

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8889 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., SUITE 200

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211

TELEPHONE: (310) 432-0000

FACSIMILE: (310) 432-0001

WWW.LELAWFIRM.COM

July 21, 2025

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO
LABOR CODE SECTION 2699.3**

To: California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, California 94612
Via Online Submission Only

<u>INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY</u> Registered Agent for Service of Process c/o C T Corporation System 330 North Brand Blvd, Suite 700 Glendale, CA 91203 <u>Certified No.:9589 0710 5270 3098 3395 47</u>	<u>INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY</u> Attn: Legal Department 6211 Descanso Ave Buena Park, CA 90620 <u>Certified No.:9589 0710 5270 3098 3396 53</u>
--	---

From: JOSUE SERMENO on behalf of himself and all other current and former aggrieved
California-based hourly non-exempt employees of INTERNATIONAL PAPER
COMPANY.

c/o Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.
Javad Tahbazsalehi, Esq.
LAVI & EBRAHERIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
jklein@lelawfirm.com
jtahbazsalehi@lelawfirm.com

Our firm has been retained by aggrieved employee JOSUE SERMENO concerning a representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, et seq. ("PAGA") against his employers, INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY.

We are filing this written notice with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") pursuant to the provisions of the California Labor Code Sections 2699, 2699.3, and 2698, et seq. The purpose of this letter is to inquire whether LWDA intends to investigate and seek civil penalties associated with my client's allegations of violations of the Labor Code by his Employer. In addition to submitting this letter and the \$75.00 filing fee via the online PAGA filing system, I am causing a copy of this letter to be mailed to the Department of Industrial Relations – Accounting Unit.

FACTUAL STATEMENT AND THEORIES OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS

Aggrieved employee JOSUE SERMENO ("Plaintiff" or "Employee") was employed by INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY ("Employers" or "Employers") as an hourly non-exempt employee from in or around November of 2022, until on or about January 21, 2025. Plaintiff believes Employer(s) employed more than one hundred (100) employees in total during the period covered by this notice, and Labor Code section 2999.3(c)(2) does not apply.

1. *Failure to Pay the Minimum Wage Rate of Pay for All Hours Worked in Violation of Labor Code Sections 1194 and 1197*

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to pay him and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with compensation at the minimum wage rate of pay for all the hours that they worked in violation of Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197. Labor Code section 1197 provides, "The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." Labor Code section 1194 states, "...any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit."

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to pay him and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees all wages at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked due to Employer's policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to:

- "Rounding down" or "shaving down" Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees total daily hours at the time of their clock-ins and clock-outs, including clock-ins and clock-outs for meal breaks, to the nearest quarter of an hour, to the benefit of Employer;

- Requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to travel while off-the-clock during their meal breaks to and from a suitable break area.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above that 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 and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were not paid for this time resulting in Employer's failure to pay minimum wage for all the hours Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees worked.

Employer's aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in time each day in which Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were subject to the control of Employer without being compensated for that time.

Based on these violations, Employee intends to seek civil penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, and Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivisions (a)(1)-(2), on behalf of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California. As a derivative claim of Employer's failure to pay wages at a minimum wage rate for all hours worked, Employee will also seek civil penalties for Employer's violations of Labor Code section 226(a) under Labor Code sections 226.3 and/or 2699(f)(2) because the failure to pay such minimum wages for all hours worked rendered Employee's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' pay calculations inaccurate and resulted in their wage statements being inaccurate with respect to gross wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code sections 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9).

2. *Failure to Authorize or Permit Meal Periods and/or Failure to Pay Meal Period Premiums in Violation of Labor Code Sections 512 and 226.7*

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums. California law requires an employer to provide an employee an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all duties and the employer relinquishes control over the employee's activities prior to the employee's sixth hour of work. Labor Code §§226.7, 512; Wage Order 1, §11; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Super Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second such meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes prior to the start of the eleventh hour of work. *Id.* If the employer requires the employee to remain at the work site or facility during the meal period, the meal period must be paid. This is true even

where the employee is relieved of all work duties during the meal period. *Bono Enterprises, Inc. v. Bradshaw* (1995) 32 Cal.App.4th 968. If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the law, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a legally required and compliant meal period was not provided. Labor Code §226.7; Wage Order 1, §11.

Employee alleges that Employer failed to authorize or permit him and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to take all legally required and compliant meal periods due to Employer's policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to, the following:

- Failing to provide Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees timely, uninterrupted, duty-free meal breaks of at least 30 minutes for every five hours worked;
- Requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to travel to and from a suitable break area away from their workstations while off-the-clock during their meal breaks. Defendants did not elongate or otherwise extend Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees meal break times to account for travel time between their workstations and the suitable break area resulting in meal breaks there were either on duty, less than a net 30 minutes, or both; and
- Failing to provide Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a second uninterrupted duty-free meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes for each workday that Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above that 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).

Additionally, Employee alleges that Employer maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure whereby they failed to pay Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a meal period premium wage of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that they did not receive all legally required and compliant meal periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order 1 at § 11.

Finally, on occasions when Employer paid Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted meal periods, Employer failed to pay the one (1) additional hour of pay at Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Employer maintained

a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as (“sign-on bonus and/or “shift differential pay”) for example, when calculating Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying meal period premium wages.

