



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

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

May 29, 2025

VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY:

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

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL:

CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
Agent for Service of Process for:
Medline Industries, LP
Attn to the CA Registered Corporate (1505)
Agent Authorized Employee(s):
Koy Saechao, Rebecca Vang, Alex Jenkins,
Wendy Harris, Melissa Dekoven, Crystal
Rodriguez, Maddie Bright, Jae Hall, Aaron
Caneles
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Ste 150n
Sacramento, CA 95833

Medline Industries, LP
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
3 Lakes Dr
Northfield, IL 60093

NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM

To: California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Medline Industries, LP
Date: May 29, 2025
Subject: *Sonia Arellano v. Medline Industries, LP*

Introduction

This office represents PLAINTIFF, Sonia Arellano (hereinafter "PLAINTIFF") in connection with PLAINTIFF's claims under the California Labor Code. PLAINTIFF was, at all relevant times herein mentioned, an employee of the following entity and individual managing agents of said

entity: Medline Industries, LP (hereinafter, this entity and its managing agents are collectively referred to as “DEFENDANTS”). DEFENDANTS may be contacted directly at the addresses listed above.

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed directly and/or via a staffing agency by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice (“NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) and on behalf of all current and former exempt employees employed directly and/or via a staffing agency by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice (“EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”), hereby gives written notice (“NOTICE”) of PLAINTIFF’s claims against DEFENDANTS. This NOTICE is being provided via online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and DEFENDANTS via certified mail to their Agent(s) for Service of Process and/or entity mailing address as provided to the California Secretary of State and/or the address of the Secretary of State of the State of incorporation and/or the entity address as provided on wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

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

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

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

PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, alleges that the specific provisions of California law that DEFENDANTS have violated, requiring this NOTICE, include but are not limited to: California Labor Code sections 226, 226.7, 245, *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2100-2112, 2802, and all applicable Wage Orders.

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

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

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

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

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

Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1

Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. DEFENDANTS, at all

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

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

General Information

DEFENDANTS specialize in the manufacture and distribution of medical supplies and services. DEFENDANTS assign its NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work at its warehouse distribution centers, manufacturing/distribution facilities and/or other locations in California, including but not limited to, in Rialto, California, where PLAINTIFF worked during the liability period. Through its various locations/business operations, DEFENDANTS serve including but not limited to, the warehousing/manufacturing industry.¹

PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of picker or a similar job title/position from in or around June 2024 until in or around March 2025. DEFENDANTS assigned PLAINTIFF to work at its warehouse distribution center located in Rialto, California. PLAINTIFF regularly worked shifts lasting at least approximately seven (7) to eleven (11) hours long. DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF an hourly rate for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked. At times, DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF an base hourly rate of \$22.00. PLAINTIFF was also compensated with shift differential pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation.

During the liability period, PLAINTIFF was required to complete off-the-clock work (e.g, cleaning tasks, waiting time/standing in line to clock in) prior to clocking in/after clocking out for shifts. PLAINTIFF was required to take shortened, interrupted and late first meal periods. PLAINTIFF was also interrupted during purportedly off-duty rest periods. Based on information and belief,

¹ See <https://www.medline.com/about-us/>; Last visited on May 26, 2025.

DEFENDANTS subjected PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to quotas that prevented them from taking their meal and rest periods. PLAINTIFF also had to complete off-the-clock work before clocking in for/after clocking out for the end of shifts. Also, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to use PLAINTIFF's personal cell phone for work to carry out assigned job duties, including, to receive and respond to work-related calls and messages. PLAINTIFF was not reimbursed for these business expenses. As a result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful off-the-clock work policies and practices and unlawful meal period policies and practices, PLAINTIFF was denied all owed minimum wages, overtime wages and premium wages, which further resulted in PLAINTIFF receiving inaccurate/incomplete wage statements throughout the liability period.

Labor Code Violations

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

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

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

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of more than five (5) hours, entitling them to at least one meal period. PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of more than ten (10) hours, entitling them to a second meal period.

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

Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to work during owed meal periods, take late, shortened and shortened meal periods due to including but not limited to, the need to complete assigned job duties.

For example, at times, PLAINTIFF was interrupted during purportedly off-duty meal periods.

Furthermore, PLAINTIFF was required to walk at least approximately four (4) minutes to and from the time clock system to clock in and out for meal periods, resulting in consistently on-duty/shortened meal periods that were less than the required thirty (30) minutes.

