

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California  
County of Sacramento

07/16/2024

By: A. Turner Deputy

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)  
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)  
**JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION**  
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101  
Pasadena, California 91103  
Telephone: (818) 230-7502  
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

PARKSON YEE, RICHARD DALEY, and  
HILLEL TRAN, individually, and on behalf  
of aggrieved employees pursuant to the  
Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”);

Plaintiff,

v.

REPAIRSMITH, INC.; a Delaware  
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,  
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2022-00331092-CU-OE-GDS

Assigned for All Purposes to:  
Honorable Jill H. Talley  
Department 23

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Complaint Filed: December 7, 2022  
FAC Filed: January 23, 2023  
Trial Date: None set

1 Plaintiffs PARKSON YEE, RICHARD DALEY, and HILLEL TRAN (collectively,  
2 “Plaintiffs”) hereby submit their Complaint against Defendant REPAIRSMITH, INC., and  
3 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive; (collectively, “Defendants”), on behalf of themselves and  
4 other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants for penalties as follows:

### 5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This representative action brought pursuant to Labor Code section 2698  
7 *et seq.* (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)) for Defendants’ violations of  
8 Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, 203, 204, 205.5, 210, 218.5,  
9 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 432.6, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194,  
10 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

11 2. This Complaint challenges Defendants’ systemic illegal employment  
12 practices resulting in violations of the stated provisions of the Labor Code against the  
13 identified group of employees.

14 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants  
15 jointly and severally acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious  
16 disregard to the rights of all employees in (a) failing to pay all meal period wages and rest  
17 break wages, (b) failing to properly calculate and pay all minimum and overtime wages, (c)  
18 failing to provide accurate wage statements, (d) failing to pay all wages due and owing during  
19 employment and upon termination of employment, and (e) failing to reimburse all necessary  
20 business expenses.

### 21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 4. This action is brought pursuant to PAGA. The civil penalties sought by  
23 Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established  
24 according to proof at trial.

25 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California  
26 Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all  
27 causes except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is  
28 brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of PAGA and Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, 203, 204, 205.5, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 432.6, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800, and 2802.

7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the named Defendants transact business and/or have offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county. Moreover, this action is brought on behalf of the State of California as a private attorney general and has jurisdiction in this venue.

## PARTIES

9. Plaintiff PARKSON YEE is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

10. Plaintiff RICHARD DALEY is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Sacramento.

11. Plaintiff HILLEL TRAN is an individual residing in the State of California, County of Santa Clara.

12. Defendant REPAIRSMITH, INC., at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation, headquartered in the State of California, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Sacramento.

13. At all relevant times, Defendant REPAIRSMITH, INC. was the “employer” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable laws and statutes.

14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendants are licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California, including the County of Sacramento.

1           15. Plaintiffs does not know the true names or capacities, whether  
2 individual, partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,  
3 and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiffs pray  
4 for leave to amend the complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiffs are  
5 informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was  
6 responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiffs and  
7 other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment  
8 practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

9           16. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were  
10 agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest,  
11 co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting  
12 within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers,  
13 representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and that all acts  
14 or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission,  
15 encouragement, authorization and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

16           17. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to  
17 Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to PAGA and Labor Code section  
18 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, 203, 204, 205.5, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3,  
19 226.7, 246, 432.5, 432.6, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,  
20 1199, 2800, and 2802.

21                                   **CAUSE OF ACTION**

22                                   **VIOLATION OF PAGA**

23                                   **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF)**

24           18. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 17  
25 as though fully set forth herein.

26   ///

27   ///

28   ///

1           19.     PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the Labor Code which  
2 provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the California Labor and Workforce  
3 Development Agency (“LWDA”), or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,  
4 agencies, or employees for a violation of the Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil  
5 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or  
6 former employees.

7           20.     On September 8, 2022, Plaintiff Parkson Yee provided written notice to  
8 the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were  
9 violated, and the theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and  
10 incorporated by reference is a copy of the September 8, 2022, written notice to the LWDA.  
11 Plaintiffs believe that on or about November 14, 2022, the sixty-five (65) day notice period for  
12 Plaintiff Parkson Yee’s written notice expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take  
13 any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Plaintiffs exhausted the statutory time period  
14 to bring this action.

15           21.     On September 26, 2022, Plaintiff Richard Daley provided written notice  
16 to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were  
17 violated, and the theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** and  
18 incorporated by reference is a copy of the September 26, 2022, written notice to the LWDA.  
19 Plaintiffs believe that on or about November 30, 2022, the sixty-five (65) day notice period for  
20 Plaintiff Parkson Yee’s written notice expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take  
21 any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Plaintiffs exhausted the statutory time period  
22 to bring this action.

