

DARREN M. COHEN, Esq., Cal. Bar No. 221938
dcohen@kingsleykingsley.com
KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC
16133 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1200
Encino, CA 91436
Telephone: (818) 990-8300
Fax: (818) 990-2903

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

05/26/2020 at 08:00:00 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Erika Engel, Deputy Clerk

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

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

JANNIA TOWNSEND, an individual, on
behalf of herself and others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P.; G6
HOSPITALITY, LLC; and DOES 1 to 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2020-00018261-CU-OE-CTL

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1199

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff JANNIA TOWNSEND (“Plaintiff”), an individual, on behalf of herself and the people of the State of California and as an “Aggrieved Employee” under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) complains against Defendant MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P. and Defendant G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC (together “Defendant”), a corporation, and DOES 1 to 50 (collectively “Defendants”), as follows:

I

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Representative Action, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*, on behalf of the following individuals: All persons who are employed or have been employed by

1 MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P. and/or G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC in the State of California since
2 one (1) year prior to the date of Plaintiff's notice letter to the Labor and Workforce
3 Development Agency ("LWDA") and continuing to the present. ("Aggrieved Employees")

4 2. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the LWDA and
5 Defendant giving notice of this claim pursuant to PAGA and continuing to the present,
6 Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages and/or overtime to all hourly
7 employees for all work perform at the proper rate of compensation. When Plaintiff and the
8 Aggrieved Employees worked overtime, Defendant failed to pay the overtime hours worked at
9 the proper overtime premium rate. As such, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid at
10 a rate less than the rate required under California law.

11 3. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the LWDA and
12 Defendant giving notice of this claim pursuant to PAGA and continuing to the present,
13 Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees a meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes for shifts over five (5) hours, to be
15 provided within the first five (5) hours of the shift, and a second meal period of at least thirty
16 (30) minutes for shifts over ten (10) hours. Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing
17 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of this right. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and
18 the Aggrieved Employees with proper meal periods as required by the Labor Code during the
19 relevant time period.

20 4. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the LWDA and
21 Defendant giving notice of this claim pursuant to PAGA and continuing to the present,
22 Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to inform employees of their right to take rest
23 periods and of failing to provide employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff,
24 rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and
25 failing to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation
26 for each workday that the rest period was not provided, as required by California state wage and
27 hour laws.

28 5. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the LWDA and

Defendant giving notice of this claim pursuant to PAGA and continuing to the present, Defendant has failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) by failing to include necessary and required information on wage statements provided to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Defendant failed to include the total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, and include meal/rest period premiums.

6. For at least one (1) year prior to the date of the letter sent to the LWDA and Defendant giving notice of this claim pursuant to PAGA and continuing to the present, Defendant has failed to pay all wages due at the time of termination or resignation to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

7. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees, brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking penalties for Defendant's violation of California Labor Code §§ 203, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1199.

II

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the California Constitution and California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10 by virtue of the fact that this is a civil action in which the matter in controversy, exclusive of interest, exceeds \$25,000, and because each cause of action asserted arises under the laws of the State of California or is subject to adjudication in the courts of the State of California.

9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant has caused injuries in the County of San Diego and the State of California through their acts, and by their violation of the California Labor Code and California state common law.

10. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395. Defendant operates within California and does business within San Diego County. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees within the State of California and the County of San Diego.

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

III

PARTIES

A. PLAINTIFF

11. Plaintiff JANNIA TOWNSEND is a resident of California.

12. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to:

a. Work without being paid for all hours worked at the appropriate rate;

b. Work without being provided their meal periods;

c. Work without being provided their rest periods; and

d. Work without being provided accurate itemized wage statements that properly indicate the total hours worked, all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, and included meal/rest period premiums.

13. Defendant willfully failed to compensate Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees for wages at the termination of their employment with Defendant.

14. Plaintiff and all current and former employees are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

B. DEFENDANTS

15. Defendant MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P. is believed to be a Delaware corporation operating within the State of California. Defendant's corporate address is believed to be 4001 International Parkway, Carrollton, TX 75007. Upon information and belief, Defendant employed Plaintiff and similarly situated persons as employees within California. Defendant has done and does business throughout the State of California.

16. Defendant G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC is believed to be a Delaware corporation operating within the State of California. Defendant's corporate address is believed to be P.O. Box 117897, Carrollton, TX 75011. Upon information and belief, Defendant employed Plaintiff and similarly situated persons as employees within California. Defendant has done and does business throughout the State of California.

17. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or

otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. Furthermore, Defendants in all respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

IV

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

19. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are, and at all times pertinent hereto, have been classified as non-exempt hourly employees by Defendant.

20. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are covered by California Industrial Welfare Commission Occupational Wage Order No. 4-2001 (Title 8 Cal. Code of Regs. § 11040).

21. On a regular and consistent basis, Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages and/or overtime to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. When Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked overtime, Defendant failed to pay the overtime hours worked at the proper overtime premium rate. As such, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid at a rate less than the rate required under California law.

