



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880
www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 1 of 6

VIA ONLINE FILING

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, CA 95814

PAGAfiling@dir.ca.gov

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: Ivan Marquez v. Collabera, Inc.

Dear Representative:

This office represents Ivan Marquez ("**Mr. Marquez**") with respect to his claims under the California Labor Code against Collabera, Inc. ("**Employer**"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified mail.

Employer employed Mr. Marquez as an hourly, non-exempt employee. During his employment with Employer, Mr. Marquez is employed as a Network Engineer at Employer's location at 7337 Grape Street, #3100 San Diego, Ca 92104. Employer is a staffing solutions company with offices and worksites throughout the state of California.

Mr. Marquez intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("**PAGA**"). Mr. Marquez is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt employees of Employer ("**Aggrieved Employees**"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Aggrieved Employees is defined as all current and former non-exempt employees of Employer, including but not limited to, all network engineer, computer engineer, technician, and field tech workers in the state of California.

As detailed below, it is believed that the Employer engaged in several violations of several of California's wage and hour laws during Mr. Marquez's employment, prior to then, and continuing since, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC Wage Order") including *inter alia*, IWC Wage Order No. 4. The claims made on behalf of Mr. Marquez and/or other Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880
www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 2 of 6

Employer has engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Mr. Marquez and/or Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

First, Employer regularly required Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, but failed to pay them overtime compensation for such work. Employer also failed to provide Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees with adequate training as to the payment of overtime compensation, all in an effort to keep its workers uninformed as to their legal right to overtime compensation. In addition, Employer regularly required Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employer and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Moreover, this off-the-clock work typically caused Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in week, resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation. In addition, Employer failed to pay Aggrieved Employees the proper overtime by failing to properly calculate when hours exceeded both eight (8) hours in a single workday and forty (40) hours in a week under California law. Further, Employer required Aggrieved Employees to work split shifts without paying an additional hour of pay owed.

In addition to requiring Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation, Employer also utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages to Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages. Employer also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in a failure to pay Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees for all hours actually worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employer failed to pay overtime to Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employer has failed to pay Mr. Marquez and/or Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 4 and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek unpaid wages; PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 4; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194; and attorneys' fees and costs.



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 3 of 6

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employer failed to provide Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were required by Employer to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employer regularly required Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. On the occasions that Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short.

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods, which included responding to telephone calls and text messages; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 4 and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 4; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880
www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 4 of 6

Employer failed to authorize and permit Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees take legally compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employer required Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to telephone calls and text messages, pages; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Marquez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees right to receive rest periods.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 4 and California Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 4; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

As to each pay period, Employer has failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880
www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 5 of 6

compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, and the correct rates of pay, and the net wages earned and proper address. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

Employer has failed to maintain accurate records relating to Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 4 and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 4; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. IWC Wage Order No. 4 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employer. These costs include, but are not limited to, the use of their personal cell phones for work-related purposes.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Order No. 4 and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880
www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 4, 2022
Page 6 of 6

Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 4; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Upon the termination of employment, Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due to them within twenty-four (24) hours or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employer's practices of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employer failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employer also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums, rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Mr. Marquez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203, 1199, and 2699(f)(2); and attorneys' fees and costs.

Therefore, on behalf of himself, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, Mr. Marquez may seek all applicable penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Amir Nayebdadash', is written over a horizontal line.

Amir Nayebdadash

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (7020 1290 0001 4026 1805)

Collabera, Inc.
7337 Grape Street, #3100
San Diego, Ca 92104

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (7020 1290 0001 4026 1799)

Collabera, Inc.
Agent for Service of Process, XL Corporate Services, Inc.
720 14th St.
Sacramento, CA 95814