notice are directed to contact the Settlement Administrator *in writing* to obtain their Unique ID — at a cost of \$0.78 in postage as of March 23, 2026, or 7.8% of the \$10.00 credit being offered. No email contact option is provided. The settlement website says, “If you did not receive a Notice or have lost yours, please contact the Settlement Administrator by calling 1-877-522-2081 (toll-free) for assistance.” (**Exhibit B**). But when I called the provided phone number on February 19, 2026, I reached only a recorded line with no option to speak to a live representative (**Exhibit C**). I tried again on March 15, 2026, and after over 5 minutes listening to different pre-recorded FAQ answers (including answers to “for information about who can participate in this settlement, please press 2” and “to find out how you can obtain settlement benefits and the deadline to receive these benefits, please press 4”), I finally gave up. As far as I could tell, there was no way to obtain a Unique ID over the phone. See attached call log and transcript (**Exhibits D & E**).

California courts require that notice be reasonably calculated to reach affected parties. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.766(e).) The Court acts as a fiduciary of absent class members and must ensure they have been meaningfully informed of their rights. (*In re Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 555.) This Court’s own Checklist for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements requires settling parties to “explain why the claims process is not so burdensome that relief would be inaccessible” (**Exhibit F**). No such explanation is adequate here. Class members who did not receive the Unique ID notice face mandatory written correspondence, out-of-pocket postage costs, and a frustrating FAQ phone line with no live contact option — all to claim a \$10 credit whose face value is already materially eroded by those costs.

This pattern of deficiency extends to the settlement agreement itself. The agreement represents that the settlement website will provide “instructions on how to access the case docket via PACER or in person at any of the court’s locations.” No such instructions appear on the settlement website. Whether this reflects a drafting error or a failure to administer the settlement as written, the commitment was not honored. Class members are entitled to expect that counsel purporting to represent their interests will ensure the settlement is drafted accurately and administered as written.

Class members have no practical way to review the prior litigation history underlying this settlement, as it is spread across multiple proceedings in different courts and jurisdictions, and the settlement website provides no guidance for accessing it.

II. THE SETTLEMENT AWARD IS NOT PROPORTIONATE TO INDIVIDUAL HARM

The settlement provides a flat \$10.00 credit to all class members regardless of how much any individual was actually overcharged. A customer who placed one order during the class period receives the same award as one who placed hundreds of orders over seven years and paid alleged misleading

the same award as one who placed hundreds of orders over seven years and paid alleged misleading fees each time. There is no apparent effort to calibrate the award to the magnitude of harm suffered by individual class members.

This one-size-fits-all approach does not constitute fair restitution. It primarily benefits GrubHub by capping total liability at \$5,000,000 regardless of actual aggregate harm, while providing class members with only nominal, undifferentiated relief. The Court must examine whether the settlement “is within the ballpark of reasonableness” in relation to the claims being released. (*Kullar*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 130.) A flat \$10 credit that bears no relationship to individual harm is not within that ballpark. The Court should require that any revised settlement include a mechanism for proportionate recovery based on each class member’s actual order history and fees paid.

III. A GRUBHUB PLATFORM CREDIT IS NOT MEANINGFUL RESTITUTION

The \$10.00 award takes the form of a GrubHub site credit, redeemable only on the GrubHub app or website. Compensation in the form of a platform-restricted credit that requires additional spending to redeem does not constitute genuine restitution and should be treated with heightened scrutiny by this Court.

In practice, a \$10 GrubHub credit cannot be used in isolation. GrubHub’s own fee structure — delivery fees, service fees, and minimum order thresholds — means that to redeem a \$10 credit, a class member will almost certainly need to spend additional money on the platform, generating further fee revenue for GrubHub in the process. A class member who does not wish to continue using GrubHub, whether due to distrust arising from this very lawsuit or any other reason, receives nothing of value whatsoever.

This arrangement functions not as restitution for alleged harm, but as a promotional coupon that incentivizes future purchases. It primarily benefits GrubHub by driving return engagement and generating new fee revenue on redemption orders. California courts have broad equitable authority to reject settlements that do not provide class members with fair value, and this Court should exercise that authority here. (*Dunk*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1801.) The compensation should be provided in cash, or at minimum as a transferable, platform-independent monetary credit.

