LIDMAN LAW, APC
Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
slidman@lidmanlaw.com
Milan Moore (SBN 308095)
mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
Tiara Gose-Hardy (SBN 323823)
tgose@lidmanlaw.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 322-4772
Fax: (424) 322-4775

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARMANDO RAMOS

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARMANDO RAMOS

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
9/29/2025 5:45:28 PM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By M. Alvarez ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

ARMANDO RAMOS, as an individual and on behalf of all other current and former Aggrieved Employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PHOENIX HOUSES OF CALIFORNIA, INC., a California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25CL052227C

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT:

(1) CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE § 2698 *et seq*.)

UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE

Plaintiff Armando Ramos ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and all other current and former Aggrieved Employees, hereby brings this Representative Action Complaint ("Complaint") against Phoenix Houses of California, Inc., a California nonprofit corporation; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive (collectively "Defendants"), and on information and belief alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other current and former Aggrieved Employees, hereby brings this Complaint for recovery of civil penalties under California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Cal. Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*. This Complaint is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code because the amount in controversy exceeds this Court's jurisdictional minimum.

VENUE

2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Cal. Code of Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of herein occurred in the County of San Diego. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have agent(s) within the County of San Diego, and/or otherwise are found within the County of San Diego, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff was and currently is, a California resident. During the one year immediately preceding Plaintiff giving the required notice under the PAGA and within the statute of limitations periods applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee.

4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the one year preceding Plaintiff giving the required notice under the PAGA, and continuing to the present, Defendants did (and continue to do) business by offering services for those seeking help with alcohol or substance use disorders and/or mental health issues. Defendants employed Plaintiff

and other, similarly-situated non-exempt employees within, among other counties, San Diego County and the state of California and, therefore, were (and are) doing business in San Diego County and the State of California.

5. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner, or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said defendants are sued under such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual, partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein, and proximately caused Plaintiff and other current and former Aggrieved Employees to be subject to the unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

6. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

7. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or omissions complained of herein.

8. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acting within the course and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further, Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. Plaintiff, a former non-exempt employee, was employed by Defendants from approximately September 2024 to approximately May 1, 2025. Plaintiff's job title was

Behavioral Health AODS – Counselor 3, and his duties included, without limitation, conducting group therapy, documenting treatments utilized, and writing reports.

10. Plaintiff was generally scheduled to work five days a week from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. However, Plaintiff regularly worked more than 8 hours per workday.

11. To keep track and record of his time worked, Defendants required Plaintiff to write on a timesheet his clock in and clock out times, as well as log his clock in and out times on a computer application, UKG.

12. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants engaged in policies and/or practices that required Plaintiff to work off-the-clock, resulting in Plaintiff not being compensated for all hours actually worked. Specifically, Plaintiff was required to arrive 20 to 25 minutes prior to his scheduled start time to go through three security check points, which included time spent waiting in line. Plaintiff was also required to go through the same process when leaving for the day, which lasted about 15 minutes after his work shift was scheduled to end. However, Defendants instructed Plaintiff to clock in no earlier than 7:10/7:15 a.m. and clock out no later than 3:40/3:45 p.m. (depending on the clock in time). As such, Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were not compensated for all hours worked and thus were not paid all minimum and overtime wages.

13. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was not provided all required meal periods due to Defendants' meal period policies and practices, which fail to provide 30-minute first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff's meal periods regularly took place after the fifth hour of work and were routinely interrupted by Defendants. Despite this, Plaintiff was instructed to record that his meal periods on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday took place from 10:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and a different 30-minute period on Tuesday and Thursday. Due to Defendants' policies and practices, as well as their work demands, meal periods were untimely, interrupted, missed, or otherwise in violation of California law.

