Los Angeles Office
9440 Santa Monica Blvd.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
kiara@crosnerlegal.com
direct: (424) 335-5236
office: (866) 276-7637
fax: (310) 510-6429

April 25, 2025

VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY:
California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL:

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent for Service of Process for:
Willis Towers Watson US LLC and Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc.
Attn: CA Registered Agent Authorized Employees: Becky DeGeorge, Koy Saechao, Nicole Stauss, Jenn Bautista, Wendy Harris, Melissa Dekoven, Carolyn Valle, Kaci Ransom, Annette Kuhlman, Brejet Stephens, Jerome Suarez, Samantha Wiltz, Parid Kurbini, Crystal Collins, Maddie Bright, Courtney Shelton, and Brittany Titlow
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive #150-N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Willis Towers Watson US LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
800 North Glebe Road
Arlington, VA 22203

Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
525 Market Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94105

C T Corporation System
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kelly Services USA, LLC and Kelly Services, Inc.
Attn: CA Registered Agent Authorized Employees:
Amanda Garcia, Gabriela Sanchez, Daisy Montenegro, Beatrice Casarez-Barrientez, Jessie Gastelum, John Montijo, Diana Ruiz, Sarai Marin, Emanuel Jacobo, Gladys Aguilera, Vivian Imperial, Carlos Paz, Alberto Damonte, Peter Cayetano, Elsa Montanez, Xenia Perez, Yesenia Carpenter, and Jaqueline Mejia
330 N Brand Blvd #700
Glendale, CA 91203

Kelly Services USA, LLC and Kelly Services, Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
999 W. Big Beaver Rd. Ste. 601A
Troy, MI 48084

NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM

To:	California Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Willis Towers Watson US LLC; Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc.; Kelly Services USA, LLC; and Kelly Services, Inc.
Date:	April 25, 2025
Subject:	*Jody Hernandez v. Willis Towers Watson US LLC, et al.*

Introduction

This office represents PLAINTIFF, Jody Hernandez (hereinafter "PLAINTIFF") in connection with PLAINTIFF's claims under the California Labor Code. PLAINTIFF was, at all relevant times herein mentioned, an employee of the following entities and individual managing agents of said entities: Willis Towers Watson US LLC; Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc.; Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. (hereinafter, these entities and their managing agents are collectively referred to as "DEFENDANTS"). DEFENDANTS may be contacted directly at the addresses listed above.

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed directly and/or via a staffing agency by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice ("NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") and on behalf of all current and former exempt employees employed directly and/or via a staffing agency by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice ("EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES"), hereby gives written notice ("NOTICE") of PLAINTIFF's claims against DEFENDANTS.

Said "NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES" include the following:

(1) all non-exempt workers who were directly employed by Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. regardless of where those non-exempt workers were assigned or staffed to work – in California at any time within one year of the date of this NOTICE;
(2) all non-exempt workers who were assigned/staffed to work at Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. by Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. and/or any other staffing/temporary service agencies at any location in California at any time within one year of the date of this NOTICE; and
(3) all non-exempt workers who were directly employed by Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. to work at any location in California within one year of the date of this NOTICE.

Said "EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES" include the following:

(1) all exempt workers who were directly employed by Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. regardless of where those exempt workers were assigned or staffed to work – in California at any time within one year of the date of this NOTICE;
(2) all exempt workers who were assigned/staffed to work at Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. by Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. and/or any other staffing/temporary service agencies at any location in California at any time within one year of the date of this NOTICE; and
(3) all exempt workers who were directly employed by Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. to work at any location in California within one year of the date of this NOTICE ("EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES"),

This NOTICE is being provided via online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and DEFENDANTS via certified mail to their Agent(s) for Service of Process and/or entity mailing address as provided to the California Secretary of State and/or the address of the Secretary of State of the State of incorporation and/or the entity address as provided on wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

This NOTICE also serves to demonstrate PLAINTIFF's reasonable attempt at settlement with DEFENDANTS. If DEFENDANTS are interested in settling this matter before a lawsuit is filed, DEFENDANTS may contact Crosner Legal, P.C., at the address listed at the close of this NOTICE. This settlement attempt is in compliance with relevant California law. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