IV. CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, I respectfully request that the Court decline to approve the proposed settlement. In the event the Court is inclined to approve a modified settlement, I request that any approval be conditioned on:

1. Establishment of a genuinely accessible notice and claims process, including a live contact option and electronic claim request form for class members who did not receive the Unique ID notice;
2. Compensation proportionate to each class member’s actual order history and fees paid during the class period;
3. Compensation provided in cash or a transferable, platform-independent form;
4. Any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

I intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing to present oral argument in support of this objection.

Please see attached purchase receipt as proof of my membership in the Settlement Class (**Exhibit G**).
I have not filed any objections to class action settlements in the last ten years.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Arthur Mateos", written over a horizontal line.

Arthur Mateos

March 23, 2026

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.

Case No. 23STCV24118

**DECLARATION OF ARTHUR MATEOS IN SUPPORT OF OBJECTION TO
PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**


I, Arthur Mateos, declare as follows:

1. I am a resident of Los Angeles, California. I am over the age of 18 and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration. If called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to these facts.
2. I am a member of the Settlement Class in the above-captioned matter. I used GrubHub to order delivery to a California address during the class period (January 24, 2019 through January 12, 2026).
3. My current email address is on file with GrubHub, and has not changed since the settlement period began. I have lived at my current address over four years, and have not placed a GrubHub order in that time.
4. As of March 23, 2026, I had not received any notice of this settlement, whether by email, mail, or any other means, from either GrubHub or the Settlement Administrator.
5. I first learned of the existence of this settlement through a third-party newsletter to which I voluntarily subscribe. I did not receive any direct notification from GrubHub or the Settlement Administrator.
6. My wife is also a GrubHub customer and a member of the Settlement Class. She similarly received no notice of this settlement from GrubHub or the Settlement Administrator by any means.
7. Upon learning of the settlement, I visited the settlement website at GHdeliveryfeesettlement.com. The website states that to submit a claim, class members must provide a "Unique ID" received with a notice from the Settlement Administrator. A true and correct screenshot, taken March 15, 2026, of this requirement is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.
8. The settlement website further states that class members who did not receive a notice should contact the Settlement Administrator by calling 1-877-522-2081, and provides no email address for this purpose. A true and correct screenshot, taken March 15, 2026, of this instruction is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

9. On February 19, 2026, I called the Settlement Administrator at 1-877-522-2081. I reached only a recorded line with the aim of obtaining a Unique ID to file a claim. There was no option to speak with a live representative. I was unable to obtain a Unique ID over the phone. My call log reflecting this call is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.
10. On March 15, 2026, I again called the Settlement Administrator, four times in total, at 1-877-522-2081 with the aim of obtaining a Unique ID to file a claim. I again reached only a recorded line. There was no option to speak with a live representative. As far as I could tell, there was no way to obtain a Unique ID over the phone. After over 5 minutes on the phone, I gave up. My call log reflecting these calls is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**. A partial transcript these calls is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

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

Executed on March 23, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Arthur Mateos", written over a horizontal line.

Arthur Mateos

Exhibit B

Wang et al. v. Grubhub - X

ghdeliveryfeesettlement.com/Login

Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.

Case No. 23STCV24618

[Home](#) [FAQs](#) [Documents](#) [Submit a Claim](#) [Contact](#)

Submit a Claim - Claim Instructions

File Online:

If you ordered and paid for food for delivery by Grubhub Independent contractors to an address in California through the Grubhub Platform between January 24, 2016 and January 12, 2026, then you are a Class Member and may be entitled to relief. Class Members must submit a Claim no later than May 12, 2026. Claim Forms submitted after the deadline will be dismissed untimely and may not be accepted.

Before you complete your claim form, please review the [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page of this website and the Long-Form Notice carefully.

In start the claim submission process, please provide the Unique ID you received with your email Notice from the Settlement Administrator. If you lost or did not receive your Notice, you may contact the Settlement Administrator in writing to obtain your Unique ID.

