



Glenn A. Danas, Esq.
Partner

Clarkson Law Firm P.C.
22525 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, CA 90265
Tel: (213) 788-4050
Direct: (213) 786-1071
Fax: (213) 788-4070
gdanas@clarksonlawfirm.com

April 10, 2025

VIA ONLINE ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102
SUBMITTED ONLINE

**Re: Notice Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3 re Monat Global Corp.;
Luis Urdaneta; Rayner Urdaneta; Lu Urdaneta; Javier Urdaneta; Marjorie
Munoz; Melissa Nunez; Carla Hernandez**

Pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*, Ms. Rachel Kreifels provides this notice on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees in the State of California to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Monat Global Corp. and including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, and employees, including but not limited to, Luis Urdaneta, Rayner Urdaneta, Lu Urdaneta, Javier Urdaneta, Marjorie Munoz, Melissa Nunez, and Carla Hernandez (collectively, “**Monat**”) of Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order violations committed by Monat and personally experienced by Rachel Kreifels. Please allow this letter to serve as a notice and a request pursuant to § 2699.3 of the California Labor Code that your agency investigate the claims described below. If the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, we ask that you please notify us of that fact. If your agency decides not to investigate the below-described claims, Ms. Kreifels intends to pursue civil penalties and injunctive relief through a court action and/or in arbitration, on behalf of herself and the other aggrieved employees against whom Labor Code and Wage Order violations were committed by Monat.

Introduction

Monat is headquartered in Doral, Florida. Monat develops and sells hair and beauty products online. Pursuant to Monat’s business model, it establishes explicit relationships with various individuals known as “Market Partners” who market and sell Monat products for Monat, establishing and managing a broad range of employment policies and procedures for these “Market Partners.” Despite calling these salespeople “Market Partners” but designating them independent contractors, these “Market Partners” are in fact employees under California law. Monat has violated numerous provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by denying its “Market Partners” the compensation, other benefits and statutory entitlements that they are owed.

One of the many individuals whom Monat employs as a “Market Partner” is Ms. Kreifels. Ms. Kreifels worked for Monat as a “Market Partner” from approximately January 2023 to present, in California. During that entire time, Ms. Kreifels was under Monat’s control, selling and marketing Monat products online in accordance with strict guidelines.

Unless the agency decides to investigate and issue citations for Monat’s numerous Labor Code and Wage Order violations, Ms. Kreifels intends to bring a representative action in court and/or in arbitration seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code that are recoverable under PAGA on behalf of the State of California and all other aggrieved employees. The aggrieved employees on whose behalf Ms. Kreifels will file a PAGA civil action include all current and former Monat “Market Partners” who sold Monat products and services in the State of California during the relevant statutory period, and any other individuals who are actually non-exempt employees of Monat under California law.

As set forth below, Monat has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 1194, 1997, 1997.1, 2802, and IWC Wage Orders, including inter alia, Wage Order No. 4, and Ms. Kreifels has personally experienced each of these violations.

Willful Misclassification of an Individual as an Independent Contractor

California law prohibits the willful misclassification of an individual as an independent contractor when he or she is in fact an employee under California law. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.8(a). “Willful misclassification” means avoiding employee status for an individual by voluntarily and knowingly misclassifying that individual as an independent contractor. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.8(i)(4). When an employer willfully misclassifies an individual as an independent contractor, the employer is subject to civil penalties. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.8(b)–(c). Monat willfully misclassified Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees as independent contractors, because it has been clear for several years now under California law that its “Market Partners” are in fact employees under Cal. Lab. Code § 2775, insofar as such “Market Partners” are under Monat’s control in performing their selling duties, the selling duties that “Market Partners” do is within the usual course of Monat’s business, and they are not engaged in an independently established trade, occupation or business. Even under a looser definition of “employee,” “Market Partners” would also be considered employees because Monat controls the manner and means through which Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees carry out their duties, including but not limited to restricting advertising, restricting what channels products may be sold through, and providing proprietary lists and direct customer leads.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Periods

