

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Xavier L. Woodford (State Bar No. 355326)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com
xavier@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Noah McMillon

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

4/3/2025 9:22:56 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By J. Ortler ,Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

NOAH MCMILLON, on behalf of others
similarly situated and the State of California
under the Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

O'REILLY AUTO ENTERPRISES, LLC and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CU017646C

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

1 Plaintiff NOAH MCMILLON, on behalf of all others similarly situated and the State of
2 California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“Plaintiff”) brings this REPRESENTATIVE
3 ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants O'REILLY AUTO ENTERPRISES, LLC., and DOES 1
4 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), alleging as follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This is a representative action complaint brought under the California Private
7 Attorneys General Act (Labor Code sections 2968 et seq.).

8 2. Defendants underpaid overtime, paid sick leave, and premiums by failing to include all
9 forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay calculations.

10 3. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees all minimum and
11 overtime wages due to unlawful policies and practices of requiring off-the-clock work.

12 4. Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and/or permit Plaintiff and the aggrieved
13 employees to take all meal and rest periods to which they were entitled.

14 5. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees for using their
15 personal cell phones, tools, and vehicles to complete work-related duties.

16 6. Defendants’ employment policies, practices, and payroll administration systems
17 enabled and facilitated these violations on a company-wide basis with respect to aggrieved employees.

18 7. Plaintiff seeks to recover the underpaid damages, plus associated penalties, interests,
19 attorney’s fees and costs.

20 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

21 8. Jurisdiction of this action is proper in this Court under Article VI, Section 10 of the
22 California Constitution as the causes of action are premised upon violations of California law.

23 9. The monetary damages and restitution sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of
24 the Superior Court.

25 10. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
26 Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail
27 themselves to the California economy so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the
28 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

11. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure sections 393(a), 395, and/or 395.5 because, upon information and belief, Defendants conducted business and committed some of the alleged violations in this County.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Noah McMillon

12. Plaintiff McMillon is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee from about July 2021 to November 2024. Plaintiff worked as a Store Manager.

13. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party in interest.”]).

B. Defendants

14. Defendant O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county.

15. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the parties sued as DOES 1 through 50, are presently unknown, unascertainable, or uncertain, and are sued by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Upon information and belief, each of DOES 1 through 50 constitutes a legal employer or is otherwise legally responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein. This Complaint may be amended to reflect their true names and capacities once ascertained.

16. Upon information and belief, Defendants in this action are employers, co-employers, joint employers, and/or part of an integrated employer enterprise, as each of the Defendants exercised control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of the employees, suffered and permitted them to work, and otherwise engaged them as employees under California law.

17. Upon information and belief, at least some of the Defendants have common ownership, common management, interrelationship of operations, and centralized control over labor relations and

are therefore part of an integrated enterprise and thus jointly and severally responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein, including pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, and 1197.1.

18. Upon information and belief, Defendants acted in all respects pertinent to this action as an alter-ego, agent, servant, joint employer, joint venturer, co-conspirator, partner, in an integrated enterprise, or in some other capacity on behalf of all other co-defendants, such that the acts and omissions of each defendant may be legally attributable to all others.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff and aggrieved employees worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees and were compensated on an hourly basis.

20. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to complete work off-the-clock, without compensation. For example, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees would often work through their off-the-clock meal periods due to the demands of the job. As discussed more in detail below, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees' meal periods would be interrupted and/or cut short and they would have to return to work to resolve customer issues or answer phone calls. Due to this unlawful practice, all hours worked were not directly compensated, resulting in the underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

21. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were made to answer phone calls and respond to messages after being clocked out for the day or on days they were not scheduled. For example, Plaintiff was required to respond to emergency scheduling and operation calls and alarms while off-the-clock sometimes needing to go to the store itself as early as 2 a.m. if an alarm was going off. This unlawful practice resulted in off-the-clock work without compensation. Plaintiff and, on information and belief, other aggrieved employees were deprived of regular and overtime wages each time Defendants engaged in this unlawful policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work.

22. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. As described above, Defendants compelled Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock during unpaid

meal periods and after clocking out. Each time this practice resulted in unpaid work over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime.

23. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay overtime and double time at the “regular rate of pay.” Defendants paid Plaintiff and aggrieved employees’ bonuses, commissions, incentives, and other forms of remuneration that Defendants failed to include in the overtime and double time rates in the pay periods when employees worked overtime hours. Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “at a rate no less than *one and one-half times the regular rate of pay* for an employee” and “twice the regular rate of pay” for double time hours as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders.

