

LAW OFFICES OF
RAMIN R. YOUNESSI
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION
3435 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2200
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90010
TELEPHONE: (323) 777-7777
FACSIMILE: (213) 480-6201
EMAIL: ABICKFORD@YOUNESSILAW.COM

PLEASE NOTE THIS FIRM DOES NOT
ACCEPT SERVICE BY FACSIMILE OR EMAIL

February 10, 2025

Via Electronic Filing Only

Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 622-3273

RE: Oscar Quintanilla Lemus v. Del Rey Party Rentals, Inc.
PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT (Our File No. 22191)

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be informed that Del Rey Party Rentals, Inc. doing business at 4855 W. Rosecrans Avenue, Hawthorne, CA 90250, (referred to as “Respondent”), and any other employers or person(s) acting on behalf of Respondent as such phrase is used under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, have committed and/or caused to be committed Labor Code violations against our client, Oscar Quintanilla Lemus, as well as other employees working for Respondent within the past four years, including all of Respondent’s other locations within California.

Our client worked as a driver from on or about May 1, 2022 to on or about April 15, 2024. Respondent failed to pay wages when due, failed to provide meal and rest periods, failed to maintain complete and accurate time records, failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to our client, failed to reimburse our client for all necessary business expenditures, failed to provide paid sick leave, and failed to pay our client earned and due wages upon separation of employment.

Our client may represent all other potentially aggrieved employees as follows:

Respondent violated Labor Code §§ 512 and 226.7 because it failed to provide our client and/or other similarly situated employees the requisite 30-minute, uninterrupted meal periods for every five (5) hours of work throughout their employment, and our client did not validly waive said meal periods. Respondent failed to affirmatively advise of the right to take statutory meal periods, regularly interrupted meal periods, and/or did not completely relieve all duty during said

meal periods. Respondent did not pay to our client and/or other aggrieved employees one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that one or more statutory meal periods was not provided.

Respondent violated Labor Code § 226.7 because it failed to provide our client and other aggrieved employees 10-minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours of work, or majority portion thereof, throughout their employment. Respondent failed to affirmatively advise our client and other aggrieved employees of the right to take statutory rest breaks, regularly interrupted our client's rest breaks, and/or did not completely relieve our client of all duty during said rest breaks. Respondent did not pay to our client one (1) additional hour of pay at our client's regular rate of compensation for each workday that one or more statutory rest breaks was not provided.

Respondent violated Labor Code §§ 226(a)(1), (2), (5) and (9), and 1174 because it failed to provide our client and other aggrieved employees with itemized wage and hour statements that fully or accurately stated the (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (5) net wages earned, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Our client's paystubs failed to include all hours worked and omitted the hourly rate for those excluded hours, rendering both the stated gross and net wages false and inaccurate. Respondent further violated Labor Code § 226(a) because it failed to keep a copy of the required itemized statements on file for at least three (3) years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

Respondent violated Labor Code § 203 because it willfully failed to pay our client and/or other aggrieved employees earned and due wages upon separation of employment, either immediately upon involuntary termination, or within 72 hours of resignation. These earned but unpaid wages include minimum wages, regular wages earned but not paid, overtime wages, meal/rest period compensation, and all wages due and owing at the end of employment described above.

Respondent violated Labor Code §2802(a) because it failed to reimburse our client and/or other aggrieved employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred during the course of employment.

Please take further notice that Respondent violated Labor Code §246 because it failed to provide to our client and its other employees with paid sick leave. Our client worked for Respondent for more than 30 days and was entitled to accrue paid sick leave at the rate of 1 hour for every 30 hours worked. Our client and/or other aggrieved employees did not accrue any paid sick leave at all, and if they took time off from work that would have qualified as sick leave, received no wages for this time period.

Respondent may have the right to cure certain violations and/or reduce certain civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 et seq. and 2699.3 et seq.

Please take further notice that, based upon the above-mentioned violations, and in addition to the penalties provided by those specific sections themselves, our client also intends to seek penalties under the following Labor Code sections which themselves are inviolable but

provide for recovery of penalties for violating one or more of the above-mentioned Labor Code sections: Labor Code §§ 203, 210, 248.5, 558, 226.3.

Respondent's violations of 8 Code of Regulations § 11070, Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 7-2001, Labor Code §§ 201-203, 221, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 512, 1194, 2699, and other applicable provisions, as alleged herein (i.e. Respondent has failed to pay wages when due, AND/OR has failed to provide meal periods, AND/OR has failed to provide rest breaks, AND/OR has failed to provide timely and accurate itemized wage and hour statements, AND/OR failed to maintain complete and accurate time records, AND/OR has failed to reimburse for necessary business expenses, AND/OR has failed to provide paid sick time, AND/OR has failed to pay all wages due and owing at the end of client's and other aggrieved employees' employment) constitute unfair business practices in violation of Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

Our client is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that he and other employees were subject to the same violations and, therefore, are aggrieved employees within the meaning of California Labor Code § 2699. Thus, our client, as an aggrieved employee, brings an action against Respondents, on behalf of himself and other current and former employees.

Should your agency choose not to pursue this matter, this law office intends to vigorously prosecute the aforementioned Labor Code violations on its behalf, and vindicate the rights of all employees who have been subjected to these same Labor Code violations by Respondent.

Respectfully,

LAW OFFICES OF RAMIN R. YOUNESSI
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Andreea Bickford

Andreea Bickford
Attorney at Law