

and

Mitch and Kristen Brink, Brink Holdings Inc., Angela Buchanan, Tim Forester, Z-Axis, Inc., Heather and Gary Nychyk, Bar N Pizza, LLC, John DeMattia, DeMattia LLC, a Texas Limited Liability Company, Harry and Terry Olson, Hot Pizza Inc., Steven Pyatt, Craig Braun, David Mraz, JIM LLC, Philip and Maria Ahn Wilson, Papa South, LLC, Steven and Holly Mead, Thomas Lance, PMG Tampa, LLC, Ilya and Chantal Rubin, Pie in the Sky LLC, Joanna and Glenn Patcha, Alchemy Foods LLC, Ian Hasinoff and Susan Lorimer, Eddrachillis LLC, Cole Kilen, Eye on the Pie LLC, Ann and Harvey Callegan, Just for Fun, LLC, Eugene and Joy Hill, Conn, Edward Turnbull, Turnbull Restaurant Group LP, Turnbull Restaurant Group GP, Conn, LLC, Loralie and Trey Bennett, Pizza Revolution of Fort Walton Beach LLC, Pizza Revolution of Panama City LLC, Pizza Revolution at Tyndall LLC, Steven Terry, Matthew and Cindy Terry, Alice and Douglas Worthington, Thomas Stephenson, Make Dough Enterprises Inc., Jared Richardson, Russell Crader, and Red Rust, LLC, v. Papa Murphy's International LLC, Papa Murphy's Company Stores, Inc., PMI Holdings Inc., Papa Murphy's Intermediate Inc., Murphy's Holdings, Inc., Lee Equity Partners LLC, John D. Barr, Ken Calwell, Thomas H. Lee, , Yoo Jin Kim, Benjamin Hochberg, John D. Schafer, Achi Yaffe, Janet Pirus, Victoria Blackwell, Gail Lawson, Dan Harmon, Scott Mullen, Jayson Tipp, Kevin King, Stephen Maeker, Steve Millard, Steve Figiola; Washington Superior Court, Clark County, Case No. 14-2-01743-3.

These two related actions were commenced in April 2014 and June 2014, respectively, by separate groups of current and former franchisees against us, certain members of our board of managers and executive team, and others in Washington Superior Court (Clark County), alleging misrepresentations involving financial performance representations in ITEM 19 of the franchise disclosure document the franchisees' local marketing obligations, among other things, and brought claims for violation of the Washington Franchise Investment Protection Act ("WFIPA"), fraud, negligent misrepresentation and breach of contract. These two actions were consolidated in September 2014 under Case Number 14-2-00904-0.

Each of the plaintiff groups entered into settlements with Papa Murphy's in which they dismissed all of their claims against defendants with prejudice and the action was dismissed in June 2020. The settlements are as follows: (1) one plaintiff group dismissed its claims against Papa Murphy's for no consideration; (2) two plaintiff groups agreed to pay amounts ranging from \$5,000 to \$8,000 to Papa Murphy's and remained in the system; (3) Papa Murphy's agreed to pay one plaintiff group's advertising costs for one year, agreed to allow the franchisee to develop an additional franchise, and agreed to return the franchisee's initial development fee of \$10,000; (4) another plaintiff group agreed to remain in the system in exchange for Papa Murphy's paying 3.8% of the franchisees' sales towards local advertising for a period of two years and extending the franchise agreement's term for an additional ten years; (5) Papa Murphy's settled with fifteen different plaintiff groups and paid amounts ranging from \$10,000 per group to \$4 million per group; (6) Papa Murphy's agreed to purchase one plaintiff group's nine

Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets plus \$500,000; and (7) Papa Murphy's agreed to purchase seven plaintiff groups' Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets.

Rob & Bud's Pizza, LLC v. Papa Murphy's International, Inc. and Papa Murphy's International, LLC; United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, Case No. 5:15-cv-05090-TLB.

In spring 2015, Papa Murphy's sent a notice of default to plaintiff for alleged defaults under the plaintiff's franchise agreements. In response, on April 17, 2015, the plaintiff brought an action seeking a declaratory judgment and injunction preventing Papa Murphy's from terminating the franchises. The plaintiff subsequently added claims in the case alleging that Papa Murphy's tortiously interfered with the plaintiff's employees and negligence in how Papa Murphy's handled the plaintiff's customer database, and sought compensatory damages, punitive damages and costs in an unspecified amount. The plaintiff was also a plaintiff in the LMP case described above. The case was dismissed with prejudice as part of a settlement with plaintiff in this case and the LMP case under which Papa Murphy's purchased plaintiff's nine Papa Murphy's stores at an agreed upon value of the stores' assets plus \$500,000.

