

July 23, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter on Behalf of MAURICIO SANCHEZ and Aggrieved
Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employers:

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET, SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA
75702 VARNER RD
PALM DESERT, CA 92211

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
c/o C T CORPORATION SYSTEM
330 N BRAND BLVD.
GLENDALE, CA 91203

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA
1100 GLENSON AVE STE 210
LOS ANGELES CA 90024

OAK VIEW GROUP, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OAK VIEW GROUP, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG FACILITIES, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG FACILITIES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG HOLDINGS, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG HOLDINGS, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
July 25, 2025
Page 2

OVG MEDIA & CONFERENCES, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG MEDIA & CONFERENCES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG SOCAL FACILITIES, LLC
11755 WILSHIRE BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG SOCAL FACILITIES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG VENUE ALLIANCE, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG VENUE ALLIANCE, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time this PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice concerns MAURICIO SANCHEZ’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employers: OAK VIEW GROUP, LLC; OVG FACILITIES, LLC; OVG GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, LLC; OVG HOLDINGS, LLC; OVG MEDIA & CONFERENCES, LLC; OVG SOCAL FACILITIES, LLC; OVG VENUE ALLIANCE, LLC; SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC, dba ACRISURE ARENA (“Employers”). Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employers, at without limitation, 75702 Varner Rd, Palm Desert, CA 92211, with duties that included, but were not limited to, performing electrical installation and repairs, from approximately December of 2021 through approximately February of 2024. Employee seeks to represent non-exempt employees of Employers, and each of them, as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as “Aggrieved Employees”. Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the “PAGA Period”, which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employers’ violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and have a policy or practice of requiring its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees:

to suffer under Employers' control due to, without limitation: to come early to work for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in to clock out for meal periods and continue working, and go through security screenings off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, either the detrimental rounding, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. Specifically, Employers adjusted Employee's time sheets when Employee worked in excess of eight hours, reducing his time worked back to eight hours, which resulted in rounded lunches and hours worked. This happened often because the time clock was offline according to the forms, which was Employers' fault and resulted in loss of pay and missed meals for Employee. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the overtime laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the overtime laws, including potential violations for failing to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and have a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Employers' control due to, without limitation: to come early to work for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in to clock out for meal periods and continue working, and go through security screenings off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employers, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employers failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employee and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, either the detrimental rounding, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. Specifically, Employers adjusted Employee's time sheets when Employee worked in excess of eight hours, reducing his time worked back to eight hours, which resulted in rounded lunches and hours worked. This happened often because the time clock was offline according to the forms, which was Employers' fault and resulted in loss of pay and missed meals for Employee. Employee and

other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the minimum wage laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the minimum wage laws. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers had and have a policy or practice of compelling its Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation: by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; and providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes. Specifically, Employers adjusted Employee's time sheets when Employee worked in excess of eight hours, reducing his time worked back to eight hours, which resulted in rounded lunches and hours worked. This happened often because the time clock was offline according to the forms, which was Employers' fault and resulted in loss of pay and missed meals for Employee. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the meal period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the meal period laws, including potential violations for unprovided meals, late meals, short meals, interrupted meals, auto-deducted meals, meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties, and meals for which aggrieved employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such

violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers maintain policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation: by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes; interrupting them; and not providing rest periods in a timely fashion. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Despite these violations, Employers failed to pay Employee penalty pay. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the meal period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the rest period laws, including potential violations for unprovided rests, short rests, interrupted meals, rest breaks that required clock-outs, rests for which Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties, and rests for which aggrieved employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive.

Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employers' herein-described policies or practices, Employers also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Employers also failed to itemize sick time on Employee's paystubs. Further, Employee is not certain of the correct name of Employers, as Employee's offer letter states and paystubs name "OVG OAK VIEW GROUP" yet Employee's W-2 states "SOCAL ARENA COMPANY LLC". Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employers would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; vacation pay and paid time off (in violation of Labor Code section 227.3; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to

provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employers, the name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employers to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers’ conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations’ civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employers are liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers’ conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers have or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employers also failed to itemize sick time on Employee’s paystubs. Employee is further informed and believes that Employers also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor

Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employers violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employers did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employers violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employers' conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employers would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employers would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employers previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employers are determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employers are also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employers are determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employers are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employers are deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employers are still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employers that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employers would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employers was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employers would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employers thus are subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employers to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Molly Ann DeSario

Molly Ann DeSario

cc:

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET, SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
c/o C T CORPORATION SYSTEM

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA
75702 VARNER RD
PALM DESERT, CA 92211

SOCAL ARENA COMPANY, LLC
dba ACRISURE ARENA

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
July 25, 2025
Page 10

330 N BRAND BLVD.
GLENDALE, CA 91203

1100 GLENSON AVE STE 210
LOS ANGELES CA 90024

OAK VIEW GROUP, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OAK VIEW GROUP, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG FACILITIES, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG FACILITIES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG HOLDINGS, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG HOLDINGS, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG MEDIA & CONFERENCES, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG MEDIA & CONFERENCES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG SOCAL FACILITIES, LLC
11755 WILSHIRE BLVD., 9TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG SOCAL FACILITIES, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

OVG VENUE ALLIANCE, LLC
5050 S SYRACUSE STREET
SUITE 800
DENVER, CO 80237

AMANDA GARCIA, As Agent for Service of Process
C/O OVG VENUE ALLIANCE, LLC
330 N BRAND BLVD
GLENDALE, CA 91203

(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)