22. On a regular and consistent basis, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been forced by Defendant to work over five (5) hours in one day without being provided a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted meal break and not being compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided or provided

1 after five (5) hours. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been forced by
2 Defendant to work over ten (10) hours in one day without being provided a second thirty (30)
3 minute uninterrupted meal period and not being compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular
4 rate of compensation for each workday that a second meal period was not provided or provided
5 after ten (10) hours. Defendant failed to inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their
6 right to take meal periods by way of a lawful policy.

7 23. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been required to work four-hour
8 increments (or major fractions thereof) without being provided with a ten (10) minute rest
9 period. Additionally, Defendant failed to inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their
10 right to take rest periods by way of a lawful policy.

11 24. Defendant has failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in compliance
12 with Labor Code § 226(a) that properly indicate the total hours worked, all applicable hourly
13 rates in effect during the pay period, the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly
14 rate by the employee, and include meal/rest period premiums.

15 25. Defendant willfully failed to pay wages and compensation, when Plaintiff and all
16 Aggrieved Employees quit or were discharged. Defendant failed to pay the wages described
17 above at the time of termination or resignation. This failure was willful, without legal
18 justification, and interfered with Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' rights.

19 26. As a result of the acts alleged herein, Defendant violated Labor Code § 2699, *et*
20 *seq.*

21 **V**

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699, ET SEQ.**

24 27. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing
25 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

26 28. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1199 require an employer to compensate its
27 employees for all hours worked, to compensate all hours at the minimum wage rate or above,
28 and to compensate at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for

any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek. Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages and/or overtime for all hours worked. When Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked overtime, Defendant failed to pay the overtime hours worked at the proper overtime premium rate. As such, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid at a rate less than the rate required under California law.

29. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 require an employer to pay an additional hour of compensation for each meal period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes for shifts over five (5) hours, to be provided within the first five (5) hours of the shift, and a second meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes for shifts over ten (10) hours. Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of this right. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with proper meal periods as required by the Labor Code during the relevant time period.

30. Labor Code § 226.7 requires an employer to pay an additional hour (1) of compensation for each rest period the employer fails to provide. Employees are entitled to a paid ten (10) minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked (or major fraction thereof). Defendant failed to maintain a policy informing Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of this right. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees consistently worked shifts with no rest breaks or with only some of their required rest breaks during the relevant time period.

31. Labor Code § 226(a) requires employers to itemize in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages, the appropriate rates of pay, and to accurately report total hours worked by Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

32. Labor Code § 226(a)(2) requires that the itemized wage statement properly state the total hours worked by the employee. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are issued wage statements that do not state the total hours worked during the pay period.

33. Labor Code § 226(a)(9) requires that the itemized statement in writing showing all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of

1 hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are
2 issued wage statements that do not include all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
3 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. In
4 addition, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are issued wage statements that do not include
5 meal/rest period premiums.

6 34. Defendant's failure to pay wages, as alleged above was willful in that Defendant
7 knew wages to be due but failed to pay them, thus entitling Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees to penalties under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall
9 continue as a penalty until paid for a period of up to thirty (30) days from the time they were
10 due. Defendant has failed to pay Plaintiff and others a sum certain at the time of termination or
11 within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums for thirty
12 (30) days thereafter in violation of Labor Code § 203.

13 35. As a result of the acts alleged above, Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code
14 § 2699, *et seq.* because of Defendant's violation of Labor Code §§ 203, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512,
15 1194, 1197, and 1199, which call for civil penalties.

16 36. For each such violation, Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees are entitled
17 to penalties in an amount to be shown at the time of trial subject to the following formula:

- 18 a. \$100 for the initial violation per employee per pay period; and
19 b. \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period.

20 37. These penalties will be allocated 75% to the Labor Workforce Development
21 Agency and 25% to the affected employees.

22 38. On March 2, 2020, in compliance with Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1), Plaintiff gave
23 written notice by online filing to the LWDA, setting forth the facts and theories of the violations
24 alleged against Defendant ("Notice Letter", see Exhibit "1") and paid the filing fee. Plaintiff
25 also mailed notice to Defendant by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the address listed
26 on the California Secretary of State's website as the entity address for MOTEL 6 OPERATING,
27 L.P., which is 4001 International Parkway, Carrollton, TX 75007, and G6 HOSPITALITY,
28 LLC, which is P.O. Box 117897, Carrollton, TX 75011. (See Exhibit "2").

39. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), no notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA evidencing its intention to investigate within sixty-five (65) calendar days of March 2, 2020. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to commence a civil action as though the LWDA has chosen not to investigate. Plaintiff will also provide the LWDA with a filed-stamped copy of the Representative Action Complaint immediately.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

1. For penalties and other relief pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*;
2. An award of prejudgment and post judgment interest;
3. An award providing for payment of costs of suit;
4. An award of attorney's fees; and
5. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem proper and just.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of her claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

DATED: May 13, 2020

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC

By: 
DARREN M. COHEN
Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees

EXHIBIT 1

From: noreply@salesforce.com on behalf of [LWDA DO NOT REPLY](#)
To: [Service Email](#)
Subject: Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.
Date: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:09:39 PM

3/2/2020

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-775905-20
Law Firm : Kingsley & Kingsley, APC
Plaintiff Name : Jannia Townsend
Employer: Motel 6 Operating, L.P.

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm



March 2, 2020

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
<https://dir.tfaforms.net/260>

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P.
4001 International Parkway
Carrollton, TX 75007
Certified Mailing: # 7019 1640 0000 8115 0683

G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC
P.O. Box 117897
Carrollton, TX 75011
Certified Mailing: # 7019 1640 0000 8115 0690

Re: JANNIA TOWNSEND V. MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P.; G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC
California Labor Code § 2699 Penalties

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Jannia Townsend ("Plaintiff") for the violations of California Labor Code §§ 203, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1199. The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* We herein set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations, which we allege Motel 6 Operating, L.P. and G6 Hospitality, LLC (together "Defendant") engaged in with respect to our client and all of their California employees.

Specifically, Defendant has violated Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1199. These statutes require an employer to compensate its employees at the minimum wage rate for all hours worked and at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for any work in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday and any work in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek. On a regular and consistent basis, Defendant has had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages and/or overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees for all hours worked. When Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked overtime, Defendant failed to pay the overtime hours worked at the proper overtime premium rate. As such, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were paid at a rate

less than the rate required under California law.

In addition, Labor Code § 512 states that an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Additionally, an employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(c), if an employer fails to provide an employee with a lawful meal period, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a thirty-minute uninterrupted meal period was not provided, was not provided in full, or was not provided in a timely manner.

Defendant failed to apprise Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees of their rights associated with meal periods and failed to provide compliant meal periods. Defendant required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to work shifts without providing them with meal periods. When employees were required to work through meal periods, Defendant failed to pay such employees one hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and Wage Order 4-2001, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with rest breaks of not less than ten (10) minutes per four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with these rest periods and failed to inform them of their right to rest periods. Further, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not compensated with one (1) hour of wages for each missed rest period as required by Labor Code § 226.7.

Defendant engaged in a practice of failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226(a), which requires that every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Specifically, Labor Code § 226(a)(2) requires that the itemized wage statement properly state the total hours worked by the employee. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are issued wage statements that do not state the total hours worked during the pay period. Labor Code § 226(a)(9) requires that the itemized wage statement properly state all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are issued wage statements that do not include the applicable regular rate, overtime rate, and double time rates. In addition, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees are issued wage statements that do not include the correct number of hours worked at each applicable hourly rate and do not include meal/rest period premiums. Thus, Plaintiff is aggrieved employees within the meaning PAGA and Defendant has violated Labor Code § 226(a) with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P.
G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC
California Labor Code § 2699 Penalties
March 2, 2020
Page 3 of 3


Lastly, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees all wages at the time of termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation and have failed to pay those sums for thirty (30) days thereafter.

Defendant's failure to provide wages and/or overtime for all hours worked and at the proper rate, failure to provide meal and rest periods, failure to provide compliant itemized wage statements, and failure to pay all wages upon termination/resignation were all done on a regular and consistent basis.

We are constrained to move forward with the filing of this complaint alleging causes of action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 203, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, and 1199, with or without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

Very truly yours,

KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC

By: 
DARREN M. COHEN

DMC/dm

LWDA Filed Electronic Submission via <https://dir.tfaforms.net/260>
VIA CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P. # 7019 1640 0000 8115 0683
G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC # 7019 1640 0000 8115 0690

EXHIBIT 2

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

MOTEL 6 OPERATING, L.P.
4001 International Parkway
Carrollton, TX 75007



9590 9402 5537 9249 5207 39

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 1640 0000 8115 0683

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

D. Metairie☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

D. Metairie

C. Date of Delivery

*3/6/20*D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type



- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☒ Return Receipt for Merchandise☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING#




First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

9590 9402 5537 9249 5207 39

United States
Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box •

Kingsley & Kingsley
16133 Ventura Blvd suite 1200
Encino CA 91436.



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

GG Hospitality, LLC
P.O. BOX 117897
Carrollton TX 75011



9590 9402 5537 9249 5207 46

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

019 1640 0000 8115 0690

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

D. McDaniel

C. Date of Delivery

03/06/20

- ☒ Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below:

☐ Yes
☐ No



3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
☒ Certified Mail®
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
☐ Insured Mail
☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☒ Return Receipt for Merchandise☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING #



First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

9590 9402 5537 9249 5207 46

United States
Postal Service

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box •

Kingsley & Kingsley
16133 Ventura Blvd #1200
Encino CA 91436