Please enter your Unique ID and click the

Submit

Where can I find my login information?

If you received a Notice indicating that you are part of the Settlement Class, you will have a 10-character alphanumeric "Unique ID" Ref ID values will be found on your Notice.

If you did not receive a Notice or have lost yours, please contact the Settlement Administrator by calling 1-877-522-7081 (toll-free) for assistance.

Close

Remember: All Claim Forms must be submitted online no later than 11:59 p.m. PST on May 12, 2026.

[Contact](#) [Privacy Policy](#)

Guidelines? Contact the Settlement Administrator at 1-877-522-7081 (Toll-Free)

© 2026 E&J All rights reserved. Notice of Class Action Settlement by E&J

Exhibit A

Wang et al. v. Grubhub - X

Endelivevicesettlement.com

Wang et al. v. Grubhub, Inc.

Case No. 23STCV24418

Home

FACs

Documents

Submit a Claim

Contact

Submit a Claim - Claim Instructions

File Online:

If you ordered and paid for food for delivery by Grubhub independent contractors to an address in California through the Grubhub Platform between January 24, 2016 and January 12, 2026, then you are a Class Member and may be entitled to relief. Class Members must submit a Claim no later than May 12, 2026. Claim Forms submitted after the deadline will be deemed untimely and may not be accepted.

Before you complete your claim form, please review the [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page of this website and the Long-Form Notice carefully.

To start the claim submission process, please provide the Unique ID you received with your email Notice from the Settlement Administrator. If you lost or did not receive your Notice, you may contact the Settlement Administrator in writing to obtain your Unique ID.

Please enter your Unique ID and click the button below to get started.

Submit a Claim Form - Login

Unique ID *

What email did you use to receive?

Where did you live at the time?

Login

Remember: All Claim Forms must be submitted online no later than 11:59 p.m. PST on May 12, 2026.


Contact

Privacy Policy

Questions? Contact the Settlement Administrator at 1-877-577-2081 (Toll-Free)

© 2020 ESI. All rights reserved. Version 1.0.2.24. Updated 2/16/2020 2:22:3 PM

Exhibit C



pg 9/22

Exhibit D




Exhibit E

Transcript from call to Settlement Administrator (1-877-522-2081), March 15, 2026, 5:49pm

Thank you for calling the Wang v. Grubhub information line. Here you can find frequently asked questions regarding the assignment which received preliminary approval on January 12, 2026. This settlement is being adjudicated in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles and the terms of the agreement are limited to delivery addresses in the state of California. The information provided here is only a summary you can find complete details regarding the settlement on the settlement website located at www.ghdeliveryfeesettlement.com which includes a downloadable copy of the settlement agreement, and the long form notice. To hear more information in the form of frequently asked questions and answers, please press one. To replay this message press the pound key.

[press # key]

Please listen carefully to the following categories. You may make your selection at any time. Press the star key to return to the main menu or simply hang up to disconnect. To hear more information about this settlement, please press one. For information about who can participate in this settlement, please press two. To learn about what benefits are available in the settlement please press three. To find out that you can obtain settlement benefits, and the deadline to receive these benefits, please press four. For class council information, please press five. To learn how to exclude yourself from the settlement please press six. To learn how to object to the settlement, please press seven. For information about the fairness hearing for the settlement, please press eight. To replay this message press the pound key.

[press # key]

Please listen carefully to the following categories. You may make your selection at any time. Press the star key to return to the main menu or simply hang up to disconnect. To hear more information about this settlement, please press one. For information about who can participate in this settlement, please press two. To learn about what benefits...

[press 2 key]

You are a settlement class member if you ordered and paid for food through the GrubHub app, the Seamless app, or GrubHub website between January 24, 2019 and January 12, 2026 for delivery to an address in the state of California. Only orders with delivery to California addresses are covered under the terms of this agreement.

To return to the main menu, please press the star key. To hear these menu options again, please press the pound key or simply hang up to disconnect.

