

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION

5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Tel.: 818-293-5623
Fax: 888-850-1310

March 21, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Ocotillo RV Resort LLC
05481 US-31 S
Charlevoix, MI 49720
Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 23

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Agent for Service of Process
Christy Harper
74711 Dillon Road
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92241
Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 30

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Ocotillo RV Resort LLC
2189 Ca 79
Borrego Springs, CA 92004
Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 47

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sky Resorts
2189 Ca 79
Borrego Springs, CA 92004
Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 47

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sky Valley Resorts
2189 Ca 79
Borrego Springs, CA 92004
Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 47

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

Ocotillo RV Resort LLC, et al.

March 21, 2025

Page 2

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Black Meadow Landing

156100 Black Meadow Rd.

Parker Dam, CA 92267

Certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 2373 3693 54

Re: ***Madeleine Morales v. Ocotillo RV Resort LLC, Sky Resorts, Sky Valley Resorts, Black Meadow Landing – Compliance Letter of California Labor Code § 2698 – Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear Sir or Madam:

This office represents Madeleine Morales (“Plaintiff”), a former California employee of Ocotillo RV Resort LLC, Sky Resorts, Sky Valley Resorts, Black Meadow Landing (“Defendants”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client worked for Defendant in Southern California. Herein we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to our client and other of its California non-exempt employees.

Plaintiff began working for Defendants in or around March of 2024. While working for Defendant as a Server, Cashier, Cook. Plaintiff was earning (\$16.00) dollars per hour.

Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were instructed to work approximately 15-20 minutes after they had clocked out to finish their assignments. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were also required to use their personal cell phone for work-related activities while off the clock, such as clocking in/out, texting/calling supervisor/boss, texting/calling clients, emails, download Paylocity work app, training, without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff on the average of 1 hour to complete these tasks. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess hours were not recorded on our client’s and Defendant’s California employees wage statements. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees should have been compensated for that time, but he was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per week and do

not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees claim that Defendant engaged in "time-shaving." This essentially means that the Defendant underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section 1194(a).

Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5). Plaintiff and the California employees wage statements' failed to accurately state the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(8), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's worked hours, due to the time-shaving. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records and required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

Our client further alleges that Defendants paid her and Defendant's California employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-monthly basis and has failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-monthly basis must be paid no later than ten calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations

described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b) and 201.3.

Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the food safety certification they purchased to perform work for Defendant. Defendant failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall 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." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

We invite Defendants or its attorney(s) to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Roman Otkupman', is written over a horizontal line.

ROMAN OTKUPMAN