24. An illustrative example of this violation is shown in Plaintiff’s Wage Report with a pay date of 10/03/2024. Here, Plaintiff earned a non-discretionary payment (“3 Ck Comp SM”) in the amount of \$120.00. Plaintiff also worked 3.0999 hours of overtime during the same pay period. However, Defendants failed to properly include the additional form of remuneration into Plaintiff’s overtime rate. Thus, Defendants paid Plaintiff overtime at a deficient rate, resulting in the underpayment of overtime wages. Therefore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages at the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. Plaintiff seeks to recover for the corresponding overtime rate on behalf of the affected aggrieved employees.

25. Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave laws with respect to the aggrieved employees. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with all sick leave accrued. To the extent that Defendants provided paid sick leave, they did not pay all sick leave wages at the proper rate of pay because they failed to incorporate the hours that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock.

26. Additionally, each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock that resulted in unpaid overtime, the overtime hours were not accounted for when calculating an employee’s accrued paid sick leave. Defendants also failed to include all forms of remuneration into

1 the paid sick leave hourly rate, resulting in depreciated sick pay to the extent any was paid at all.
2 Therefore, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not awarded the total accrued sick leave time
3 they had earned.

4 27. Defendants maintained an unlawful policy and practice of failing to pay all accrued and
5 unused vacation wages upon separation of employment at the lawful rate of pay, resulting in forfeiture
6 of vested vacation time and wages. As described above, Defendants failed to record all of the time that
7 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked for Defendants and undercounted their hours worked.
8 Consequently, Defendants failed to credit the aggrieved employees with all vacation time they had
9 actually accrued. Therefore, vacation wages were not paid out at the lawful rate of pay inclusive of all
10 earnings.

11 28. Defendants failed to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the aggrieved
12 employees to which they were entitled in a manner that complies with California Law. Plaintiff and
13 other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods due
14 to pressures to keep up with high demands of the job and understaffing. For example, Plaintiff and the
15 aggrieved employees were required to answer customer questions about auto products or respond to
16 phone calls with commercial customers. Often while on break, the cashier line would back up and it
17 would turn into an emergency where Defendants would pull Plaintiff away from his break. If he was
18 on the property, he would get stopped and pulled to answer questions from employees and customers.
19 Plaintiff was required to email the district manager to request a meal break premium, despite the fact
20 that his meals were interrupted or missed entirely almost daily.

21 29. Additionally, when Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were made to work more
22 than 12 hours, they did not receive a second meal period. As a matter of common policy and practice,
23 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees all meal period premiums owed.

24 30. To the extent that Defendants paid meal premiums, Defendants failed to pay them at
25 the regular rate of compensation and the premiums paid did not factor in bonuses, and other forms of
26 remuneration into the regular rate of compensation. An illustrative example of this violation is shown
27 in Plaintiff's wage report with a pay date of 09/19/2024. Here, Plaintiff earned a meal period premium
28 ("Meal Brk Pen") in the amount of \$18.40 and a holiday shift differential ("Holiday Ovt") in the same

1 pay period he earned his meal period premium. However, Defendants failed to properly incorporate
2 all forms of remuneration into Plaintiff's meal period premium pay, resulting in the underpayment of
3 meal period premiums. On information and belief, Defendants committed the meal period premium
4 violation against the other aggrieved employees as a matter of common payroll administration and
5 company policy in a matter susceptible to common proof.

6 31. Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which employees were entitled and
7 failed to pay all rest period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. As stated above, due
8 to the job's high demands, lack of proper staffing, and the profession's nature, Plaintiff and aggrieved
9 employees were rarely, if at all, authorized or permitted to take all their rest periods. Defendants
10 required Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees to effectively waive or otherwise forego their
11 rest periods contrary to the law. For example, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were unable to
12 take their first or second rest periods during their shifts due to high demands and understaffing.
13 Plaintiff alleges that he was unable to take a rest period when he was the only employee working at
14 the location because he was prevented from scheduling more than one other employee to open with
15 and the others would often call out, leaving him alone to do all the opening procedures. Furthermore,
16 Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees would have their rest periods continually interrupted by
17 customers asking them questions or being pulled away from their breaks to help with a checkout line
18 getting overly backed up because of understaffing.

19 32. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced non-compliant rest
20 periods, they were owed a rest period premium. As a matter of policy and practice, Defendants failed
21 to pay all owed rest period premiums to employees who were unable to take rest periods. To the extent
22 Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because
23 such premiums were not paid at the "regular rate of compensation" to Plaintiff and aggrieved
24 employees, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-excludable remuneration.