[press # key]

Please listen carefully to the following categories. You may make your selection at any time. Press the star key to return to the main menu or simply hang up to disconnect. To hear more information about this settlement, please press one. For information about who can participate in this settlement, please press two. To learn about what benefits are available in the settlement please press three. To find out that you can obtain settlement benefits, and the deadline to receive these benefits, please press four. For class council information, please press five. To learn how to exclude yourself from the settlement

please press six. To learn how to object to the settlement, please press seven. For information about the fairness hearing for the settlement, please press eight. To replay this message press the pound key.

[Hang up]

Answer to pressing "4" key at FAQ menu on phone call to Settlement Administrator (1-877-522-2081), March 15 2026, 5:46pm

To be eligible for benefits from the settlement, you must be a member of the class and you must fill out and submit a valid claim form on the settlement website to qualify for a settlement award. You can easily file your claim at www.ghdeliveryfeesettlement.com. The completed claim form must be submitted online by May 12, 2026.

Exhibit F

LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT, COMPLEX CIVIL DEPARTMENT

CHECKLIST FOR

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

This checklist provides direction on what information and argument the court requires to grant a motion for preliminary approval of a class action settlement. All parties are urged to carefully review the checklist and fully comply with each item that applies to the case in order that the motion may be promptly ruled upon. The content of the motion should follow the same order as this checklist, as that is how the judge and research attorney review the motion.

I. MOVING PAPERS (Motion and Declarations)

All facts submitted for the court to consider must be provided in the form of a declaration or other admissible evidence. The court will not consider facts stated only in the motion.

A. Introductory Information

- ☐ Summary of the litigation, including identity of the parties, brief procedural history, claims asserted, and general factual basis for the claims.

B. Dunk/Kullar Analysis

- ☐ Summary of the case, including the legal and factual basis for each claim. (*Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 133 (*Kullar*); *Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 409.)
- ☐ Summary of the investigation and discovery conducted, including the specific documents reviewed prior to agreeing to settle the case. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1802, as modified Sept. 30, 1996 (*Dunk*). If counsel's analysis was informed by a data sample, show that the sample is statistically reliable.
- ☐ Summary of settlement negotiations, including when the settlement was reached, and whether the parties were assisted by a mediator. (*Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 1802.)
- ☐ A summary of the risks, expenses, complexity, and duration of further litigation if the settlement is not approved.

☐ A summary of the risks of achieving and maintaining class action status.

☐ Specific information sufficient for the court to make an independent determination that the consideration being received for the release of class members' claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular litigation. (*Kullar, supra*, 168 Cal.App.4th at 129.) This discussion should specify the maximum realistic recovery of each claim asserted in the operative complaint, defenses asserted by Defendant, and any other relevant factors justifying the amount offered in settlement. If the settlement is predicated on a payment plan or is predicated on defendant's financial situation, admissible evidence of Defendant's financial situation should be provided, including appropriate financial documents such as a balance sheet, statement of cash flows, profit and loss statement, and the like.

☐ If approval of the settlement of class claims is requested together with approval of non-class claims (such as claims under the Labor Code's Private Attorney General Act (PAGA)) discuss why the amount allocated to the non-class claims is fair to those affected. See *Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77 (*Moniz*).

C. Class Certification

☐ Numerosity: Total number of members in the settlement class and number of members in each sub-class (if applicable).

☐ Ascertainability: The manner by which members of the class will be identified and when. (*Noel v. Thrifty Payless* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 955.)

☐ Community of Interest: Discuss specific facts showing that the proposed class representatives have claims or defenses typical of the class and can adequately represent the class. (*Linder v. Thrifty Oil Co.* (2000) 23 Cal.4th 429, 435.)

☐ Adequacy:

Class Counsel: A summary of Class Counsels' experience and a listing of all prior cases in which each named Class Counsel has been approved by a court to act as lead or co-counsel. (See *Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at 1802.)

Class Representative(s): Provide evidence that each proposed class representative has agreed to act as same and understands his or her responsibilities. (See *Soderstedt v. CBIZ Southern California, LLC* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 133, 155-156; *Jones v. Farmers Ins. Exchange* (2013) 221 Cal.App.4th 986, 998-999.)