23     ///

24     ///

25     ///

1           22.     On November 2, 2022, Plaintiff Hillel Tran provided written notice to the  
2 LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were violated,  
3 and the theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** and incorporated by  
4 reference is a copy of the November 2, 2022, written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiffs believe that  
5 on or about January 6, 2023, the sixty-five (65) day notice period for Plaintiff Hillel Tran’s  
6 written notice expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate  
7 or prosecute this matter. Plaintiffs exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

8           23.     Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are  
9 “aggrieved employees” as defined by Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or  
10 former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendant who worked for Defendant within  
11 the State of California at any time during the period from November 2, 2021, through March  
12 22, 2024, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

13                   **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

14           24.     At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate  
15 their non-exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all  
16 hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant  
17 to the mandate of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

18           25.     As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiffs and  
19 other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay  
20 all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

21           26.     As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to include non-discretionary  
22 bonuses and incentives in aggrieved employees’ regular rate for purposes of overtime  
23 compensation.

24     ///

25     ///

26     ///

1                                   **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

2                   27.     In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512,  
3 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-  
4 minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and were further  
5 required to provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five  
6 (5) hours worked.

7                   28.     As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and  
8 other aggrieved current and former employees with legally mandated meal periods and rest  
9 breaks and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

10                               **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

11                  29.     At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their  
12 employees within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code section 204.

13                  30.     As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other  
14 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required  
15 time period.

16                               **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

17                  31.     At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their  
18 employees all wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to Labor  
19 Code sections 201 to 204.

20                  32.     As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above,  
21 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages  
22 pursuant to Labor Code sections 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties  
23 pursuant to section 203.

24                               **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

25                  33.     At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate*  
26 records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections  
27 226 and 1174.

28     ///

1           34. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants  
2 failed to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former  
3 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate  
4 records regarding Plaintiffs and other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages  
5 earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates  
6 and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

7                           **Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days**

8           35. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their  
9 employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code section 246.

10           36. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and  
11 other aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code  
12 section 246.

13                           **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

14           37. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse their  
15 employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct  
16 consequences of the discharge or their duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code sections  
17 2800 and 2802.

18           38. As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and other  
19 aggrieved current and former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them within  
20 the required time period.

21                           **Penalties**

22           39. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiffs, individually, and on  
23 behalf of other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover  
24 from Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant,  
25 including but not limited to:

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 1 a. Penalties under Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a hundred  
2 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial  
3 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee  
4 per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 5 b. Penalties under Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11040 in the amount  
6 of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the  
7 initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved  
8 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 9 c. Penalties under Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and entirely  
10 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the Labor  
11 Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved  
12 employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred  
13 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each  
14 subsequent violation;
- 15 d. Penalties under Labor Code section 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred  
16 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial  
17 violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved  
18 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- 19 e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or  
20 other statutes; and
- 21 f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 1194,  
22 and 2699, and any other applicable statute.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, on their own behalf as individuals and as  
3 representatives of other current and former aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, prays for  
4 judgment as follows:

- 5 1. Upon the Cause of Action, for civil penalties pursuant to statute as set forth in  
6 Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*, for Defendants' violations of sections 201,  
7 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, 203, 204, 205.5, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a),  
8 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 432.6, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174(d),  
9 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800, and 2802.
- 10 2. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code  
11 sections 210, 218.5, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and
- 12 3. For such other and further relief the court may deem just and proper.

13  
14 Dated: July 16, 2024

**JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION**

15  
16 By: 

Douglas Han  
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **EXHIBIT 1**

September 8, 2022

**BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION**

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

**Re: REPAIRSMITH, INC.**

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Parkson Yee against Repairsmith, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20<sup>1</sup> for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "REPAIRSMITH").

Mr. Yee is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Yee may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Repairsmith, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104, El Segundo, California 90245.

REPAIRSMITH employed Mr. Yee as an hourly-paid non-exempt Service Advisor within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around November of 2021) in the State of California. REPAIRSMITH directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Yee may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of REPAIRSMITH within the State of California.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Yee does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Yee will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Yee is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Yee and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

REPAIRSMITH failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Yee has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at REPAIRSMITH, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

REPAIRSMITH has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. REPAIRSMITH also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Yee and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH routinely required Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with REPAIRSMITH's policies and expectations. REPAIRSMITH failed to provide coverage to Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, REPAIRSMITH also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if 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 requires that if 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. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

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 in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from REPAIRSMITH were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved 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 Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or 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 time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees.

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Yee and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee 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 their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by REPAIRSMITH, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Yee and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Yee will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of REPAIRSMITH within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA  
September 8, 2022  
Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

**JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

**CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):**

Brendan Gawlik  
c/o Repairsmith, Inc.  
2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104  
El Segundo, California 90245  
*Agent for Service of Process for* Repairsmith, Inc.