PUBLIC AGENCY ACTIONS AGAINST MTY USA, AFFILIATES AND/OR THEIR PREDECESSORS

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving SFF, L.L.C., successor in interest to SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C.

In the Matter of SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C. f.k.a. Imagination Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a Sweet Frog, Administrative Proceeding Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2012-0055.

As a result of an inquiry into the franchise related activities of SweetFrog Enterprises, L.L.C., ("SFE") the Maryland Securities Commissioner ("Commissioner") concluded that grounds existed to allege that SFE violated the registration and disclosure provisions of the Maryland Franchise Law in relation to the offer and sale of certain license agreements. SFE acknowledged that those license agreements constituted franchises as defined under the Maryland Franchise Law. SFE represented that it entered into license agreements with eight Maryland licensees during the time it was not registered to offer and sell franchises in Maryland. On August 29, 2012, the Commissioner and SFE agreed to enter into a consent order whereby SFE, without admitting or denying any violations of the law, agreed to: (i) immediately and permanently cease from the offer and sale of franchises in violation of the Maryland Franchise Law; (ii) file and diligently pursue an application for an initial franchise registration in Maryland relating to the license agreements it offered and sold to Maryland licensees; and (iii) to offer to rescind the license agreements of all Maryland licensees to whom it sold unregistered franchises. We

are not aware of any licensees that accepted the rescission and have made a good faith effort to obtain that information.

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving Predecessor Blimpie Associates, Ltd.

In May 1992, Blimpie Associates, Ltd. (“Blimpie”) and Joseph Dornbush (formerly the President of Blimpie) (collectively “Respondents”) responded to a claim by the New York Department of Law that it had sold franchises during a period of time when Blimpie’s prospectus had not been updated by amendment. Without the admission of any wrongdoing, Respondents consented to the entry of an order in which Respondents agreed: (i) to entry of a judgment enjoining them from further violations of the New York Franchise Sales Act; and (ii) to pay the sum of \$18,000 to the State of New York as an additional allowance. Respondents paid the \$18,000 in May 1992 and executed the consent judgment on August 25, 1992.

Concluded State Administrative Actions Involving Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., predecessor in interest to Kahala Franchising, L.L.C.

In the Matter of Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2005-0651.

On November 11, 2005, Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., the predecessor franchisor of the Maui Wowi brand (“MWF”), entered into a Consent Order with the Securities Commissioner of Maryland (“Commissioner”) resulting from MWF inadvertently entering into four franchise agreements with Maryland residents after its registration in Maryland expired on June 9, 2004 (“Maryland Franchisees”). The Consent Order required MWF to cease and desist from the offer and sale of unregistered franchises in Maryland; to diligently pursue the completion of its then pending application; to register its Offering Circular in Maryland; to develop and implement new franchise law compliance procedures to ensure future compliance with the registration and disclosure provisions of Maryland Franchise Law; and to enroll an officer and a franchise compliance person in a franchise law compliance training program. Upon notification by the Commissioner, MWF sent to the Maryland Franchisees the registered Offering Circular, a copy of the Consent Order, and a letter notifying the Maryland Franchisees that they could rescind their franchise agreements. At this time, MWF is in full compliance with the Consent Order.

In the Matter of Maui Wowi Franchising, Inc., Before the Securities Commissioner of Maryland, Case No. 2007-0194.

On September 12, 2007, “MWF” entered into a Consent Order with the Maryland Commissioner resulting from MWF inadvertently entering into two franchise agreements with two Maryland residents (“Second Maryland Franchisees”) without delivering to them the appropriate Offering Circular. MWF was registered in the State of Maryland at the time of the offer and sale with an Offering Circular containing certain specific information