D. Claim Requirement (if applicable)

- ☐ If class members are required to submit a claim to receive compensation, explain why a claim form is necessary and either 1) provide an estimate of the anticipated claims rate or 2) provide an explanation why a claims rate cannot be provided.
- ☐ Provide a detailed explanation why a “claims made” settlement is appropriate.
- ☐ Indicate what actions class counsel will take to encourage claim submission.
- ☐ Explain why the claims process is not so burdensome that relief would be inaccessible to class members (if applicable).

E. Miscellaneous

- ☐ If appropriate, explain why the settlement includes terms that are outside the scope of the operative complaint. (*Trotsky v. Los Angeles Fed. Savings & Loan Assn.* (1975) 48 Cal.App.3d 134, 148.) If approval of settlement of a PAGA claim is requested provide a copy of Plaintiff’s notice letter to the LWDA.
- ☐ If notice will be given in English only, explain why this is sufficient.
- ☐ A statement of any affirmative obligations to be undertaken by the class member or class counsel and the reason for such obligations.
- ☐ Provide information regarding any fee splitting agreement and whether the client has given written approval. (*Mark v. Spencer* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 219; Rules Prof. Conduct, rule 1.5.1; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769.)
- ☐ Any agreement that has injunctive relief against a class representative or absent class member generally is not appropriate in a class action case. Provide the authority and factual reasons why this case is an exception. See *Moniz, supra*, 72 Cal.App.5th at 84. (“[T]he preclusive effect of a prior judgment is determined by the court in which it is asserted, not the court that rendered it.” (*Fireside Bank Cases* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 1120, 1131 [115 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80].))
- ☐ Explain why any proposed class representative enhancement is reasonable, including what the class representative did beyond the expected services of any class representative. (*Munoz v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 399, 412; *Radcliffe v. Experian Information Solutions Inc.* (9th Cir. 2013) 715 F.3d 1157, 1165.) In PAGA settlements explanation should be provided as to why an incentive award is appropriate.

II. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The settlement agreement should address the following:

A. The Basics

☐ Class definition. If a PAGA representative action is settled with a proposed Class Settlement consider whether there should be separate definitions for Class Members and Aggrieved Employees.

☐ Class and Release Period: If the class and release periods extend beyond the date of preliminary approval explain why this is appropriate.

B. Release of Claims

☐ Scope: The scope of any release given by class members must be defined with precision and clarity. Any released claims not presented directly in the operative complaint should be based on the facts alleged in the operative complaint. (See *Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Mgmt.* (2021) 69 Cal. App. 5th 521, 537 and FN. 5; *Uribe v. Crown Building Maintenance Co.* 70 Cal. App. 5th 986, 1005.)

☐ Class cases which include a PAGA claim should have a separate release for the PAGA claim tied to the facts alleged in the notice given to the LWDA. Id.

☐ If PAGA and Class Settlement: The Release should provide an explanation that released claims include all PAGA claims that could have been premised on the facts alleged in the Plaintiff's Notice and aggrieved employees will release PAGA claims even if class members request exclusion from the class. See *Robinson v. Southern Counties Oil Co.* (2020) 53 Cal.App.5th 476.)

☐ A Civil Code section 1542 waiver is generally not appropriate in a class action case as to the putative class members (if applicable). Provide the authority and factual reasons why this case is an exception. (*Israel-Curley v. California Fair Plan* (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 123, 129; *Salehi v. Surfside III Condominium Owners' Assn.* (2011) 200 Cal.App.4th 1146, 1159–1161.)

☐ Release Effective Date: Indicate the point in time at which the release will be deemed effective as to the absent class members. If the release will be effective before settlement funds are paid, explain why this is in the best interest of the class.

☐ Class Data: If there are confidentiality provisions, explain why they are in the best interest of the Class and whether they will impede Class Counsel's ability to discharge fiduciary duties.

C. Monetary Terms of Settlement

☐ Settlement Amount: Indicate the amount of the gross settlement, how and when the settlement will be paid, and information regarding payment plan, if any. If a class claim is being settled with a PAGA claim the amounts allocated should be separated and paid only to the aggrieved employees.

