

---

# FERRARO VEGA

---

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro  
[nick@ferrarovega.com](mailto:nick@ferrarovega.com)  
Lauren N. Vega  
[lauren@ferrarovega.com](mailto:lauren@ferrarovega.com)

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300  
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727  
619-350-6855 fax  
[ferrarovega.com](http://ferrarovega.com)

May 5, 2025

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS**  
**CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.***

**VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL**  
***- Electronic Return Receipt -***

**Railpros Field Services, Inc.**  
5605 N. MacArthur Blvd., Ste. 650  
Irving, TX 75038

***- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -***  
Submitted electronically to the Labor and  
Workforce Development Agency

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **DANIEL CASTRO** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “aggrieved employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

**RAILPROS FIELD SERVICES, INC.**

Defendant(s) shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App. 5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff’s counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a

reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal. 4th 553, 561.

### **- BACKGROUND -**

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Roadway Worker in Charge/Flagger from about November 2022 to present. His job duties included but were not limited to, working to protect construction and maintenance personnel by making sure the track is clear. During his employment Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “aggrieved employees” and the “PAGA Period”).

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “aggrieved employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants’ violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

### **- PAGA CLAIMS -**

#### **Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period,

even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal. App. 3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant maintained and enforced an unlawful policy of time shaving and rounding, whereby Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees were directed to artificially reduce their recorded hours worked. Specifically, Defendant required employees to “round down” or omit actual hours worked when recording their time.

By way of example, Plaintiff routinely begins performing work duties, including flagging designated work areas, at approximately 11:00 p.m. on Sunday evenings. Nonetheless, Plaintiff is required by Defendant to record his start time as 12:01 a.m. on Monday, thereby eliminating entitlement to premium compensation for hours worked during the double-time period. This practice resulted in lost wages and constitutes a violation of applicable labor laws.

Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants required Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees to report to their job sites prior to their scheduled start times in order to complete mandatory safety-related paperwork. This pre-shift paperwork, which pertained to the specific duties and safety protocols for the day’s assignment, typically required approximately thirty (30) minutes to complete.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were instructed to have this paperwork fully completed prior to attending the daily team briefing, which commenced at their designated start time. Despite the fact that this pre-shift activity was required by Defendants and performed for the benefit of the employer, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not compensated for the time spent completing the paperwork. As such, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, in violation of applicable wage and hour laws.

Finally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for reporting time in violation of California labor laws. Specifically, when contractors canceled scheduled projects with more than twenty-four (24) hours’ notice, Defendants paid Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees only a flat fee of fifty dollars (\$50), regardless of the time they waited at the jobsite for the contractor to show up.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were often required to travel to remote or out-of-town job sites, and in such instances, they spent significant uncompensated time waiting at job locations. Despite these obligations and the last-minute nature of the cancellations, Defendants failed to compensate employees for actual hours worked or reporting time as required under applicable wage orders.

Due to Defendants’ unlawful policies of time rounding and requiring off-the-clock work, Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked, resulting in the underpayment of regular wages to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

**Unpaid Overtime**  
**Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

As stated in the “Unpaid Hours Worked” section above, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to “round back” or shaving-off hours worked from the timecards to avoid being paid double time. Additionally, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to complete off-the-clock work. Each time these unlawful policies and practices resulted in unpaid hours worked 8 hours worked in a day or more than 40 hours worked in a week, these practices resulted in unpaid overtime wages. As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

**Unpaid Paid Sick Leave**  
**Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 24 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) “the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;” (2) “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;” or (3) “for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time.” Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees “with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave requirements with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. Specifically, as a result of Defendants’ unlawful time-shaving policy, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not properly credited with their full accrued sick leave, as required under California law. Furthermore, when sick leave was used, Defendants failed to compensate employees at a lawful rate that included all forms of compensation, as mandated by Labor Code §§ 246(l)(1)-(3) and 247 et seq.

This failure to accurately calculate and pay sick leave at the proper rate was implemented uniformly as a matter of company-wide policy and practice, thereby denying aggrieved employees the full benefit of their earned sick leave.