California law requires employers to provide their employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a); Wage Order No. 4. A second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes must be provided before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a); Wage Order No. 4. Further, an employer must provide an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7; Wage Order No. 4. When an employer fails to provide a meal or rest period, an hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Monat failed to provide Ms. Kreifels or the other aggrieved employees with an opportunity to take timely, uninterrupted meal and rest periods of the requisite length, free from employer control. Monat also failed to compensate Ms. Kreifels and the other aggrieved employees properly for the non-compliant meal and rest periods including, inter alia, missed, short, late, and/or interrupted meal and rest periods. Monat also failed to pay premium wages for the many meals and rest breaks that Ms. Kreifels and the aggrieved employees were deprived of. Indeed, Monat did not provide any meal or rest breaks or premium compensation for missed breaks to Ms. Kreifels or other aggrieved employees, since Monat improperly classified its Market Partners as independent contractors who were not entitled to meal or rest breaks.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages and Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

Monat violated California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and Wage Order No. 4 by failing to pay Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked. Primarily, this was due to Monat having misclassified its Market Partners as independent contractors rather than as employees. Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees were required or knowingly permitted to perform all their work duties off-the-clock, including but not limited to training, communicating with Monat, and selling and marketing Monat products and services. By failing to pay Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees any wages for their time spent performing work duties for Monat, Monat violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and Wage Order No. 4, which require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees.

California Labor Code section 510 and Wage Order No. 4 require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek. During the relevant time period, Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees worked over 8 hours in a day and/or 40 hours in a week without overtime compensation because Monat failed to pay them for their work duties, as described above. This was, in turn, due to Monat's unlawful misclassification of "Market Partners" as independent contractors rather than as employees. On occasions when Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees had already worked eight hours in one day (performing all their work off-the-clock), Monat failed to pay them any overtime compensation due. Therefore, Ms. Kreifels and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive overtime compensation from Monat that Monat failed to pay, violating Labor Code § 510 and Wage Order No. 4.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor more than the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant period, Monat failed to pay Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, within any time period specified by California Labor Code section

204. Moreover, Monat failed to pay Ms. Kreifels or other aggrieved employees earned commissions in a timely and complete fashion.

Failure to Keep Accurate Payroll Records

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep at a central location in the state or at the establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant period, Monat failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the actual hours worked daily and the wages paid to Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code section 226(a) and Wage Order No. 4 require an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, inter alia, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. Monat failed to provide *any* wage statements to Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees, despite being required to do so. Accordingly, Monat is subject to civil penalties under Labor Code section 226.3.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses

Labor Code section 2802 and Wage Order No. 4 require employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary business expenses that they incur in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During the relevant period, Ms. Kreifels and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Monat. These costs include, but are not limited to, the use of personal cell phones and computers, Wi-Fi and internet connections, purchasing ads on social media, premium memberships for access to any sites that “Market Partners” were required to use to market and sell Monat services and products, home office equipment, ring lights other equipment for making content videos, among other expenses. Indeed, Ms. Kreifels and the other aggrieved employees absorbed all the costs associated with marketing and selling Monat’s products and services at their own expense and without reimbursement by Monat. Ms. Kreifels and the aggrieved employees are entitled to reimbursement for all such expenses.

* * *

Monat has violated, caused to be violated, or is currently violating, numerous provisions of the California Labor Code, as described above. Ms. Kreifels respectfully requests that the agency investigate the above allegations, and, in any event, provide notice regarding its intent to investigate pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3. If the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, Ms. Kreifels respectfully requests a letter confirming the same so that we may bring a civil action for civil penalties and injunctive relief under PAGA against Monat for the

April 10, 2025

Page 5 of 5

violations described in this letter. Please know that we intend to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under Labor Code § 2699 should your office decline to investigate, or investigate but decline to issue citations, within the time frames set out in Labor Code § 2699.3. Should you require anything further or have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

CLARKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.



Glenn A. Danas, Esq.

Via Certified Mail

Monat Global Corp.
c/o CT Corporation
1201 Hays Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Monat Global Corp.
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Rayner Urdaneta
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Luis Urdaneta
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Lu Urdaneta
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Javier Urdaneta
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Marjorie Munoz
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Melissa Nunez
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172

Carla Hernandez
10000 NW 15 Terrace
Doral, FL 33172