

December 2, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Boreal Ridge Corporation
CSC- Lawyers Incorporating Service, Agent for Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7029 65

Boreal Ridge Corporation
1526 Ute Blvd., Suite 101
Park City, UT 84098
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7029 72

Boreal Ridge Ski Resort
19749 Boreal Ridge Rd.
Soda Springs, CA 95728
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7026 68

Boreal Mountain Resort
19749 Boreal Ridge Rd.
Soda Springs, CA 95728
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7026 20

Powdr. Corp.
CSC- Lawyers Incorporating Service, Agent for Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7026 37

Powdr Corp.
1794 Olympic Pkwy, Suite 201
Park City, UT 84098
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5843 7021 56

LWDA No. 1093619-25



**Re: Labor Code § 2699 Penalties-PAGA Notice Letter to LWDA
*Young v. Boreal Ridge Corporation, et al.***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiffs Kristyna Young and Michael Delarm (“Plaintiffs”) and other similarly situated aggrieved non-exempt employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245, *et seq.*, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* (“the Act”) and to supplement and amend Plaintiff Kristyna Young’s original PAGA Notice to the LWDA, submitted on April 21, 2025 (LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-1093619-25). Plaintiff Young concurrently filed a class action complaint in Placer County Superior Court alleging various wage and hour violations committed by Defendants Boreal Ridge Corporation; Boreal Ridge Ski Resort; Boreal Mountain Resort; and Powdr Corp. Plaintiff Kristyna Young would now like to add Plaintiff Michael Delarm to her original PAGA Notice and operative complaint so they may continue to pursue the representative action, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendants Boreal Ridge Corporation; Boreal Ridge Ski Resort; Boreal Mountain Resort; and Powdr Corp.; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act. We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. Plaintiffs will seek leave of the Court to file a Second Amended Complaint that incorporates the allegations and claims in this Amended Notice Letter.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as a non-exempt, hourly employee based out of Defendants’ location in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees.” Aggrieved Employees consistently worked at Defendants’ behest and under their control and subject to their policies and practices without being paid all wages due. Plaintiffs are also informed and believe that there are other Aggrieved Employees employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below.



Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. Aggrieved Employees were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular, and overtime rates. Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for all time that they worked off-the-clock without compensation by picking up other employees pre-shift, reviewing communications and other event information from managers or third parties pre-shift and by breaking down tables, tents, audio equipment, and otherwise cleaning up after events post-shift, dropping other employees off post-shift, ordering supplies and cleaning post-shift, and receiving and responding to work-related calls and text messages while off-the-clock. The uncompensated time also included the time Aggrieved Employees worked off-the-clock during meal periods. Thus, Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours, under the control of Defendants, without wages.

By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures, and protocols which resulted in off the clock work, Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages and overtime pay to Aggrieved Employees. For example, the off the clock work addressed above caused Aggrieved Employees to begin receiving overtime pay later than they should have.

As a result of the above-described requirements to work off the clock, understatement of hours, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants' hands, Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees to overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of denying Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees proper meal periods. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to keep their radios on during meal periods, resulting in on-duty and interrupted meal periods. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were also required to work through their meal periods. Also, what meal periods that Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees did take, were provided after working well beyond five hours, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Similarly, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours a day, without ever receiving a second meal compliant period, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees with paid, uninterrupted and duty-free rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants had a policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep radios on during rest breaks, which resulted in on duty and interrupted meal periods.



Defendants failed to pay all vested and accrued vacation time to former Aggrieved Employees upon their termination. Defendants also failed to satisfy the sick pay accrual requirements under California Labor Code § 246(b)(2)-(4). Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and Employees 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or no less than 40 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 200th calendar day of employment.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures incurred in execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants including, the cost of snowboarding gear, such as a snowboard, boots, bindings, and waterproof apparel and its maintenance; personal cell phone usage; personal vehicle mileage; work from home expenses including personal computer usage and home internet; and tools including power tools, which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ and which was used throughout the course of Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees' duties under Defendants' employ.

Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks, and total hours worked as discussed above. As a result, Aggrieved Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees.

Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages owed, as detailed above, at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required under Labor Code § 203. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not paid all regular and overtime wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, including required off the clock work, to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be



paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders 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 suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “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 attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Defendants thus failed to pay Employees minimum wages they were owed, including by their consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for all hours worked. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time that they worked off-the-clock by picking up other employees pre-shift, by reviewing communications and other event information from managers or third parties pre-shift and by breaking down tables, tents, audio equipment, and otherwise cleaning up after events post-shift, dropping off other employees post-shift, ordering supplies and cleaning post-shift, and receiving and responding to work-related calls and text messages while off-the-clock. Employees also worked off-the-clock during meal periods without compensation. Defendants thus regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and Class members. Thus, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours without wages. Additionally, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees at the applicable



minimum wage for all hours worked. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Aggrieved Employees.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week. However, Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Upon information and belief, the uncompensated time, discussed above including the time worked off-the-clock by picking up other employees pre-shift; reviewing communications and other event information from managers or third parties pre-shift and by breaking down tables, tents, audio equipment, and otherwise cleaning up after events post-shift; dropping off other employees post-shift; ordering supplies and cleaning post-shift, receiving and responding to work-related calls and text messages while off-the-clock; and working while clocked out for meal periods caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages, which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Defendants failed to compensate for all hours worked and at the applicable hourly rates for regular rate and overtime.



Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above. With work shifts requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours or twelve hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Failure to Pay Vacation Wages

Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3, whenever a contract of employment or employment policy provides for paid vacation and an employee is terminated without having taken off her vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to her as wages at her final rate in accordance with said contract of employment or policy respecting eligibility or time served. Defendants failed to pay former Aggrieved Employees all vested vacation time upon their termination. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3. Plaintiffs accordingly seek this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code § 227.3 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and



statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Failure to Comply with Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246

California Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* requires that Defendants provide paid sick time to Aggrieved Employees, including at the amount, terms, and rate of compensation set forth in said law. At times relevant, Defendants have failed to compute the amount due for paid sick time in conformance with the pay calculation under California Labor Code § 246(l). Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and Employees 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or no less than 40 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 200th calendar day of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 245, *et seq.* and 246. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiffs accordingly seek this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.*, 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Defendants had a policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work through their meal periods and to keep their radios on during meal periods resulting in on-duty and interrupted meal periods.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,



558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

///

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid and uninterrupted rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Additionally, Defendants had a policy and practice requiring Aggrieved Employees to keep their radios on during rest breaks, resulting in on-duty and interrupted rest breaks.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants, including the cost of snowboarding gear, such as a snowboard, boots, bindings, and waterproof apparel and its maintenance; personal cell phone usage; work from home expenses including, personal computer usage and home internet; and tools, including power tools, which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ which was used throughout the course of Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees' duties under Defendants' employ in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work-related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California



Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

///

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees, by Defendants, failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks. Therefore, Aggrieved Employees' wage statements did not include: the total hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and failed to accurately set forth all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each such rate in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees.

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are 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) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage



Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during on-duty meal periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code §§ 204 and 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Aggrieved Employees were not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours they worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that they were not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, off the clock work, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties



available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

///

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, etc., all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).



Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiffs' PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period, Plaintiffs will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245, *et seq.*, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802, including as follows:

(a) **Wage Claims:** For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(b) **Meal and Rest Period Claims:** For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(c) **Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records:** For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant



to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to “a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...”;

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(e) Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days: For Defendants’ failure to provide Employees with all their required and earned sick days in violation of Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(f) Failure to Pay Vacation Wages: For Defendants’ failure to provide Employees with all their vacation days in violation of Labor Code § 227.3 and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(g) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants’ failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1);

(h) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5 and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(k)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of the Complaint without the PAGA claim. This letter therefore provides the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiffs allege have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Boreal Ridge Corporation; Boreal Ridge Ski Resort; Boreal Mountain Resort; Powdr Corp; and



any other named Defendants. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

Roman Shkodnik

Cc: Above listed Boreal Ridge Corporation, Boreal Ridge Ski Resort, Boreal Mountain Resort, and Powdr Corp. by Certified Mail