



**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA**  
**(Labor Code § 2699.3)**

**DATE** January 14, 2025

**DELIVERY** Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

**RECIPIENTS** California  
Workforce Development Agency  
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

**SUBJECT: MIGUEL GALVAN v. JA METALS, INC. — NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3**

Dear Representative:

This office represents Miguel Galvan (“Mr. Galvan” or Complainant) with respect to their claims against JA Metals, Inc and John M. Atkinson (an individual). (“Employer”) for violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. Both JA Metals, Inc. and John M. Atkinson are responsible for the working conditions and controlled the wages, hours and compensation of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers are a corporation doing business in the State of California. Employers employed Mr. Galvan from approximately July 2023, until their last date of employment of approximately February 2024. During their employment with Employers, Mr. Galvan was employed as a Water Jet Operator at Employers’ manufacturing site located at 1790 Dornoch Ct, San Diego, CA 92154.

Mr. Galvan 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. Galvan is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt/hourly employees of any of the Employers working within California holding various positions who experienced the same violations as themselves as set forth in this notice.

Office: (310) 248-2944  
E-Mail: info@caworklawyer.com  
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300  
Torrance, California 90505

("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Complainant's employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC Wage Order"). The claims made on behalf of Complainant and 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.**

Employers have engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Defendants implemented a violative "bell" system that deprived Complainant and Aggrieved Employees of all their compensable work time at the correct rate of pay. In addition, Defendants practiced a non-neutral time rounding system that deprived Complainant and Aggrieved Employees of all time work by rounding compensable work time downward in a non-neutral fashion.

First, Employers regularly required Complainant 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 Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employers 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. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employers failed to pay overtime to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration and all compensable work time.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers have failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees all owed wages for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Office: (310) 248-2944  
E-Mail: [info@caworklawyer.com](mailto:info@caworklawyer.com)  
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300  
Torrance, California 90505

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Order; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

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

Employers required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Complainant 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 Complainant and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Complainant and Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all non-exempt/hourly employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; and (6) Employers' policy and culture prevented Complainant 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.

Accordingly, Employers violated of the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), 512(a) and 1198.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties of the applicable IWC Wage Order; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code 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.**

Employers failed to authorize and permit Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant 10-minute periods. Employers required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Complainant 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, Complainant 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, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were never completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' 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) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Complainant 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 in person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Complainant 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.

Complainant 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, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), and 1198.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

Office: (310) 248-2944  
E-Mail: [info@caworklawyer.com](mailto:info@caworklawyer.com)  
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300  
Torrance, California 90505

#### **4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT.**

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Complainant 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 PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO DISCHARGED AND QUITTING EMPLOYEES.**

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Complainant Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 201(a), 202(a) and 203(a).

Complainant 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.

#### **6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS.**

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees never included the actual hours worked as the time worked was detrimentally rounded, the correct name and address of the legal employing entity, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

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

#### **7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS.**

Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

#### **8. 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 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the use of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees personal use of their personal cell phones to communicate with his supervisors regarding job duties. Complainant would maintain contact with his supervisor through his personal telephone without reimbursement.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Complainant 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; and attorneys' fees and costs.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Justin Lo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**JUSTIN LO ESQ.**

Office: (310) 248-2944  
E-Mail: [info@caworklawyer.com](mailto:info@caworklawyer.com)  
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300  
Torrance, California 90505

**Notice via Certified Mail**

JA Metals, Inc.  
John M. Atkinson - Agent for Service of Process  
1790 Dornoch Ct  
San Diego, CA 92154

JA Metals, Inc.  
Human Resources/Legal Dept.  
1790 Dornoch Ct  
San Diego, CA 92154

JA Metals, Inc.  
John M. Atkinson - Individual  
1790 Dornoch Ct  
San Diego, CA 92154

Office: (310) 248-2944  
E-Mail: [info@caworklawyer.com](mailto:info@caworklawyer.com)  
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300  
Torrance, California 90505