This NOTICE is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5. This NOTICE further reserves any and all rights by PLAINTIFF to amend this notice to include, amend, or add further charges upon discovery of new violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code. In addition, to the extent that entities and/or other individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code sections including, but not limited to sections 558.1 and 1197.1—PLAINTIFF reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue. Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this NOTICE. Consequently, DEFENDANTS are on notice that PLAINTIFF continues its investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of *any* of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein. For violations that are curable under § 2699.3(c) and that DEFENDANTS intend to cure within the statutory time period set forth in §§ 2699 and 2699.3(c), the DEFENDANTS shall provide notice including a description of the actions taken to cure. If the alleged violation is not cured within the statutory time period, PLAINTIFF will commence a civil action pursuant to section 2699. For all other violations that are not curable, an action pursuant to section 2699(a) and 2699(f) will commence after the requirements under 2699.3 are fulfilled.

Based on the following summary of facts and theories upon which PLAINTIFF will base PLAINTIFF's claims, PLAINTIFF requests that the LWDA regard this NOTICE as written notice of PLAINTIFF's intent to seek civil penalties against DEFENDANTS.

PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, alleges that the specific provisions of California law that DEFENDANTS have violated, requiring this NOTICE, include but are not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 210, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 2802, and all applicable Wage Orders.

The Named Entities Are Joint Employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES

California courts have recognized that the definition of "employer" for purposes of enforcement of the California Labor Code goes beyond the concept of traditional employment to reach irregular working arrangements for the purpose of preventing evasion and subterfuge of California's labor laws. *Martinez v. Combs* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35, 65. As such, anyone who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, engages, suffers, or permits any person to work or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person, may be liable for violations of the California Labor Code as to that person.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS and unknown entities operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized human resources as set forth herein. Under California law, in determining whether two defendant entities are liable as an integrated enterprise, courts consider four factors: (1) centralized control of labor relations; (2) interrelation of operations; (3) common management; and (4) common ownership or financial control. *Laird v. Capital Cities/Abc, Inc.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 727, 737 (overruled on other grounds, *Reid v. Google, Inc.* (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 512 (2010).)

PLAINTIFF believes and hereon asserts that DEFENDANTS and unknown entities must be classified as joint employers of PLAINTIFF for purposes of liability for civil penalties under PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered and permitted PLAINTIFF to perform services from which they benefited, and furthermore that the aforementioned entities had the right to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF at all relevant times herein, so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

During PLAINTIFF's employment by DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were jointly employed by DEFENDANTS for purposes of the Wage Orders, under the alternative definitions of "to employ" adopted by the California Supreme Court in Martinez, supra. As discussed below, these DEFENDANTS (1) exercised control over wages, hours and working conditions of PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (2) suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work for them; and (3) engaged

PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work for them.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized human resources. As a result, DEFENDANTS utilized the same unlawful policies and practices across all of their locations/facilities and subjected all of the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to these same policies and practices regardless of the location(s) where they worked. Among other things, PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that: (1) there is common ownership in, and financial control, in DEFENDANTS' companies, (2) DEFENDANTS utilize common management, who have control over the day-to-day operations and employment matters, including the power to hire and fire, set schedules, issue employee policies, and determine rates of compensation across its locations in California; (3) DEFENDANTS utilize the same policies and procedures for all California employees, including issuing the same employee handbooks and other form agreements; (4) DEFENDANTS use at least some of the same Human Resources personnel and attorneys to oversee employment matters; and, (6) DEFENDANTS share employees.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all relevant times, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES upon whose behalf PLAINTIFF brings these allegations and causes of action, in that DEFENDANTS, exercised sufficient control over PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' wages, hours and working conditions, and/or suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANTS created a uniform set of policies, practices and/or procedures concerning, inter alia, hourly and overtime pay, time-keeping practices, meal and rest periods, reimbursement of business expenses and other working conditions that were distributed to, and/or applied to PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and further that DEFENDANTS uniformly compensated and controlled the wages of PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in a uniform manner. DEFENDANTS collectively represented to PLAINTIFF and the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that each was an "at-will" employee of DEFENDANTS, and that DEFENDANTS collectively retained the right to terminate PLAINTIFF's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' employment with or without cause. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS further collectively represented to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in writing the details of their compensation, and the manner in which they were to take meal and rest periods, the procedures required by DEFENDANTS collectively for recordation of hours worked and the policies applicable to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by which DEFENDANTS collectively would evaluate the wage rates of

PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, Kelly Services USA, LLC and/or Kelly Services, Inc. ("Kelly Services") hired PLAINTIFF and entered into a written employment agreement with PLAINTIFF. During PLAINTIFF's employment, Kelly Services maintained control over many aspects of PLAINTIFF's employment, including, among other things, having the authority to discipline PLAINTIFF, change PLAINTIFF's job assignment, change PLAINTIFF's work hours, change PLAINTIFF's rates of pay, and to terminate PLAINTIFF's employment.

In addition, when PLAINTIFF was first hired, Kelly Services provided PLAINTIFF with orientation and training materials. Kelly Services issued PLAINTIFF written policies concerning meal periods, rest breaks, timekeeping, hours worked, and payment of PLAINTIFF's wages, with which PLAINTIFF was required to comply. Based on information and belief, among other things, these policies provided that PLAINTIFF's weekly time records be submitted to Kelly Services, and Kelly Services was supposed to process PLAINTIFF's time records and pay PLAINTIFF for all hours worked. Kelly Services exercised ultimate control over the payment of PLAINTIFF's wages, as Kelly Services issued PLAINTIFF his paychecks. Finally, Kelly Services directed PLAINTIFF to comply with Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. 's policies and directions. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that Kelly Services exercised the same control over, applied the same policies and practices, and engaged in the same acts and omissions with regard to the other class members.

Willis Towers Watson US LLC and/or Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc. (referred to herein as "WTW") similarly suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF to work for them or engaged PLAINTIFF to work for them. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that WTW entered into a written agreement with Kelly Services, pursuant to which WTW paid Kelly Services to provide it with workers, including PLAINTIFF, to conduct WTW business operations – namely, to work in WTW 's warehousing facilities. WTW suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF to work at WTW and for the entirety of PLAINTIFF's employment.

WTW further exercised control over PLAINTIFF's wages, hours and working conditions. WTW also: (1) set PLAINTIFF's work hours and provided PLAINTIFF with PLAINTIFF's work schedule; (2) provided PLAINTIFF with policies regarding meal periods and rest breaks, with which PLAINTIFF was required to comply; (3) directly supervised PLAINTIFF's work through its employees; (4) assigned PLAINTIFF job duties and trained PLAINTIFF on said job duties; (5) exercised authority to reprimand and counsel PLAINTIFF regarding any work performance and other issues; (6) exercised authority to end PLAINTIFF's work assignment at any time, which essentially equated to a termination of employment as PLAINTIFF was not guaranteed any other job assignments; (7) required PLAINTIFF to use its timekeeping system for purposes of recording time worked; (8) determined whether and when PLAINTIFF would receive meal periods and rest breaks; (9) subjected PLAINTIFF to unlawful schedules for taking meal periods and rest breaks; and, (10) was responsible for recording when PLAINTIFF began and ended work shifts. On information and belief, WTW issued further written policies and practices and guidelines governing PLAINTIFF's working conditions with which PLAINTIFF was required to comply. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that WTW exercised the same control over, applied the same policies and practices, and engaged in the same acts and omissions with regard to the other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

By reason of their status as joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, they are each liable for civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders as to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1

Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. DEFENDANTS, at all relevant times, were an employer or person acting on behalf of employer(s) who violated PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code. The California Legislature defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as "*a natural person* who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer." The "managing agent" definition mirrors that found in California's punitive damages statute (subdivision (b) of section 3294 of the Civil Code). Under that statute and supporting case law, "managing agents" are all employees who exercise substantial independent authority and judgment in their corporate decision-making such that their decisions ultimately determine corporate policy. *White v. Ultramar, Inc.* (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 563, 566-67. For the reasons set forth above and others, at all relevant times, any above-listed individuals meet the criteria of managing agents under California law, and therefore, may be held liable under California Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, and/or 1194 as further described in detail below.