14. Although Plaintiff was not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required meal period

premium for each workday in which he experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

15. Plaintiff was also not authorized and permitted to take all legally required and compliant rest periods due to Defendants' rest period policies and practices. Specifically, due to Defendants' rest period policies/practices, Plaintiff was not permitted to take timely first or second rest periods. Defendants did not authorize and permit one rest period for every four hours worked, or *major fraction thereof*.

16. On those occasions when Plaintiff was not authorized and permitted to take all legally-compliant rest periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required rest period premium for each workday in which he experienced a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

17. Defendants also failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for necessary business expenses incurred during the relevant time period. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff to purchase supplies, including but not limited to a police duty belt, but he was not reimbursed for his expenses. Accordingly, despite Plaintiff and the other non-exempt employees being required to purchase supplies, Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff or other non-exempt employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of the employer in violation of California law.

18. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Plaintiff.

19. As a further result of Defendants' failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period premium wages, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff all wages owed upon termination of employment with Defendants.

20. As a result of all of the aforementioned Labor Code violations, Defendants are liable for civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act.

/ /

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

21. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff, an "Aggrieved Employee" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 et seq., acting on behalf of himself and other Aggrieved Employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, the other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) $250.00 for each initial violation and $1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (2) no less than $25.00 and up to $200.00 for each aggrieved employee per pay period pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f) for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

a. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1197 by failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees the statutory minimum wage for all hours worked;

b. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 by failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all overtime compensation earned;

c. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required meal periods and failing to pay meal period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees;

d. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required rest periods and failing to pay rest period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees;

e. Defendants violated Labor Code § 226 by failing to furnish Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with accurate and compliant itemized wage statements;

f. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203 by failing to timely pay all final wages due to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees;

g. Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred in the discharge of their duties; and

h. Defendants violated Labor Code § 1174 by failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

22. On July 24, 2025, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") via e-mail, of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff's intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code *§ 2698 et seq.* with respect to violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 21 (a)-(h). Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the July 24, 2025 correspondence. Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these violations, Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

23. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to protect his interests and the interests of other aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

1. Upon the First Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) $100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and $200.00 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 % of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) $250.00 for each initial violation and $1,000.00 for each subsequent

violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; (3) $50.00 for each initial violation and $100.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (4) no less than $5,000.00 and up to $25,000.00 for each violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.8(b) and (c); and/or (5) no less than $25.00 and up to $200.00 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the Labor Code violations cited in Paragraph 21 (a)-(h) above.;

2. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;

3. Upon the First Cause of Action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code § 218.5 and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and all other applicable statutes; and

4. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: September 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
LIDMAN LAW, APC

By: ______________________
Scott M. Lidman

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARMANDO RAMOS

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 1

LIDMAN LAW
2155 CAMPUS DRIVE, SUITE 150, EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245
OFFICE: (424) 322-4772
FAX: (424) 322-4775

July 24, 2025

VIA LWDA WEBSITE
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
Phoenix Houses of California, Inc., a California nonprofit corporation
C/O Hened Ayala
11600 Eldridge Avenue
Lake View Terrace, CA 91342

Re: *Armando Ramos v. Phoenix Houses of California, Inc., a California nonprofit corporation*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that this law firm represents Armando Ramos in claims arising from his employment with Phoenix Houses of California, Inc., a California nonprofit corporation ("Defendant"). Mr. Ramos is an "aggrieved employee" as defined by Labor Code sections 2699, *et seq*. due to Defendant's numerous violations of the Labor Code as set forth below. The purpose of this letter is to comply with Labor Code section 2699.3, which requires aggrieved employees to notify their employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated.

For purposes of this letter, an "aggrieved employee" should be considered to include all current and former hourly, non-exempt employees in California who worked, at least in part, during the one year immediately preceding the date of this letter through the date of trial, the date judgment is entered, the date of settlement, and/or other date approved by the Court.

