MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP
Arash Sadat (SBN 279282)
Camron Dowlatshahi (SBN 308618)
Mir Raza (SBN 358311)
333 South Hope Street, 40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Tel.: (213) 628-3856
Email: arash@msdlawyers.com
Email: camron@msdlawyers.com
Email: mir@msdlawyers.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Karla Solis Castillo

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
9/22/2025 10:32:53 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By E. Schilawski ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

KARLA SOLIS CASTILLO, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHNSON SERVICE GROUP, INC., a Delaware stock corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CU050527C

KARLA SOLIS CASTILLO'S COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO THE PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERA ACT ("PAGA") (LAB. CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.*)

Plaintiff Karla Solis Castillo, individually, and on behalf of the State of California and other aggrieved persons, brings this action against Defendant Johnson Service Group, and Does 1 through 10, inclusive (collectively, "Defendants"), and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Karla Solis Castillo ("Plaintiff") is an individual residing in the County of San Diego, California, and worked as a non-exempt Talent Acquisition Coordinator from January 2, 2025 through February 28, 2025.

2. Defendant Johnson Service Group, Inc. ("JSG") is a Delaware stock corporation with its principal place of business in the County of DuPage, Illinois. JSG is a business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in San Diego County, and is the current or former employer of Plaintiff and of the aggrieved employees. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

3. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged and that Plaintiff's damages were proximately caused by said defendants' conduct.

4. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured Plaintiff and other employees in the State of California.

5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in

interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

VENUE AND JURISDICTION

6. The wrongful conduct alleged against the Defendants occurred in the County of San Diego, California. At all relevant times, the conduct at issue was part of a continuous and ongoing pattern of behavior.

7. This Court is the proper forum to adjudicate this action because the wrongful acts that are the subject of this action occurred here and because the Defendant now resides in its jurisdictional area.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

8. During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

9. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff.

10. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff for all hours worked. Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct rate of pay and meal and rest break premium rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiff.

11. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff worked.

12. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing timely 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff of her right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff in compliance with California law.

13. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting her to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff of her right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff was taking her required rest periods.

14. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely pay Plaintiff during and at the conclusion of her employment all wages for all minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages.

16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net

wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned for hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code § 2698, *et seq.*)

(Against All Defendants)

17. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though set forth fully herein.

18. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the California Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

19. California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

20. Plaintiff has exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. On March 13, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by certified mail to Defendants the specific provisions of the California Labor Code that Defendants violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's notice to LWDA and Defendants is attached as **Exhibit A**. Plaintiff's LWDA case number is LWDA-CM-1085877-25.

21. At the time of this filing, LWDA has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. If it does so, Plaintiff will amend her

complaint. Otherwise, Plaintiff will proceed with this civil action to recover penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 pursuant to section 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code alleged herein. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

22. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

23. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

24. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the California Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked, as stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants.

25. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable

IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

26. Based on the conduct described in this complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

27. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (g)(1), which states, "[a]ny employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendants as follows:

A. For an award of civil penalties under PAGA;

B. For costs of suit, including attorneys' fees, costs, and expert witness fees; and

C. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 22, 2025

MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP

By:

Camron Dowlatshahi

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Karla Solis Castillo

EXHIBIT A

MSD MILLS SADAT DOWLAT LLP

333 South Hope Street
40th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
www.msdlawyers.com

Camron Dowlatshahi
O: (213) 628 3856
D: (213) 279-2612
E: camron@msdlawyers.com

March 13, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION TO LWDA;
VIA CERTIFIED MAIL TO EMPLOYER

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Johnson Service Group
One E Oak Hill Drive Suite 200
Westmont, IL 60559

Re: Notice of Claim Under Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA")

Dear LWDA:

My office has been retained by Karla Solis Castillo ("Plaintiff'') to pursue a PAGA representative action (Lab. Code § 2699, *et seq.*) against Johnson Service Group ("Defendant"). This letter shall serve as notice, and a request pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, that the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") investigate the violations by Defendant described herein against Plaintiff and against other current and/or former employees ("Aggrieved Employees"). If LWDA does not intend to investigate the violations described herein, we respectfully request that the agency specifically notify our office of the same at your earliest possible opportunity

Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. Defendant is therefore subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business and Professions Code.

Plaintiff is a resident of San Diego County, California who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately January 01, 2025 to approximately February 28, 2025. Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than 40 hours in a workweek.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendant terminated Plaintiff's employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff, and failed to indemnify Plaintiff for expenditures. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Defendant Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and Overtime Wages

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. **"**Hours worked**"** is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Labor Code sections 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during unpaid meal periods and after clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendant also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant used a system of time rounding and/or synthetic timekeeping that resulted, over a period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendant operations are such that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Accordingly, Defendant frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time. Some of this unpaid work also should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 210, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (t)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (*i.e.*, more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted.

Instead, Defendant continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

<u>Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month</u>

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code section 204.

Labor Code section 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wage for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code section 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d). Under Labor Code section 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code section 1174 is subject to a penalty under section 1174.5. Pursuant to IWC Wage Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended—i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged—and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail, to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or 72 hours of their leaving Defendant's employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced, but that the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up 30 days, pursuant to Labor Code section 203. Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226, subd. (e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides that "[a]n employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." (Lab. Code § 226, subd. (e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant or failed to furnish Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Defendant violated Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant's failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars ($4,000) per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that employers shall indemnify employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of their duties. Throughout the statutory period applicable to this cause of action, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, work-related equipment, work attire, and use of personal cellular phones. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, but Defendant or failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code sections 2802 and 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Statement of Specific Provisions of the Labor Code Violated

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

(1) Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;

(2) Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;

(3) Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;

(4) Labor Code section 204 by failing to pay all earned wages twice per month;

(5) Labor Code section 1174.5 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;

(6) Labor Code section 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;

(7) Labor Code section 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

(8) Labor Code section 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties arising from these violations. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, l 174.5, 1197.l, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

This letter shall serve as Plaintiff's notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 and we ask that LWDA conduct an investigation concerning the violations described herein. Alternatively, if LWDA does not intend to investigate these violations, we ask that it issue a notification letter to our office confirming the same so that we may proceed with our civil action asserting the PAGA claims described herein.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or if you would like to discuss this matter further. Nothing in this letter is intended to be, or should be construed as, an admission against the interests of Plaintiff or other current or former employees of Defendant and shall not be construed as a waiver of their rights, remedies, claims, or defenses, all of which are expressly reserved.

Sincerely,

Camron Dowlatshahi