required only by Maryland law. At the same time, MWF used a second form of Offering Circular in other states that did not contain all of the information required by Maryland law. Prior to the execution of the franchise agreements with the Second Maryland Franchisees, MWF accidentally delivered to them the Offering Circular that did not contain the Maryland-specific information. We subsequently reported these mistakes to the Commissioner. The Consent Order required MWF to cease and desist from the offer and sale of franchises in Maryland in violation of the Maryland Franchise Law; to diligently pursue the completion of its then pending application to register its Offering Circular in Maryland; to implement additional compliance measures to ensure future compliance with the Maryland Franchise Law; to employ an approved franchise law compliance training program or trainer to monitor MWF's franchise activities in Maryland for two years; and to reimburse the Maryland Attorney General for its investigation and resolution costs in the total amount of \$2,500. Additionally, MWF was required to provide to the Second Maryland Franchisees the registered Offering Circular, a copy of the Consent Order, and a letter notifying the Second Maryland Franchisees that they have a right to rescind their franchise agreements. The Commissioner and MWF subsequently entered into an Amended Consent Order in which MWF elected to withdraw from the State of Maryland instead of employing a compliance monitor, with the agreement to employ a monitor if MWF was to re-register in the State of Maryland. MWF fully complied with the Amended Consent Order, and subsequently employed a compliance monitor and was granted registration in the State of Maryland.

Concluded State Administrative Actions, Arbitration, and Litigation Involving BF Acquisition Holdings, L.L.C. and/or its predecessors

State of Maryland Determination; Case Number 2012-0073.

In February 2012, the State of Maryland alleged that during the period January 1, 2009 to November 26, 2009, Triune, LLC ("Triune"): (i) did not retain signed acknowledgements of receipt reflecting the dates that its Franchise Disclosure Document was delivered to certain Maryland residents and non-residents; (ii) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without providing them with a copy of a 2009 Franchise Disclosure Document; (iii) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without providing them with a copy of a 2009 Franchise Disclosure Document that contained its 2008 financial statements with a going concern note from its auditors resulting from the unfavorable financial condition of its parent company; and (iv) sold franchises to certain Maryland residents and non-residents without including, or abiding with, a deferral condition in their Franchise Agreements that was imposed upon it by the State of Maryland, all as required by the Maryland Franchise Registration and Disclosure Law (the "Maryland Law") and in violation of the Maryland Law. Without admitting or denying the allegations, in September 2012, Triune voluntarily entered into a Consent Order with the Office of the Attorney General of Maryland and agreed to: (i) not violate the Maryland Law in the future; (ii) pay the Office of the Attorney General the sum of \$50,000 as a civil penalty; (iii) retain copies of all acknowledgments of receipt confirming

dates that prospective Maryland franchisees received any Maryland Franchise Disclosure Documents; (iv) comply with the disclosure and antifraud provisions of the Maryland Franchise Law and the record keeping and escrow requirements of the Code of Maryland Regulations; and (v) send a copy of the Consent Order to certain Maryland franchisees.

State of Virginia Determination; Case Number SEC-2012-00027.

In February 2012, the Division of Securities and Retail Franchising of the State Corporation Commission (the "Commission") alleged that during 2009 Triune, LLC ("Triune"): (i) offered or sold franchises in Virginia in 2009 that were not registered under the Virginia Retail Franchising Act (the "Virginia Act"); (ii) offered or sold franchises in Virginia without disclosing that it was not registered to do so; (iii) failed to provide material information regarding the parent company's unfavorable financial condition and the potential impact that it could have on Triune as stated in a going concern note in its 2008 financial statements from its auditors; and (iv) failed to provide a prospective franchisee with a copy of its Franchise Disclosure Document as required by rule or order of the Commission at least 14 calendar days before the prospective franchisee signed a binding agreement or made any payment to it in connection with the sale or offer to sell a franchise in Virginia. Without admitting or denying the allegations, on November 26, 2012, Triune voluntarily entered into a Settlement Order with the Commission and agreed: (i) to not violate the Virginia Act in the future; (ii) to pay Virginia the sum of \$25,000 as a penalty and the sum of \$5,000 to defray the Commission's costs of investigation; (iii) to offer certain Virginia franchisees a refund of their initial franchise fees; and (iv) to send a copy of the Settlement Order to certain Virginia franchisees.

Lawsuits Filed by Franchisor Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. Against Franchisees During Fiscal Year December 1, 2024 through November 30, 2025

Suit for Breach of Contract

Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. v. Golden Enterprises, Inc.; DBH Associates, LP, Deseret Sales, Inc., Randy Herzog, Laurie Herzog, Amy Wilson, Rob Wilson, Clare Hunter, Deobrah Hunter; United States District Court in and for the Eastern District of Washington; Case No.: 2:25-cv-00426.

Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. v. Mid Valley Foods, Inc., Candyce Dilbeck, Steve Hopkins, Gegory M. Hopkins; United States District Court in and for the District of Arizona; Case No.: 2:25-cv-04166-KML.

Suit for Federal Trademark Infringement, Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §1124; Common Law Trademark Infringement; Federal Unfair Competition, Lanham Act, 15 U.S. C. §1125; Common Law Unfair Competition; Breach of Contract; Unjust Enrichment; Audit Demand/Accounting

Kahala Franchising, L.L.C. v. Byron Washington and Bram Berg; United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; Case No.: 1:25-cv-06392.

Other than these actions, no litigation is required to be disclosed in this Item.

ITEM 4: BANKRUPTCY

No bankruptcy information is required to be disclosed in this Item.

ITEM 5: INITIAL FEES

Initial Franchise Fee

If/when you sign the Franchise Agreement, you must pay to Franchisor the initial franchise fee (“Initial Franchise Fee”) for your Restaurant in an amount equal to \$40,000. There are no refunds of the Initial Franchise Fee under any circumstances. We may periodically reduce the Initial Franchise Fee in connection with limited time promotions, new concepts and/or operational programs. We may vary the terms of our franchises in connection with testing new marketing, branding and/or operational programs. These tests are generally conducted with experienced, existing franchisees and may include incentives and other rights which are not available to all franchisees. If you sign the Franchise Agreement in connection with a transfer or renewal, you will not pay the Initial Franchise Fee.

Opening Team Expenses

You will reimburse Franchisor for the Travel Expenses and the prorated Salaries and Benefits for the Opening Team members who assist you with the opening of your Restaurant (see Item 11). These expenses are nonrefundable and will typically range between \$10,000 and \$50,000 but may be lower or higher depending upon the particular needs and the location of your Restaurant. You will pay to Franchisor 50% of the estimated Opening Team expenses for your Restaurant, which Franchisor will determine based on the size of the Opening Team, distance traveled, and other factors, before the date that the Opening Team arrives at your Restaurant. Upon completion of the Opening Team’s assistance, Franchisor will send you an invoice for the actual amount of remaining Opening Team costs. You must pay this invoice within 30 days.

Site Review Report Fee

You will pay to Franchisor the then-current Site Review Report Fee after Franchisor prepares a site model report and issue a “no brand standard objection” letter for the proposed site of your Restaurant. The current Site Review Report Fee is \$1,000 to \$5,000, and may increase if a site visit is required. The Site Review Report Fee is nonrefundable.

We may offer you the option to purchase a license to sell additional signature products in your Restaurant and to use the signature products trademark(s) as signature products are developed.

The initial fees to be paid to us and/or our affiliate(s) before the Franchised Business opens are indicated on the chart below and in the notes to the chart.

CATEGORY	AMOUNT	METHOD OF PAYMENT	DUE DATE	TO WHOM PMT IS MADE	REFUNDABILITY
Initial Franchise Fee	\$40,000	Lump Sum	Signing of the Franchise Agreement	Franchisor	See Note (1)
Opening Team Expense	\$10,000 to \$50,000	Two Installments	50% prior to Opening Team's arrival, balance after Opening Team's Arrival	Franchisor or its affiliate	See Note (1)
Site Review Report Fee	\$1,000 to \$5,000	Lump Sum	After Franchisor prepares a site review report and issue a "no brand standard objection" letter for the proposed site	Franchisor or its affiliate	See Note (1) and (2)

Notes:

(1) There are no refunds under any circumstances. Franchisor does not offer any financing. We may periodically reduce a fee in our sole discretion, for example, in connection with limited time promotions, new concepts and/or operational programs.

(2) If a site visit is required to prepare the Site Review Report then the fee may increase.