☐ Deductions from the settlement fund: Indicate the amounts to be deducted from the gross settlement for attorneys' fees and costs, plaintiff incentive awards, administrative costs, PAGA payment and allocation of award to LWDA and the parties, and any other existing deductions.

☐ If there are subclasses, explain why the monetary distribution is fair to each subclass. Insure there is a class representative who fits the definition of each subclass.

☐ Information about how attorney fees will be calculated. The percentage method, with or without a lodestar cross-check, may be used in common fund cases. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat., Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.) In other cases, counsel should fully brief how the fees are calculated.

☐ If wages are involved, explain how Defendant's share of taxes will be paid.

☐ Whether, and under what circumstances, amounts may revert to Defendant, and a justification for such reversion (if applicable). (*Cundiff v. Verizon California, Inc.* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 718, 728–729.)

☐ Payment Formula: Amount and manner of distribution of the compensation to each class member, including the estimated amount each class member will receive and the timeline on which payments will be issued.

☐ Tax allocation of settlement payments.

☐ Nature of injunctive relief (if any), and valuation of such relief.

D. Notice Administration

The following issues regarding notice administration should be addressed in the settlement agreement. A copy of the proposed notice must be attached to the settlement agreement as an exhibit.

☐ Indicate the administrator for the settlement and why the bid for administration is fair.

- ☐ Provide the qualifications and experience of the Administrator, including evidence that the settlement administrator has procedures in place to protect the security of class data and adequate insurance in the event of a data breach or defalcation of funds.
- ☐ Indicate how/when the administrator will receive the class list.
- ☐ Indicate whether the list will be updated by the administrator prior to the initial mailing by use of National Change of Address Registry.
- ☐ Provide the deadline for the initial issuance of notice to class members.
- ☐ Ensure the content of the notice complies with California Rules of Court, rule 3.766(d). In wage and hour cases the notice should indicate the specific amount the class member will receive, and how that amount was calculated. A separate breakdown for PAGA payments should be provided. The terms of the release(s) should be reflected in the Notice.
- ☐ Ensure the notice accurately reflects the Court's current social distancing procedures for attendance at hearings and review of court files. (Counsel should check the Court website for most current information.)
- ☐ Indicate how and when payments will be processed.
- ☐ Indicate how notices returned to the administrator as undeliverable will be handled.
- ☐ Explain how re-mailed notices, if any, will be handled. Will class members who receive re-mailed notices be given an extended deadline to respond (i.e., opt-out, object, and dispute workweeks)?
- ☐ Explain how notice of any change of the date or location of the will hearing be given.
- ☐ Indicate whether there will be a settlement website. If so, provide the URL.
- ☐ If publication notice will be given indicate the timing, locations, and manner by which publication notice will be disseminated.
- ☐ Explain how notice of final judgment will be given to the class. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b)) (e.g. Posted on claims administrator's website.)

E. Responses to Notice

- ☐ Description of the procedures for submitting written objections, requests for exclusion, claim forms (if applicable) and disputes to estimated payments.
- ☐ Indicate the deadline to submit objections, requests for exclusion, claim forms (if applicable), and/or disputes to workweeks. Confirm the deadline is reasonable and that class members who receive re-mailed notices will be given an extension.
- ☐ The objection procedure the same as the opt-out procedure, with the only requirement being that objections be mailed to the settlement administrator and not filed with the court.
- ☐ Do not include language indicating that class members may only be heard at final approval if they have complied with all objection procedures or that they must use specific language to request exclusion, or, if a specific procedure is sought explain why it is necessary. In general, the court will hear from any class member who attends the final approval hearing and asks to speak regarding his or her objection. accordingly.