25 33. Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to incur costs for work-
26 related purposes without full reimbursement. In direct consequence of their job duties, Plaintiff and
27 the aggrieved employees unavoidably and necessarily incurred these losses, expenditures, costs, and
28 as a matter of policy and practice. For example, Plaintiff was required to purchase and utilize his

1 personal tools for work-related purposes such as fixing store shelving. Further, although Plaintiff was
2 initially given a work vehicle, it was subsequently taken away for use at another location, after which
3 Plaintiff was required to use his personal vehicle for work purposes such as making deliveries.
4 Defendants required Plaintiff to submit reimbursement requests and wait for district manager's
5 approval. However, after termination, Plaintiff was locked out from making reimbursement requests
6 despite having used his personal vehicle for work purposes.

7 34. Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to utilize their
8 personal cell phones to complete necessary work tasks, such as fielding calls about scheduling and
9 answering customer questions about products. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not
10 reimbursed for the expenses associated with cell phone usage. Instead, Plaintiff and the aggrieved
11 employees bore the cost of these requirements, without reimbursement.

12 35. These violations create derivative liability for failure to timely pay all wages owed each
13 payday or upon separation of employment

14 36. As a result of the foregoing issues, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
15 statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth
16 in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct
17 "gross wages earned" or "net wages earned," as the employees earned wages and premiums that were
18 not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of "gross wages earned" on those wage
19 statements.

20 37. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on
21 employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of
22 hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees.
23 The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the
24 pay stub.

25 38. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list
26 employees' "total hours worked," as the wage statements did not accurately include the
27 uncompensated time Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants' policy and
28 practice of requiring off-the-clock work.

1 39. Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to
2 accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records
3 in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

4 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

6 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***

7 **(By Plaintiff on Behalf of the State and the Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants)**

8 40. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

9 41. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
10 the following “aggrieved employees” pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”),
11 codified as Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*:

12 a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in
13 California at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the initial
14 PAGA notice through date of trial.

15 42. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
16 aggrieved employees, according to proof.

17 43. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
18 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action with respect to this cause of action. (*Kim v. Reins*
19 *Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff
20 files suit is always the real party in interest.”])

21 44. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,,
22 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
23 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
24 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
25 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former
26 employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures
27 specified in Section 2699.3. “

1 45. Any allegations regarding violations of the IWC Wage Orders are enforceable as
2 violations of Labor Code section 1198, which states: “[t]he employment of any employee for longer
3 hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

4 46. Labor Code section 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
5 penalties under the PAGA.

6 47. On or about **January 27, 2025**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and
7 provided written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to
8 Defendants) of Defendants’ alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support
9 the alleged violations.

10 48. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s written PAGA notice, entitled “Notice of Labor
11 Code Violations” is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference as though fully set
12 forth herein (the “PAGA notice”).

13 49. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received a response to Plaintiff’s
14 written PAGA notice from the LWDA.

15 50. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice sent by Plaintiff, neither
16 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
17 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

18 51. Now that at least 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these
19 violations, without notice of cure from Defendants or notice from the LWDA of its intent to investigate
20 the alleged allegations and issue the appropriate citations to Defendants, Plaintiff exhausted all
21 prerequisites and commenced this civil action under Labor Code section 2699 *et seq.*

22 52. As set forth in the PAGA notice attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this
23 Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all corresponding civil
24 penalties:

- 25 a. ***Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194,
26 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 27 b. ***Unpaid Overtime.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage
28 Orders.

- c. ***Unpaid Paid Sick Leave.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7.
- d. ***Unpaid Vacation Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code § 227.3.
- e. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- f. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- g. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210.
- h. ***Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256.
- i. ***Non-Compliant Wage Statements.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- j. ***Unreimbursed Employee Expenses.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 2802, 2804.
- k. ***Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.*** Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders.

53. Plaintiff seeks to collect all recoverable civil penalties for the Labor Code violations alleged in this Complaint and the PAGA notice (including amendments thereto) against Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) and (f), in addition to attorneys' fees, costs, and interest to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 2699(k).