PLAINTIFF intends to further name any unknown individuals responsible for violations arising under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 after further discovery. PLAINTIFF will ask the Court to relate the amendment of the PAGA charge and the operative complaint to the date of filing of these charges. PLAINTIFF asks and demands that DEFENDANTS put these individuals on notice immediately to provide them as much notice possible to mount in defense. In the alternative, PLAINTIFF also offers to DEFENDANTS to place those individuals on notice if DEFENDANTS voluntarily provides their contact information.

DEFENDANTS are Liable for All Temporary Agency Workers

Labor Code section 2810.3 requires a client employer to share with a labor contractor all civil legal responsibility and civil liability for all workers supplied by that labor contractor in California for the payment of wages. Section 2810.3 prohibits a client employer from shifting to the labor contractor legal duties or liabilities under workplace safety provisions with respect to workers provided by the labor contractor. It defines a client employer as a business entity that obtains or is provided workers to perform labor within the usual course of business from a labor contractor. It defines a labor contractor as an individual or entity that supplies workers, either with or without a contract, to a client employer to perform labor within the client employer's usual course of business. Willis Towers Watson US LLC and Willis Towers Watson Insurance Services West, Inc., and each of them, qualify as a client employer under Labor Code section 2810.3 for purposes of liability.

General Information

DEFENDANTS own, operate, manage and/or staff its employees to work at the offices, remote offices, facilities and/or other location(s) in cities throughout California. DEFENDANTS, through its various locations, serve the including but not limited to, business support / administrative services and/or insurance broker industry. WTW specializes in the provision of insurance brokerage services and business/administrative support and consulting services, including in the areas of risk management, employee benefits, risk and reinsurance, human capital and benefits, and investment. WTW operates business under including but not limited to the following names: "WTW," "WTW Willis," "WTW Tower," "W.F. & Co. LTD.," "The Wyatt Company," "Watson Wyatt Worldwide," "Willis," "Willis Towers Watson," "TPE&C," "Towers Perrin," "Towers Watson," and/or "Willis Towers Watson plc." Kelly Services is a staffing agency. [1] Although DEFENDANTS may operate a successful business or have a noble mission, DEFENDANTS do not comply with California's labor laws.

PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of customer service representative and/or a similar job title/position from in or around September 2024 through in or around November 2024. PLAINTIFF regularly worked shifts lasting at least approximately eight (8) to nine (9) hours per day, at least five (5) days per week. DEFENDANTS assigned PLAINTIFF to work remotely from PLAINTIFF's home in San Diego, California. DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF an hourly rate for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked.

During the liability period, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF take late and shortened meal periods, work during owed rest periods, and complete pre-shift off-the-clock work. As a result of being denied meal and rest period premiums and all owed wages, PLAINTIFF was denied accurate and complete wage statements, in violation of Labor Code section 226. DEFENDANTS also failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF for all business expenses, including, for personal cell phone use and home internet and electricity expenses incurred because DEFENDANTS assigned PLAINTIFF to work remotely from home. Furthermore, PLAINTIFF was not provided with any final paycheck for at least approximately several days after PLAINTIFF's termination date.

Labor Code Violations

Meal Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must be provided before the end of the 10th hour of work. Ibid. Meal periods can be waived, but only under the following circumstances: (1) if an employee's

[1] *See* https://www.wtwco.com/en-us and https://www.kellyservices.com/about-kelly/; Last visited on April 25, 2025.

total work period in a day is over five (5) hours but no more than six (6) hours, the required meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, and (2) if an employee's total work period in a day is over ten (10) hours but no more than twelve (12) hours, the required second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived. Ibid. Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF did not sign a valid meal period waiver throughout PLAINTIFF's employment by DEFENDANTS.

Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above), and (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is presumed that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3) ("Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded"); Brinker, supra, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1052-1053, citing section 7(A)(3) ("If an employer's records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was provided").

Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees' regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided"); Brinker, supra, 53 Cal.4th 1004.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of more than five (5) hours, entitling them to at least one meal period.

At times, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not receive legally compliant thirty (30) minute first meal breaks.