Based on information and belief, at times, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to stand in line behind other employees to access DEFENDANTS' time-keeping system before they could clock in after completing a purported meal period.

Also, PLAINTIFF was sometimes forced to take late meal periods due to the need to continue completing assigned job duties.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS would unlawfully edit the clock in and out times for PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods in order to display a timely, at least thirty minute meal period even though DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that they were required to work through part of those meal periods/were otherwise not permitted to take legally compliant meal periods.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of wages at their regular rate(s) of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period. To the extent meal period premiums were paid, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the owed meal period premium, resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of the owed meal period premium.

By way of illustration, during PLAINTIFF's employment, including but not limited to during pay period beginning on 8/11/2024 and ending on 8/24/2024, PLAINTIFF earned several different shift differentials, including but not limited to, Shift1," at a rate of \$1.0000 "ShiftDiff2," at a rate of \$2.0000, "TrvDiff5," at a rate of \$5.0000 "TrvDiff7," at a rate of \$7.000. To the extent meal period premiums were paid, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate used to calculate the owed meal period premium, resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of meal period premiums.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.² DEFENDANTS' failure to provide valid meal

² See Lab. Code §2699(f); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that

periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

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

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

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

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were often required to work during their owed rest periods due to the need to complete assigned job duties and/or were prohibited from taking net ten-minute rest periods in a suitable rest area.

For example, PLAINTIFF was sometimes interrupted during purportedly off-duty rest periods.

“[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty...for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid”).

Also, DEFENDANTS prohibited the taking of any third rest break on shifts longer than ten (10) hours, in violation of California rest period law.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their policies and practices resulted in the denial of ten-minute rest periods which were free of DEFENDANTS' control owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of wages at their regular rate(s) of pay for each missed or unlawful rest period. For example, DEFENDANTS' wage statements for PLAINTIFF do not show the payment of any rest period premiums.

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

Violation of Labor Code Sections 2100-2112:

Pursuant to Labor Code Sections 2100–2112, employers with one hundred (100) or more employees at a single warehouse distribution center, or one thousand (1,000) or more employees at one or more warehouse distribution centers in California are required to provide nonexempt employees, either upon hire or within 30 days of this new law's enactment, with a written description of each quota they are subject to (e.g., quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be handled) within a defined period of time and any potential adverse employment action that may result from failure to meet the quota. Labor Code Section 2104 (see below) prohibits adverse employment actions against employees who fail to meet their quota if the quota was not properly disclosed to the employee and prohibits quotas that prevent an employee from taking his or her meal or rest breaks, use of restrooms, or that interfere with compliance with California's occupational health and safety laws.

Labor Code Section 2101 provides:

Each employer shall provide to each employee, upon hire, or within 30 days of the effective date of this part, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject, including the quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be produced or handled, within the defined time period, and any potential adverse employment action that could result from failure to meet the quota.

Labor Code Section 2102 provides:

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

An employee shall not be required to meet a quota that prevents compliance with meal or rest periods, use of bathroom facilities, including reasonable travel time to and from bathroom facilities, or occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards. An employer shall not take adverse employment action against an employee for failure to meet a quota that does not allow a worker to comply with meal and rest periods, or occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards, or for failure to meet a quota that has not been disclosed to the employee pursuant to Section 2101.

Labor Code Section 2104 provides in pertinent part:

(a)(1) If a current or former employee believes that meeting a quota caused a violation of their right to a meal or rest period or required them to violate any occupational health and safety laws in the Labor Code or division standards, they have the right to request, and the employer shall provide, a written description of each quota to which the employee is subject and a copy of the most recent 90 days of the employee's own personal work speed data.

(2) If a former employee requests a written description of the quotas to which they were subject and a copy of their own personal work speed data pursuant to paragraph (1), the employer shall provide 90 days of the former employee's quotas and personal work speed data for the 90 days prior to the date of the employee's separation from the employer.

(b) An employer that receives a written or oral request for information pursuant to subdivision (a) shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request.

During the liability period, DEFENDANTS employed 100 or more NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at a single warehouse distribution center rendering DEFENDANTS subject to the provisions of Labor Code Sections 2100-2112, during the relevant period.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, upon hire, with a written description of each quota they are subject to (e.g., quantified number of tasks to be performed or materials to be handled) within a defined period of time and any potential adverse employment action that may result from failure to meet the quota.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS subjected PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to quotas that prevented them from taking their meal and rest periods, use of bathroom facilities and/or interfered with compliance of California's occupational health and safety laws. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS subjected NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to adverse employment actions for failure to meet a quota that was not disclosed pursuant to Labor Code Section 2101 and/or did not allow them to comply with meal and rest period laws and/or occupational health and safety laws.