PRAYER

Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. For recovery of damages in amount according to proof;
- b. For all recoverable pre- and post-judgment interest;
- c. For this action to be maintained as a representative action under the PAGA;
- d. For Plaintiff and counsel of record to be provided with all enforcement capability as if the action were brought by the State of California or the California Division of Labor Enforcement;
- e. For recovery of all civil penalties and other recoverable amounts under the PAGA;

- 1 f. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent
2 permitted by law, associated with the PAGA claims pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
3 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and any other applicable sections; and
4 g. For such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

5
6 Dated: April 3, 2025

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

7 
8 _____
9 Nicholas J. Ferraro
Xavier L. Woodford
Attorneys for Plaintiff Noah McMillon

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA
SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

January 27, 2025

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL
- Electronic Return Receipt -

O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC
10050 Campo Road
Spring Valley, California 91977

O'Reilly Automotive Stores, Inc.
233 S. Patterson Ave.
Springfield, MO 65802

O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC
233 S. Patterson Ave.
Springfield, MO 65802

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **NOAH MCMILLON** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “aggrieved employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

O'REILLY AUTO ENTERPRISES, LLC; O'REILLY AUTOMOTIVE STORES, INC.

Defendant(s) shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that

employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff’s counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal. 4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Store Manager from about July 6, 2021, to November 9, 2024. During their employment Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “aggrieved employees” and the “PAGA Period”).

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “aggrieved employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants’ violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and

Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal. App. 3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to complete work off-the-clock, without compensation. For example, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees regularly had to work through their off-the-clock meal periods due to the high volume of work and understaffing. As discussed in more detail in the meal periods section, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees’ meal periods would be interrupted and/or cut short and they would have to return to work to resolve customer issues or answer phone calls. Due to this unlawful practice, all hours worked were not directly compensated, resulting in the underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Furthermore, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were made to answer phone calls and respond to messages after being clocked out for the day or on days they were not scheduled. For example, Plaintiff was required to respond to emergency scheduling and operation calls and alarms while off-the-clock sometimes needing to go to the store itself as early as 2 a.m. if an alarm was going off. This unlawful practice resulted in off-the-clock work without compensation. Plaintiff and, on information and belief, other aggrieved employees were deprived of regular and overtime wages each time Defendants engaged in this unlawful policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Overtime
Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. As described above, Defendants compelled Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock during unpaid meal periods and after clocking out. Each time this practice resulted in unpaid work over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime.

Moreover, Defendants failed to pay overtime and double time at the “regular rate of pay.” Defendants paid Plaintiff and aggrieved employees bonuses, commissions, incentives, and other forms of remuneration that Defendants failed to include in the overtime and double time rates in the pay periods when employees worked overtime hours. Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “at a rate no less than ***one and one-half times the regular rate of pay*** for an employee” and “twice the regular rate of pay” for double time hours as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders.

An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

10/03/2024	Regular	39.9833	735.70
10/03/2024	Overtime	3.0999	85.56
10/03/2024	3 Ck Comp SM	0	120.00

Extract of Plaintiff's Wage Report with a pay date of 10/03/2024.

Here, Plaintiff earned a non-discretionary payment (“3 Ck Comp SM”) in the amount of \$120.00. Plaintiff also worked 3.0999 hours of overtime during the same pay period. However, Defendants failed to properly include the additional form of remuneration into Plaintiff’s overtime rate. Thus, Defendants’ paid Plaintiff overtime at a deficient rate, resulting in the underpayment of overtime wages. Therefore, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages at the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. Plaintiff seeks to recover for the corresponding overtime rate on behalf of the affected aggrieved employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave
Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 24 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) “the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;” (2) “by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;” or (3) “for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time.” Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees “with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

Defendants failed to comply with California's paid sick leave laws with respect to the aggrieved employees. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with all sick leave accrued. To the extent that Defendants provided paid sick leave, they did not pay all sick leave wages at the proper rate of pay because they failed to incorporate the hours that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock.

Additionally, each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock that resulted in unpaid overtime, the overtime hours were not accounted for when calculating an employee's accrued paid sick leave. Defendants also failed to include all forms of remuneration into the paid sick leave hourly rate, resulting in depreciated sick pay to the extent any was paid at all. Therefore, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not awarded the total accrued sick leave time they had earned.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Vacation Wages
Violation of Labor Code § 227.3

Defendants violated Labor Code section 227.3 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 227.3 requires "whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination."

Defendants maintained an unlawful policy and practice of failing to pay all accrued and unused vacation wages upon separation of employment at the lawful rate of pay, resulting in forfeiture of vested vacation time and wages. As described above, Defendants failed to record all of the time that Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked for Defendants and undercounted their hours worked. Consequently, Defendants failed to credit the aggrieved employees with all vacation time they had actually accrued. Therefore, vacation wages were not paid out at the lawful rate of pay inclusive of all earnings.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). "[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage." *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is "exceedingly narrow" and applies only when (1) "the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty" and (2) *both* "the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period." *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal. 5th 444, 459.