# **EXHIBIT 2**

September 26, 2022

**BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION**

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

**Re: REPAIRSMITH, INC.**

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Richard Daley against Repairsmith, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20<sup>1</sup> for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "REPAIRSMITH").

Mr. Daley is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Daley may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Repairsmith, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104, El Segundo, California 90245.

REPAIRSMITH employed Mr. Daley as an hourly-paid non-exempt Mechanic within one year of the date of this letter (until in or around August of 2022) in the State of California. REPAIRSMITH directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Daley may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of REPAIRSMITH within the State of California.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Daley does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Daley will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Daley is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Daley and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

REPAIRSMITH failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Daley has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at REPAIRSMITH, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

REPAIRSMITH has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. REPAIRSMITH also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Daley and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH routinely required Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with REPAIRSMITH's policies and expectations. REPAIRSMITH failed to provide coverage to Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, REPAIRSMITH also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if 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 requires that if 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. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

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 in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from REPAIRSMITH were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved 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 Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or 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 time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Daley and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee 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 their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by REPAIRSMITH, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Daley and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Daley will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of REPAIRSMITH within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA

September 26, 2022

Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

**JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

**CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):**

Brendan Gawlik  
c/o Repairsmith, Inc.  
2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104  
El Segundo, California 90245  
*Agent for Service of Process for* Repairsmith, Inc.

# **EXHIBIT 3**

November 2, 2022

**BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION**

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

**Re: REPAIRSMITH, INC.**

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Hillel Tran against Repairsmith, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20<sup>1</sup> for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "REPAIRSMITH").

Mr. Tran is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Tran may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Repairsmith, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104, El Segundo, California 90245.

REPAIRSMITH employed Mr. Tran as an hourly-paid non-exempt Fleet Technician within one year of the data of this letter (until 2022) in the State of California. REPAIRSMITH directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Tran may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of REPAIRSMITH within the State of California.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Tran does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Tran will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Tran is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Tran and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

REPAIRSMITH failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Mr. Tran has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at REPAIRSMITH, regardless of their classification, job title, location, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency.

REPAIRSMITH has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double-time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. REPAIRSMITH also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Tran and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees with paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH routinely required Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with REPAIRSMITH's policies and expectations. REPAIRSMITH failed to provide coverage to Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Moreover, REPAIRSMITH also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, REPAIRSMITH failed to compensate Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." REPAIRSMITH required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if 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 requires that if 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. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

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 in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to pay Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from REPAIRSMITH were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved 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 Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or 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 time period, REPAIRSMITH failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees.

///

LWDA

November 2, 2022

Page 6 of 7

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, REPAIRSMITH did not provide Mr. Tran and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee 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 their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by REPAIRSMITH, including for purchasing equipment they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones for work purposes.

We believe that Mr. Tran and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Tran will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of REPAIRSMITH within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

LWDA

November 2, 2022

Page 7 of 7

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

**JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

**CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):**

Brendan Gawlik

c/o Repairsmith, Inc.

2333 Utah Ave. Suite 104

El Segundo, California 90245

*Agent for Service of Process for* Repairsmith, Inc.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**  
**1013A(3) CCP**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste. 101 Pasadena, California 91103.

On July 16, 2024, I served the foregoing document described as

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

on interested parties in this action a true and correct copy thereof to the email addresses as follows:

Christopher C. Hoffman (choffman@fisherphillips.com)

A.J. Sparagna (asparagna@fisherphillips.com)

**FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP**

4747 Executive Drive, Suite 1000

San Diego, CA 92121

Legal Staff:

Lori Cutrell (lcutrell@fisherphillips.com)

Lisa Whitaker (lwhitaker@fisherphillips.com)

Andrea Ford (aford@fisherphillips.com)

*Attorney(s)* for Defendant Repairsmith, Inc.


**[X] BY E-MAIL**

Pursuant to an agreement between the Parties regarding electronic service, the above-referenced document was transmitted to the addressee(s) at the e-mail addresses listed herein, which are their most recently known e-mail addresses or e-mail addresses of record in this action. I did not receive, within reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

**[X] STATE**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on July 16, 2024, at Pasadena, California.



Christina Castro

**PROOF OF SERVICE  
1013A(3) CCP**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, CA 91103 and my electronic service address is ccastro@justicelawcorp.com

On July 17, 2024, I served the foregoing document described as

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

for the following case: **Parkson Yee, et al. v. Repairsmith, Inc.**  
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM-906722-22**  
**LWDA Case No.: CM-910120-22**  
**LWDA Case No.: CM-917376-22**  
**Court Case No.: 34-2022-00331092-CU-OE-GDS**  
**Sacramento County Superior Court**

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California  
Labor & Workforce Development Agency  
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55  
Sacramento, California 95814

**[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION**

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

**[X] STATE**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on July 17, 2024, at Pasadena, California.



Christina Castro