

EXHIBIT 1

August 14, 2025

Richard Lessard



Michelle C. Yau
COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC
1100 New York Ave. NW Eighth Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Alison V. Douglass
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
100 Northern Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

Attorney Yau and Attorney Douglas,

I am notifying you of my objection, applying to only myself, to the proposed settlement regarding the Case Beth Andrew-Berry, et al. v George A. Weiss, et al., Civil Action No. 3:23-CV-00978-OAW. I am a Class Member through my participation in the GWA, LLC 401(k) Profit Sharing Plan. I would like to think that all participants would agree with this objection. I have been a plan member for over 30 years and the results of this case affect the funding of my retirement, as well as all other Class Participants who contributed their earnings in the GWA Plan to fund their retirement.

I am specifically objecting to the proposed Attorney's Fees of \$2,633,333.33 requested by Class Counsel. The Attorney's Fees requested include \$1,390,255 in documented billable hours plus an additional \$1,243,078.33 reward for cost of money and the risk incurred by assuming the case on a contingency basis. This represents a return on investment (ROI) to the Class Counsel of 89.4%. This return is highly excessive and is being paid by those originally harmed by the defendant thereby victimizing the Class Participants a second time. The requested ROI is unreasonable and unethical. I propose that Class Counsel be awarded an amount of \$450,000 in addition to any Attorney's Fees and Expenses incurred to settle this case. This provides a ROI of more than 30% of their investment (Attorney's Fees *plus* Expenses). I feel this is a reasonable and ethical ROI and more than adequately rewards them for the cost of money and risk incurred.

I would like to clearly state that my objection is solely to the \$1,243,078.33 requested by the Class Counsel to compensate them for the risk of incurring the expense of \$1,390,255 for litigating this case on a contingency basis. Class Counsel should be compensated for the \$1,390,255 for the documented hours they invested in the case. I commend them on their successful work on behalf of the Class Participants. I strongly object to awarding Class Counsel an 89.4% return for operating expenses, plus interest,

and the risk incurred by agreeing to litigate the case. Their self-declared expertise in the practice of representing clients for ERISA cases exhibits a clear understanding of the risks involved in assuming this case on a contingency basis. They wouldn't have invested \$1,390,255 if the risk of losing was too high. The additional \$450,000 in compensation above billable hours and expenses incurred provides for the cost of money as well as an award for litigation risk. Any additional monies requested assess an unreasonable and unethical additional loss on the Class Participants already harmed.

I am unable to attend the fairness hearing. I can be contacted by phone at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] if either attorney or the court has any questions or concerns regarding my objection. I would appreciate being notified by mail of the ruling on my objection.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RA Q 1'.

Richard Lessard