F. Cy Pres Distribution

- ☐ Indicate the length of time from issuance for which settlement checks will remain valid.
- ☐ Identify the fund to which uncashed checks will be directed and detail the steps that will be taken to ensure compliance with Code of Civil Procedure section 384. The Court's Omnibus Trailer Bill of 2018 replaced the language of the prior statutory distribution scheme under Code of Civil Procedure, section 384 with a requirement that the Court re-open judgments following the final distribution of funds to include the cy pres in the judgment and to include the unclaimed amount, plus an unspecified amount of interest. Such information should be actively contemplated/provided for within the current terms of the settlement.
- ☐ Explain why any cy pres distribution fills the purposes of the lawsuit or is otherwise appropriate. (*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co.* (1986) 41 Cal.3d 460, 472; *In re Microsoft I-V Cases* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 706, 722; *Nachshin v. AOL, Inc.* (9th Cir. 2011) 663 F.3d 1034, 1038–1041; *Dennis v. Kellogg Co.* (9th Cir. 2012) 697 F.3d 858, 865; Code Civ. Proc., § 384.)
- ☐ Provide declarations disclosing the interest or involvement (or lack thereof) by any counsel or party in the governance or work of the cy pres recipient.

G. Miscellaneous

- ☐ Assure the Settlement Agreement and Notice are consistent and that the Settlement Agreement has been signed by all parties and counsel. Carefully proofread both.
- ☐ The Settlement Agreement and paperwork derivative thereof should not suggest that the end result of court approval will be dismissal of the Action with prejudice or entry of a Final Judgment and Order dismissing with prejudice all claims. See California Rules of Court, rule 3.769(h).

III. EXHIBITS TO THE MOTION

- ☐ Provide proof of submission of the proposed settlement agreement to the LWDA. (Lab. Code, § 2699, subd. (1)(2).)
- ☐ Include a proposed Judgment, which should not include a dismissal or any findings not contained in the Final Approval Order. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.769(h).)
- ☐ All exhibits should be bookmarked, as set forth in the Presiding Judge's First Amended General Order of May 3, 2019 re: Electronic Filing, available on the Court website.

Revision: February 2022



Arthur M <acm532@gmail.com>

Your order from Japanese Curry Hyuga is being prepared

Grubhub <orders@eat.grubhub.com>
Reply-To: orders@eat.grubhub.com
To: acm532@gmail.com

Wed, Apr 29, 2020 at 5:59 PM

Hello Arthur,

Your delivery order from **Japanese Curry Hyuga** is being prepared. Your food should arrive between **6:25pm – 6:35pm**.

[Track your order](#)

Ordered from
Japanese Curry Hyuga

Delivery (ASAP) to Arthur Mateos, 601 Ansel Rd Burlingame, CA
(617) 800-3945

Delivery instructions
"Please leave outside front door and then text me. Thanks!"

Plasticware
Do not include extra plasticware or napkins with my order to help reduce waste.

Payment Method
Credit Card - 7951 **\$74.79**

Order Details
Apr 29, 2020 5:56:35pm
#84701142-1635409

1 Chicken Katsu Curry **\$18.00**

- Add Topped Veggies (Vegetarian)
- Add Boiled Egg

1 Chicken Katsu Curry	\$18.00
• Add Chicken Katsu • Extra Curry	
1 Hyuga Chicken Soup	\$4.00
1 Cold Milk Tea	\$3.50
1 Karaage Fried Chicken (Shio)	\$5.00
Items subtotal	\$48.50
Delivery fee	\$1.49
Service fee	\$2.55
Sales tax	\$4.99
Tip	\$17.26
Total charge	\$74.79

Have questions about your order? [Get help](#)

**Unlimited free
delivery & 10%
Cashback with
Grubhub+**

[Learn more](#)



GIFT CARDS

Give the gift of food

[Learn more](#)



© 2020 Grubhub. All rights reserved.

This email was sent by GrubHub 111 W. Washington St., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL, 60602, USA

* Any changes you make to your order after it has been placed may result in additional charges.