Mr. Ramos, a former non-exempt employee, was employed by Defendant from approximately September 2024 to approximately May 1, 2025. During his employment with Defendant, Mr. Ramos's job title was Behavioral Health AODS – Counselor 3, and his duties included, without limitation, conducting group therapy, documenting treatments utilized, and writing reports.

During his employment with Defendant, Mr. Ramos was generally scheduled to work five days a week from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. However, Mr. Ramos regularly worked more than eight (8) hours per workday. To keep track and record of his time worked, Defendant required Mr. Ramos to write on a timesheet his clock in and clock out times, as well as log his clock in and out times on a computer application, UKG.

During his employment with Defendant, Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were not paid for all time worked. Specifically, Defendant engaged in policies and/or practices that required Plaintiff to work off-the-clock, resulting in Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees no being compensated for all hours actually worked. Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were required to arrive 20 to 25 minutes prior to their scheduled start time to go through three security check points, which included time spent waiting in line. Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were also required to go through the same process when leaving for the day, which lasted about 15 minutes after their work shift was scheduled to end. However, Defendant instructed Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees to clock in no earlier than 7:10/7:15 a.m. and clock out no later than 3:40/3:45 p.m. (depending on the clock in time). Defendant's policy/practice resulted in Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees not being compensated for all hours worked and thus they were not paid all minimum and overtime wages.

During his employment with Defendant, Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were not provided all legally required meal periods due to Defendant's meal period policies and practices, which fail to provide 30-minute duty free first meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work in violation of California law. Additionally, Defendant regularly interrupted Mr. Ramos's and other hourly, non-exempt employees' meal periods. Despite this, Mr. Ramos was instructed to record that his meal periods on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday took place from 10:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. and a different 30-minute period on Tuesday and Thursday. As a result of Defendant's policies and practices, as well as the work demands imposed by Defendant, Defendant often provided meal periods that were either interrupted, late, or otherwise in violation of California law.

Although Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which they were entitled, Defendant failed to compensate them with the required meal period premium for each workday in which they experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were also not authorized and permitted to take all legally required and compliant rest periods due to Defendant's rest period policies and practices. Specifically, Defendant's policies/failed to provide a second rest period. As such, Defendant did not authorize and permit one rest period for every four hours worked, or *major fraction thereof*. Further, Mr. Ramos's and other hourly, non-exempt employees' rest periods were routinely interrupted by Defendant and/or work requirements.

On those occasions when Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees were not authorized and permitted to take all legally-compliant rest periods to which they were entitled, Defendant failed to compensate them with the required rest period premium for each workday in which they experienced a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

As a result of Defendant's failure to pay all minimum wages, overtime wages, as well as meal period premium wages and rest period premium wages, Defendant maintained inaccurate payroll records and issued inaccurate wage statements to Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees.

Defendant also failed to reimburse Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees for necessary business expenses incurred during the relevant time period. Specifically, Defendant required Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees to purchase supplies, including but not limited to a policy duty belt. Accordingly, despite Mr. Ramos and the other hourly, non-exempt employees being required purchase supplies, Defendant did not reimburse them for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of the employer in violation of California law.

As a result of Defendant's failure to pay all minimum and overtime wages, as well as meal period premium wages and rest period premium wages, Defendant failed to pay Mr. Ramos and other former non-exempt employees all wages owed upon termination of employment with Defendant.

As described above, Defendant committed the following violations of the Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 17 ("Wage Order 17"):

<u>Minimum Wage Violations</u>

Defendant was required to pay Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees an hourly rate at least equal to the minimum wage for each hour actually worked. *See* Labor Code §§ 1194; 1194.2, 1197; The Wage Order 17. Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees were not paid for all hours worked due to Defendant's policy and practice of requiring work be performed off-the-clock.

<u>Overtime Violations</u>

Defendant was required to pay Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of eight hours per workday and/or forty hours per workweek. *See* Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1198; the Wage Order 17, § 4. According to Labor Code § 510(a), "Any 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." This Section further provides, "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. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated equal to one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all overtime hours worked." As explained above, Mr.

Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees worked overtime hours but were not properly compensated due to Defendant's policy and practice of requiring work be performed off-the-clock.

Meal Period Violations

As alleged above, Defendant failed to provide Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees with all required and compliant meal periods. *See* Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Wage Order 17, § 9. Specifically, due to Defendant's policies, practices, and the work demands imposed by Defendant, Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees were often unable to take a duty-free 30-minute meal period before the end of the fifth hour of work and were often interrupted. As a result, their meal periods were often late, short, interrupted, missed, or otherwise unlawful. As a result, Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees are owed an additional hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation for each workday they experienced a meal period violation. *See* Labor Code § 226.7 ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with … [an] order of the Industrial Welfare Commission … the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided."). Although Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which they were entitled, Defendant failed to compensate Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees with the required meal period premium for each workday in which they experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7.

Rest Period Violations

Defendant also failed to authorize and permit Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees to take all required rest periods. *See* Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516. As alleged above, Defendant's rest period policies/practices fail to authorize and permit all rest periods for every four hours worked, or *major fraction thereof*. Specifically, as a result of the work demands imposed by Defendant, Defendant did not authorize and permit all rest periods. As a result, Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees are owed an additional hour of wages at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that they were not authorized and permitted to take all legally required rest periods. *See* Labor Code § 226.7 ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest period is not provided.")

Wage Statement Violations

Defendant knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform practice and policy, failed to furnish Mr. Ramos and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements that included, among other requirements, all minimum and overtime wages earned and meal and rest period premiums, in violation of Labor Code § 226 *et seq*. Defendant's failure to furnish Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of all minimum and overtime wages earned, and meal and rest period premium wages, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify discrepancies in Defendant's reported data.

Waiting Time Penalties

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require that employees receive all of their final wages at the time of their separation of employment. Defendant failed to timely pay Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees all of their final wages at the time of separation, which included, among other things, unpaid minimum and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages.

Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendant's failure to pay all final wages due to their aggrieved employees was willful and, consequently, entitles the aggrieved employees to waiting time penalties equal to one day of wages at their standard hourly rate for each day Defendant failed to pay their final wages after their separation, up to a maximum of thirty days.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenditures

As described above, Defendant required Mr. Ramos and other hourly, non-exempt employees to purchase supplies used in the discharge their duties. Accordingly, despite the non-exempt employees being required to purchase supplies, Defendant did not reimburse Mr. Ramos or other hourly, non-exempt employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of the employer in violation of California law. Defendant's policy of not providing reimbursement for necessary work-related expenses is in violation of Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2804 ("An employer shall indemnify his or her employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or obedience to the directions of the employer."). Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to reimbursement of such unpaid work expenses with interest.

As an "aggrieved employee," Mr. Ramos will initiate a civil action on behalf of himself and other Aggrieved Employees to recover damages, statutory penalties, and civil penalties resulting from the wage and hour violations alleged herein. Based on Mr. Ramos's own investigation, and on information and belief, Defendant committed the following Labor Code violations:

a) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 1194, 1194.2, and 1197 by failing to pay Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees the statutory minimum wage for all hours worked;

b) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 by failing to pay Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees all overtime compensation earned;

c) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required meal periods and failing to pay meal period premiums to Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees;

d) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558 by failing to provide all legally required rest periods and failing to pay rest period premiums to Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees;

e) Defendant violated Labor Code § 226 by failing to furnish Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees with accurate and compliant itemized wage statements;

f) Defendant violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203 by failing to timely pay all final wages due to Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees;

g) Defendant violated Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred in the discharge of their duties; and

h) Defendant violated Labor Code § 1174 by failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Mr. Ramos and other aggrieved employees.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(A), please notify us and Defendant if the LWDA intends to investigate these alleged violations of the Labor Code. Please contact me should you require additional information.

Very truly yours,

LIDMAN LAW, APC

Scott M. Lidman