Minimum Wage Violations: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit." Labor Code section 1194.

Labor Code section 1197 states the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the Commission, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Pursuant to section 4 of the applicable Wage Order, "Every employer shall pay to each employee not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period..." The applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." See §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. An employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324. Furthermore, "in any action under Section 98, 1193.6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon..." *Cal. Lab. Code* § 1194.2.

NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for all hours worked due to DEFENDANTS' mandated off-the-clock work policies and/or practices and failure to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during unpaid meal periods:

For example, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to arrive at work at least approximately two (2) minutes prior to the start of PLAINTIFF's scheduled shift so that PLAINTIFF would have time to wait in line and clock in right at the start of PLAINTIFF's scheduled shift. This time spent fulfilling DEFENDANTS' requirements, including, time spent waiting in line behind other employees to clock in was unrecorded and uncompensated, resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to compensate PLAINTIFF for all hours worked and the underpayment of wages owed.

PLAINTIFF had to complete other work tasks prior to clocking in for the start of shifts/after clocking out for the end of shifts, e.g., cleaning tasks, resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to compensate PLAINTIFF for all hours worked and the additional underpayment of wages owed.

Also, as explained herein, PLAINTIFF was interrupted and/or otherwise not relieved of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during unpaid meal periods, resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to compensate PLAINTIFF for all hours worked and the underpayment of wages owed.

DEFENDANTS' off-the-clock work policies and practices described above resulted in DEFENDANTS' failure to compensate PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked and the underpayment of wages owed.

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

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

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

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

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

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay twice NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

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

By way of example, during pay period beginning on 8/11/2024 and ending on 8/24/2024, PLAINTIFF earned various shift differentials, e.g., "Shift1," at a rate of \$1.0000 "ShiftDiff2," at a rate of \$2.0000, "TrvDiff5," at a rate of \$5.0000 "TrvDiff7," at a rate of \$7.000. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS' overtime rate of \$33.695/hour which is only \$.695 higher than one- and one-half times PLAINTIFF's base rate of pay of \$22.00 does not incorporate all shift differentials/other non-discretionary pay earned during the pay period, resulting in the miscalculation of the owed overtime rate and the underpayment of overtime wages owed.

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

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

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

Among other things, under California law, when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, § 9 (b).

Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan’s Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use. *Id.* 1144-1145

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

DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business onto NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by requiring them to pay for their business expenses including personal vehicle and/or cell phone expenses.

For example, PLAINTIFF was required to use PLAINTIFF’s personal cell phone to receive and respond to work related calls/messages without being provided with any reimbursement for these cell-phone-related business expenses.

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

To this end, DEFENDANTS' wage statements issued to PLAINTIFF do not show any reimbursement for business expenses.

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

Sick Leave Violations: DEFENDANTS violated California's paid sick leave laws including but not limited to section, Labor Code section 245, et seq. DEFENDANTS failed to properly accrue paid sick leave due to DEFENDANTS' failure to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all forms of non-discretionary remuneration including but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, multiple base rates of pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation in violation of Labor Code section 246.

Throughout the relevant time period, DEFENDANTS failed to provide proper paid sick leave to PLAINTIFF. DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of failing to use the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating owed compensation, including overtime payments and premium payments. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of paying sick leave at the base rate of pay rather than the regular rate of pay.

As such, DEFENDANTS improperly calculated the sick leave rate of pay owed to PLAINTIFF, resulting in DEFENDANTS' failure to provide paid sick leave at the correct rate.

On information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that all of these practices were experienced and continue to be experienced by other Aggrieved Employees.

These practices violated California's sick leave laws, Labor Code section 245, et seq.

Wage Statement Violations: California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains the following: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Cal. Lab. Code. section 226(a).

As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed and continue to fail to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b) the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section

226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

DEFENDANTS' issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES (by virtue of DEFENDANTS' off-the-clock work policies and practices described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.*, (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

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

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

As described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

For example, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9) due to DEFENDANTS' failure to list a category containing the proper overtime rate.

In addition, because of the violations detailed above, including but not limited to, not paying regular and overtime wages for all hours worked and failing to provide meal and rest break premiums, DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate, itemized wage statements.

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,



Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
CROSNER LEGAL, PC