* We sent you this email to give you the latest information about your Grubhub order. Please don't reply to this email — instead, to get in touch with us, visit our [Help](#) page and let us know how we can help.

pg 22/22

Arthur Mateos
1390 Veteran Ave
Apt 3
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Retail



97208

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LETTER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90024
MAR 25, 2026

\$6.37

S2324W501227-05

RDC 99

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

CERTIFIED MAIL®



9589 0710 5270 3807 2546 42

Grubhub Delivery Fee Settlement Objections
PO Box 2349
Portland, OR 97208-2349

EXHIBIT D



Wang v Grubhub
Opt Out Report
Report Date: 6/23/2026

Opt Out Status	Tracking Number	Settlement Class List	First Name	Last Name	Address 1	Address 2	City	State/Territory	Zipcode	Country
LATE	895225	INITIAL	NATALIE	SALAMEH	2220 CEMO CIR	UNIT 2311	GOLD RIVER	CA	95670	US
INCOMPLETE	1119115	INITIAL	RILEY	-	PO BOX 7724		SAN BERNARDINO	CA	92411-0724	US
COMPLETE	1744089	INITIAL	CHARLES	NELSON	43638 NICOLE ST		LANCASTER	CA	93535	US
COMPLETE	2223440	INITIAL	CINDY	TRAN	145 BEACON DR		MILPITAS	CA	95035-5802	US
COMPLETE	3915165	INITIAL	CHRISTOPHER	FORESTIERE	4217 E 5TH ST	APT 9	LONG BEACH	CA	90814	US
COMPLETE	4191962	INITIAL	ALAN	VASQUEZ	612 S FLOWER ST	APT 725	LOS ANGELES	CA	90017	US
COMPLETE	4260244	INITIAL	ROBERT	NARDIL	1225 WASHINGTON ST	APT 303	SAN FRANCISCO	CA	94108	US
COMPLETE	4696851	INITIAL	LEE	WATERWORTH	62-66 CRAWFORD MANSIONS	FLAT 1 CRAWFORD MANSIONS	LONDON		W1H4JU	UK
COMPLETE	5398702	INITIAL	STEVEN	HERNANDEZ	9324 MCNERNEY AVE		SOUTH GATE	CA	90280	US
COMPLETE	6787646	INITIAL	KATHERINE	RANCATORE	1624 OAKWOOD DR		SAN MATEO	CA	94403	US
COMPLETE	6799605	INITIAL	MICHAEL	TRAN	6351 HUNTINGTON DR		CARLSBAD	CA	92009-3080	US
COMPLETE	6967529	SUPPLEMENTAL	ANDREW	CHAN	9921 CARMEL MOUNTAIN RD	PMB 162	SAN DIEGO	CA	92129-2813	US
COMPLETE	7252331	SUPPLEMENTAL	JOCELYN	MEHLSACK	3330 MAINE AVE		LONG BEACH	CA	90806	US
COMPLETE	7308118	SUPPLEMENTAL	GORDON	SHEPPARD	PO BOX 1855		CAMPBELL	CA	95009	US
COMPLETE	7473041	SUPPLEMENTAL	WILLIAM	DALLAS	6225 LINKS DR		WOODRIDGE	IL	60517	US
COMPLETE	7806418	SUPPLEMENTAL	KRISTOPHER	YOUNG	59 BEECHWOOD AVENUE	APT 2	NEW ROCHELLE	NY	10801	US
COMPLETE	9043808	SUPPLEMENTAL	SAMANTHA	TRULL	849 E MAGNESIUM RD	APT P111	SPOKANE	WA	99208	US

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I am employed in the state of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within
4 action. My business address is 490 43rd Street NW, 4th Floor, Oakland, CA 94609.

5 On **June 24, 2026**, I served the document(s) described as:

6 **DECLARATION OF BRIAN YOUNG RE IMPLEMENTATION OF NOTICE**

7 on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof
8 [✓] to interested parties as follows:

9 **[X] BY NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING:** I electronically served the document(s) with
10 the by using the CaseAnywhere system. Participants in the case who are registered
11 CaseAnywhere users will be served by the CaseAnywhere system. Participants in the case
12 who are not registered CaseAnywhere users will be served by mail or by other means
13 permitted by the court rules.

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

16 Executed this **June 24, 2026**, at Los Angeles, California.

17 NEVA R. GARCIA

18 Type or Print Name

19 

20 Signature