For example, at times, PLAINTIFF was required to take shortened meal periods (i.e. take a meal period of less than thirty (30) minutes) due to the need to complete assigned job duties.

PLAINTIFF was also required to take late meal periods (i.e. on or after the end of the fifth hour of work) due to the need to complete assigned job duties.

PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their unlawful policies and practices resulted in the denial of lawful meal periods owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay, commissions, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[2] DEFENDANTS' failure to provide valid meal periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

Rest Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a paid, duty-free ten (10) minute rest period for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(A). In *Brinker v Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court,* 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012), the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided").

Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. Id. at 268 (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). Id.; see also, *Bufil v. Dollar Fin. Grp.*, Inc., (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

[2] See Lab. Code §2699(f); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

DEFENDANTS did not properly authorize and provide PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the middle of the work period, as required by law.

For example, at times, PLAINTIFF was required to take shortened and/or interrupted rest periods due to the need to complete assigned job duties, resulting in denied rest periods.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in which NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period in violation of California law. *Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of pay for each workday a proper rest period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each workday a lawful rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, commission pay, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating the owed rest period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[3]

Minimum Wage Violations: "Notwithstanding 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 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit." Labor Code section 1194.

Labor Code section 1197 states the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the Commission, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Pursuant to section 4 of the applicable Wage Order, "Every employer shall pay to each employee …. not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period…" The applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is

[3] See Lab. Code §2699(f) and All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." *See* §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. An employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324. Furthermore, "in any action under Section 98, 1193.6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon…" *Cal. Lab. Code* § 1194.2.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for all hours worked due to DEFENDANTS' mandated off-the-clock work policies and/or practices.

For example, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to complete pre-shift off-the-clock work resulting in the underpayment of wages owed.

For example, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not compensated for all time spent booting up and logging into DEFENDANTS' computer/electronic timekeeping system and/or completing DEFENDANTS authentication/security processes, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work and the underpayment of minimum wages and overtime wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

To this end, prior to being able to clock in for the start of PLAINTIFF's scheduled shift each workday, PLAINTIFF was required to start and/or boot DEFENDANTS' computer systems and/or software and complete a multi-step authentication process to log in so as to have the system running at the start of the scheduled shift. As such, PLAINTIFF spent at least approximately one (1) to five (5) minutes before each scheduled shift booting up/logging into work application(s)/DEFENDANTS' electronic system and undergoing DEFENDANTS' authentication/verification process in order to clock in and begin PLAINTIFF's shift. This pre-shift work was off-the-clock and uncompensated resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages.

PLAINTIFF was required to complete additional work tasks off-the-clock outside of PLAINTIFF's scheduled shift times for which PLAINTIFF was not compensated. For example, PLAINTIFF was required to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to work-related phone calls and/or messages PLAINTIFF was required to respond to, including, communications from supervisors regarding scheduling, timekeeping and/or other work tasks, resulting in off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their off-the-clock work policies and practices resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's minimum wage laws.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 1197.1 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[4]

<u>Overtime Violations</u>: California law requires employers to pay overtime equal to one and one-half times the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond eight (8) hours per workday and each hour worked beyond forty (40) hours per work week. Lab. Code §510; IWC Wage Order All applicable IWC Wage Orders §3. Employers must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid*.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated California's overtime laws by, among other things, failing to correctly calculate, or record, the total number of hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and not paying proper overtime rates for overtime worked by virtue of same.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay a premium wage rate for all hours worked beyond eight (8) hours in a day or beyond forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, non-discretionary shift differential pay, bonus pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

This conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 218.5, 510, 558, 558.1, 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 218.5, and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[5]

---

[4] See Lab. Code §1197.1(a) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "<u>[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law</u>, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

[5] See Lab. Code §2699(f); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "<u>[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law</u>, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Wage Statement Violations: California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains the following: (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; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only 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. Cal. Lab. Code. section 226(a).

As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed and continue to fail to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b) the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

DEFENDANTS' issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES (by virtue of DEFENDANTS' off-the-clock work policies and practices described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a).