Defendants failed to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to which they were entitled in a manner that complies with California Law. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods due to pressures to keep up with high demands of the job and understaffing. For example, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were required to answer customer questions about auto products or respond to phone calls with commercial customers. Often while on break, the cashier line would back up and it would turn into an emergency where Defendants would pull Plaintiff away from his break. If he was on the property, he would get stopped and get pulled to answer questions from employees and customers. Plaintiff was required to email the district manager to request a meal break premium, despite the fact that his meals were interrupted or missed entirely almost daily.

Additionally, when Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were made to work more than 12 hours, they did not receive a second meal period. As a matter of common policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees all meal period premiums owed.

To the extent that Defendants paid meal premiums, Defendants failed to pay them at the regular rate of compensation and the premiums paid did not factor in bonuses, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of compensation. An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

Regular	31.95	587.88
Overtime	3.75	103.50
Holiday Ovt	7.9167	218.51
Meal Brk Pen	1	18.40

Extract of Plaintiff's Wage Report with a pay date of 09/19/2024.

Here, Plaintiff earned a meal period premium ("Meal Brk Pen") in the amount of \$18.40 and a holiday shift differential ("Holiday Ovt") in the same pay period he earned his meal period premium. However, Defendants failed to properly incorporate all forms of remuneration into Plaintiff's meal period premium pay, resulting in the underpayment of meal period premiums. On information and belief, Defendants committed the meal period premium violation against the other aggrieved employees as a matter of common payroll administration and company policy in a matter susceptible to common proof.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). Labor Code section 1198 renders

“employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which employees were entitled and failed to pay all rest period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. As stated above in the “Unpaid Meal Period Premium” section, due to the job’s high demands, lack of proper staffing, and the profession’s nature, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were rarely, if at all, authorized or permitted to take all their rest periods. Defendants required Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees to effectively waive or otherwise forego their rest periods contrary to the law. For example, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were unable to take their first or second rest periods during their shifts due to high demands and understaffing. Plaintiff alleges that he was unable to take a rest period when he was the only employee working at the location because he was prevented from scheduling more than one other employee to open with and the others would often call out, leaving him alone to do all opening procedures. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees would have their rest periods continually interrupted by customers asking them questions or being pulled away from their breaks to help with a check out line getting overly backed up because of understaffing.

Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced non-compliant rest periods, they were owed a rest period premium. As a matter of policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay all owed rest period premiums to employees who were unable to take rest periods. To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the “regular rate of compensation” to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-excludable remuneration.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of “all wages” for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid “not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor

within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides “every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty” of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Indeed, Defendant failed to pay all premiums, overtime, regular, sick leave, and other earnings on time each payday.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours’ notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours’ notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants additionally failed to pay all accrued paid sick leave owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice and failed to pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:” (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list employees’ “total hours worked,” as the wage statements did not accurately include the uncompensated time plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants’ policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unreimbursed Employee Expenses
Violation of Labor Code §§ 2802, 2804

Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to reimburse the aggrieved employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred as part of their job duties.

Labor Code section 2802 requires an employer to “indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.” *See, e.g., Espinoza v. West Coast Tomato Growers, LLC*, 2016 WL 4468175 at *4, n.2 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2016, No. 14-CV-2984 W (KSC)).

Labor Code section 2804 affirms that “[a]ny contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to incur costs for work-related purposes without full reimbursement. In direct consequence of their job duties, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees unavoidably and necessarily incurred these losses, expenditures, costs, and as a matter of policy and practice.

For example, Plaintiff was required to purchase and utilize his personal tools for work-related purposes such as fixing store shelving. Further, although Plaintiff was initially given a work vehicle, it was subsequently taken away for use at another location, after which Plaintiff was required to use his personal vehicle for work purposes such as making deliveries. Defendants required Plaintiff to submit reimbursement requests and wait for district manager approval. However, after termination Plaintiff was locked out from making reimbursement requests despite having used his personal vehicle for work purposes.

Moreover, Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to utilize their personal cell phones to complete necessary work tasks, such as fielding calls about scheduling and answering customer questions about products. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not reimbursed for the expenses associated with cell phone usage. Instead, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees bore the cost of these requirements, without reimbursement.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys’ Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other aggrieved employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants’ written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees’ personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,



Xavier L. Woodford

Cc Plaintiff Noah McMillon

Counsel for Defendants

Brian Loomis, Esq. - bloomis2@oreillyauto.com