ITEM 6: OTHER FEES

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Type of Fee	Amount	Due Date	Remarks
Royalty Fee and Surcharge (Notes 1 and 13)	5% of Gross Sales plus a maximum Surcharge of \$10 per week (Note 2)	Withdrawn electronically weekly (Note 3)	"Gross Sales" include all revenue from your Restaurant excluding sales tax and authorized refunds, credits and allowances.
Advertising Fees (Note 1)	1% of weekly Gross Sales	Same as Royalty Fee (Note 3)	Franchisor can increase this fee by up to 0.5% per year after giving you at least 60 days prior notice of the increase.
Local Advertising	Minimum of 1.5% of Gross Sales	Payable to suppliers as incurred	You must spend at least 1.5% of your quarterly and annual Gross Sales on approved local advertising. If/when two or more independently owned or controlled Restaurants, including the Franchisee's Restaurant, are opened in the Franchisee's Designated Market Area ("DMA"), you may be required by Franchisor to contribute Local Advertising Fees equal to 1.5% of your weekly Gross Sales to a local advertising group (the "Local Advertising Association"). Local Advertising Fees will meet your local advertising requirement.
Additional Training Fee (Note 1)	You must pay the then-current Per Diem Training Fee (currently \$750 per day) for each trainer provided by Franchisor. You must also reimburse Franchisor for the Travel Expenses it incurs, estimated to range from \$100 to \$1,000 per trainer.	Prior to training being offered	Payable if we require or you request additional training after attending the Training Program.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Type of Fee	Amount	Due Date	Remarks
Remodeling Costs	The amount you incur to remodel your Franchised Location. These costs may range from \$50,000 to \$350,000 each time you remodel.	Payable to suppliers as incurred	You must remodel your Franchised Location in accordance with Sauce Pizza / Wine requirements. Sauce Pizza / Wine can require that you extensively remodel your Restaurant once every five to ten years. This does not include routine maintenance costs.
Third-Party Performance Measurement Evaluations (Note 1)	Estimated to range from \$250 to \$500 per inspection	Within 30 days after receipt of an invoice	Sauce Pizza / Wine can utilize feedback and inspection programs to evaluate your operations, quality, compliance and food safety. Sauce Pizza + Wine (in its sole discretion) may share the cost for these services upon the audit or inspection of your location if passing feedback is obtained.
Annual Meeting Registration Fee (Notes 1 and 5)	Up to \$1,000 plus incidental costs to attend	60-90 days prior to the Meeting	We will debit your account for this fee, which is non-refundable. This fee is charged to all franchisees whether or not they attend the Meeting.
Depository Account	Minimum amount to be determined by us	Signing of Franchise Agreement	(Note 3)
Charitable Contributions	To be determined by us	As determined by us	(Note 6)
Network Infrastructure Equipment and Security	\$3,500 to \$4,500	Upon invoicing	Payable to Sauce Pizza / Wine
Technology Support Fees (Notes 1 and 7)	\$200 to \$325 per month	As incurred	Payable to Sauce Pizza / Wine for ongoing technology support
Credit Card Processing Fee (Note 1)	None as of the Issuance Date, but subject to reasonable annual and/or service enhancement increases throughout the Term	As invoiced	
Charges for Testing and Evaluation (Note 1)	Will vary under circumstances	As incurred	See Item 8

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Type of Fee	Amount	Due Date	Remarks
Renewal Franchise Fee (Note 1)	50% of the then-current Initial Franchise Fee not including any discounts or reductions	Signing of new Franchise Agreement at renewal	Applicable if you are renewing your Franchise Agreement. Renewal term is ten years.
Transfer Franchise Fee (Notes 1 and 10)	\$5,000	Prior to consummation of transfer	Payable if you are purchasing your Franchised Business as a result of a full transfer. A full transfer is including, but not limited to, a transfer of 50% or more ownership or control.
Relocation Fee (Note 1)	\$500	At signing of relocation amendment to Franchise Agreement	Payable if we approve the relocation of your store.
Non-participation Fee	\$100 per day if you fail or refuse to participate in any required national, local, regional, seasonal, promotional or other program, initiative and campaign or in any new or modified product or service test or offering.	Upon failing or refusing to participate	Payable to us.
Document Administration Fee	\$500 (Note 11)	As incurred	Applicable if an amendment must be prepared, including for an affiliate transfer.
Default Interest (Notes 1 and 12)	\$50 plus interest at 1-1/2% per month or maximum legal rate, if less ("Default Rate").	Payable upon assessment	Payable on all overdue amounts.
Document Late Charge (Notes 1 and 8)	\$100 per week or partial week	Payable upon assessment	Payable if any required financial statement, report or other document is delinquent.
Draft Draw Charge (Note 1 and 9)	\$100 per day	As incurred	Payable to us.
Late Charge (Note 1)	5% of the unpaid amount or \$100, whichever is greater, on royalties, advertising payments, and other amounts unpaid within 10 days.	As incurred	Payable to us.