As a result of these violations, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties both individually and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all aggrieved employees, in an amount up to the maximum permitted under the California Labor Code.

### **Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages** **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee’s “regular rate” of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 (“We hold that the terms are synonymous: “regular rate of compensation” under section 226.7(c), like “regular rate of pay” under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages”). “[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage.” *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is “exceedingly narrow” and applies only when (1) “the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all

duty” and (2) *both* “the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period.” *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal. 5th 444, 459.

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with all meal periods to which they were lawfully entitled, in violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable wage orders. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees regularly experienced missed, late, or shortened meal periods due to the demands of their job duties and Defendants’ failure to relieve them of all work duties during designated meal periods.

More specifically, Defendants did not permit Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to take compliant meal periods despite working shifts of eight (8) or more hours. Employees were required to work through their meal periods in order to meet the operational expectations set by Defendants. Despite these violations, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not compensated with the meal period premiums mandated under the Labor Code.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were frequently the only personnel assigned to job sites, rendering it impossible to step away for a full, uninterrupted meal period. They were required to remain on site at all times, coordinate the movement of trains, maintain constant communication with the railroad, and enforce railroad safety policies, leaving no opportunity to take a lawful, off-duty meal period.

In addition, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees who worked in excess of ten (10) hours in a day were regularly denied a second meal period, again due to job demands and a lack of relief coverage. Despite being entitled to premium pay for each meal period violation, Defendants failed to compensate them at the regular rate of pay, or at all, for these violations.

As such, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, both individually and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed by law.

### **Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages** **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee’s “regular rate” of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 (“We hold that the terms are synonymous: “regular rate of compensation” under section 226.7(c), like “regular rate of pay” under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages”). Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each

four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with all rest periods required under California Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable wage orders. As described in the sections above, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work continuously throughout their shifts without being relieved of duties, thereby denying them their legally mandated rest periods.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were required to remain on duty at all times, including during periods when rest breaks should have been provided. Specifically, they were required to keep their radios on at all times and respond to all communications immediately, making it impossible to take uninterrupted, off-duty rest periods.

Each time a rest period was missed, shortened, or otherwise noncompliant, Defendants were obligated to pay a rest period premium at the lawful rate of pay. However, as a matter of common policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide such premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, both individually and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all aggrieved employees, in the maximum amount permitted under the Labor Code.

#### **Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment** **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of "all wages" for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid "not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period." Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides "every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty" of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

**Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment**  
**Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours' notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours' notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

**Non-Compliant Wage Statements**

**Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, "an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:" (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct "gross wages earned" or "net wages earned," as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of "gross wages earned" on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Defendant violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately include the uncompensated time Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendant's unlawful policy and practice of time rounding and time editing.

Further, in violation of 226(i) Defendants failed to "set forth the amount of paid sick leave available" on Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees' wage statements.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

#### **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records** **Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate "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." Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

#### **Unlawful Employment Condition** **Violation of Labor Code § 432.5**

Defendants violated Labor Code section 432.5 with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees by requiring that they agree to an unlawful term or condition in writing during their employment.

Labor Code section 432.5 states that "[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."

Non-competition agreements are illegal under California law. Business and Professions Code 16600 provides that “every contract by which anyone is restrained from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business of any kind is to that extent void.” Defendants required that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees sign non-competition agreements restricting their ability to accept certain work on behalf of themselves or other employers. As such, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees sign non-competition agreements prohibited by California law. This violation occurred each pay period within the PAGA period until the unlawful agreement was rescinded by Defendants in a notice dated February 7, 2024.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

**Attorneys’ Fees and Costs**  
**Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)**

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other aggrieved employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

**- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -**

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants’ written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees’ personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

**- CONCLUSION -**

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys’ fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,

*Dorota James*  
Dorota A. James

LMP

Cc Plaintiff Daniel Castro

RailPros Legal Department -  
[legal@railpros.com](mailto:legal@railpros.com)