Failure to list all hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.,* (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements caused confusion to PLAINTIFF and caused and continue to cause confusion to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES over whether they received all wages owed to them. PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were injured by DEFENDANTS' failure to provide accurate wage statements.

In addition, because of the violations detailed above, including but not limited to, not paying regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, and failing to provide meal and rest break premiums, DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate, itemized wage statements. As described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 226. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[6]

Business Expense Violations: California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to the directions of the employer. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2802(a) and all applicable Wage Orders, § 9 (b). Furthermore, "for purposes of [section 2802], the term 'necessary expenditure or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section."

Among other things, under California law, when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, § 9 (b). Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use. *Id.* 1144-1145

Further, "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under the laws of this State." *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2804.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business onto NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by requiring them to pay for their business expenses including the use of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' personal cell phones/mobile devices for work-related purposes and business expenses associated with remote work, including, increased utility/electricity and home internet expenses.

For example, at times, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to use PLAINTIFF's personal cell phone / personal device to carry out PLAINTIFF's assigned job duties, including, to complete DEFENDANTS' authentication process/login to DEFENDANTS' electronic system each day, however, DEFENDANTS did not provide PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for the personal cellphone-related business expenses PLAINTIFF incurred.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS contacted PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their personal cell phones/devices to discuss work without reimbursing PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for any

---

[6] See Lab. Code §226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is "per employee per violation").

cell-phone-related expenses.

Also, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work remotely, including, from their homes. As a result of working from home, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to use their home internet, electricity, and other utilities in the discharge of their job duties. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS lacked and continue to lack a policy to reimburse employees who regularly increased utility expenses as a result of working from home. PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' increased utility and internet expenses were expenses for which DEFENDANTS were required to reimburse PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES a reasonable percentage based on their required business use because said expenses were necessarily incurred by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as a direct consequence of the discharge of their duties of employment. However, DEFENDANTS failed to reimburse PLAINTIFF, other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for any electricity and internet expenses, in violation of California law.

For example, DEFENDANTS assigned PLAINTIFF to work on a remote basis, from PLAINTIFF's home. PLAINTIFF necessarily incurred business expenses as a result of being required to carry out PLAINTIFF's assigned job duties from PLAINTIFF's home, including, increased internet and electricity expenses. However, DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for PLAINTIFF's home internet expenses and electricity/utility expenses incurred as a result of being required to perform PLAINTIFF's job duties remotely from PLAINTIFF's home.

As described herein, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their job duties. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

Final Pay Violations: Labor Code section 201 requires employers to pay all wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." California Labor Code section 202(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits 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 his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting." Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid. This 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code Section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also, *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages that were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS untimely provide final wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES without regard to the timing requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

Upon separation of employment, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' final paychecks were not timely provided, were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off and/or did not include all wages owed as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

For example, DEFENDANTS did not furnish PLAINTIFF with any final paycheck for at least approximately several days after PLAINTIFF's termination date, and PLAINTIFF's late final paycheck was devoid of all wages owed as it was devoid of all wages owed, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or 256. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[7]

Conclusion

DEFENDANTS have violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, the applicable IWC Wage Order, including but not limited to all applicable Wage Orders, as well as other laws, and is liable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. The civil penalties PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES seek to recover include, but are not limited to, the statutory and civil penalties specified above.

Labor Code § 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter (i.e. this NOTICE) to the employer in question and file an online claim to the LWDA setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the LWDA an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this NOTICE is to satisfy the requirements created by Labor Code §§ 2699, 2699.3(a), 2699.3(b), 2699.3(c), and 2699.5, prior to seeking penalties and premium wages allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations in a civil action. We look forward to determining whether the LWDA intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly ask that you respond to this NOTICE according to the time frame contemplated by the code.

If the LWDA elects not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, PLAINTIFF will seek these penalties in a civil action, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of DEFENDANTS within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

Please advise if your office intends to investigate any of the factual and legal allegations and provide notice within sixty-five days of the date of this NOTICE to our office and to that of other charged parties. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
Crosner Legal, PC
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Main: 866.276.7637
Fax: 310.510.6429
Email: kiara@crosnerlegal.com

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,

Kiara Bramasco

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
CROSNER LEGAL, PC