Based on these violations, Employee intends to seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, under Labor Code sections 558 and/or Labor Code section 2699(f)(2) on behalf of LWDA against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California. As a derivative claim of Employer’s failure to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant meal periods and/or failure to pay meal period premium wages, Employee will also seek civil penalties for Employer’s violations of Labor Code section 226(a) under Labor Code sections 226.3 and/or 2699(f)(2) because the failure to pay meal period premiums and/or pay meal period premiums at the proper regular rate of pay rendered Employee’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ pay calculations inaccurate and resulted in their wage statements being inaccurate with respect to gross and net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code sections 226(a)(1 & 5).

3. *Failure to Authorize or Permit Rest Periods and/or Failure to Pay Rest Period Premiums in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7*

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failed to pay rest period premiums. California law requires that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof....” Wage Order 1, § 12. “Employees are entitled to 10 minutes’ rest for shifts from three and one-half to six hours in length, 20 minutes for shifts of more than six hours up to 10 hours, 30 minutes for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours, and so on.” *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Sup. Ct. (Hohnbaum)* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1029; Labor Code §226.7. Additionally, the rest period requirement “obligates Employer to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. That is, during rest periods an employer must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Id.* If the employer fails to authorize or permit a required rest period, the employer must pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday the employer did not authorize or permit a legally required rest period. Labor Code section 226.7; Wage Order 1 at § 12.

Employee alleges that Employer failed to authorize or permit him and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to take all legally required and compliant rest periods due to Employer’s policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to, the following:

- Failing to provide Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees with net ten (10) minute rest breaks for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof; and

- Requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to travel to and from a suitable break area away from their workstations while off-the-clock during their Rest breaks. Defendants did not elongate or otherwise extend Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees Rest break times to account for travel time between their workstations and the suitable break area resulting in Rest breaks there were either on duty, less than a net 10 minutes, or both; and
- Failing to provide Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a third uninterrupted duty-free rest break of no less than ten (10) minutes for each workday that Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees work shifts over ten (10) hours.

Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above that 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).

Additionally, Employee alleges that Employer maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure whereby they failed to pay Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a rest period premium wage of one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that they did not receive all legally required and compliant rest periods, in violation of Labor Code section 226.7 and Wage Order 1 at § 12.

Finally, on occasions when Employer did pay Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a "premium" wage for late, missed, short, on-premise, on-duty, and/or interrupted rest periods, Employer failed to pay the one (1) additional hour of pay at Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of compensation. Specifically, Employer maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration such as ("sign-on bonus and/or "shift differential pay") for example, when calculating Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying rest period premiums.

Based on these violations, Employee intends to seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), on behalf of LWDA against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California. As a derivative claim of Employer's failure to authorize or permit all legally required and compliant rest periods and/or failure to pay rest period premium wages, Employee will also seek civil penalties for Employer's violations of Labor Code section 226(a) under Labor Code sections 226.3 and/or 2699(f)(2) because the failure to pay rest period premiums and/or pay rest period premiums at the proper regular rate of pay rendered Employee's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' pay calculations inaccurate and

resulted in their wage statements being inaccurate with respect to gross and net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code sections 226(a)(1 & 5).

4. *Failure to Timely Pay Earned Wages During Employment in Violation of Labor Code Section 204*

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to timely pay Employee's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' earned wages. In California, wages must be paid at least twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays, subject to some exceptions. Labor Code §204(a). Wages earned between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 16th and the 26th day of that month and wages earned between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month must be paid between the 1st and 10th day of the following month. *Id.* Other payroll periods such as those that are weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly, must be paid within seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period in which wages were earned. Labor Code §204(d).

As a derivative of Employee's claims above, Employee alleges that Employer failed to timely pay him and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' earned wages (including minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), in violation of Labor Code section 204. Employer's aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Employer failing to pay Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees their earned wages within the applicable time frames outlined in Labor Code 204. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Based on these violations, Employee intends to seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, on behalf of LWDA against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

5. *Secret Payment of Wages Lower Than Designated by Statute, in Violation of Labor Code Section 223*

Labor Code section 223 provides that, where any statute or contract requires an employer to maintain the designated wage scale, it shall be unlawful to secretly pay a lower wage while purporting to pay the wage designated by statute or contract. By engaging in the unlawful conduct alleged herein, including by failing to pay wages no less than the applicable legal minimum and overtime wages, and also meal and rest break premiums, as established by Labor Code sections 226.7, 510, 1194, 1197 and sections 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, as incorporated by Labor Code section 1198, the Employer secretly paid a lower wage than designated by statute while purporting to pay the wages designated by statute, in violation of Labor Code section 223. The Employee will therefore pursue the civil penalties established by Labor Code section 225.5 for all such violations of Labor Code section 223, on behalf of the LWDA and against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California. Plaintiff also

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

6. *Failure to Establish, Implement, and Maintain a Workplace Violence and Injury Prevention Program in Compliance with Labor Code Sections 6401.7 and 6401.9.*

California Labor Code Section 6401.7 requires every employer to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention program. California Labor Code Section 6401.9 requires California employers to adopt a comprehensive Workplace Violence Prevention Plan (WVPP), train employees on workplace violence, log safety incidents, and conduct periodic inspections to evaluate workplace violence hazards.

Employee alleges that Employer did not comply with Employer's responsibilities and duties under Labor Code sections 6401.7 and 6401.9. Employee is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Employer (1) failed to establish, implement, and maintain an effective injury prevention program; (2) failed to adopt a compliant Workplace Violence Prevention Plan; (3) failed to train Employee and other aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees in workplace violence and injury prevention; (4) failed to log safety incidents; and (5) failed to conduct compliant periodic inspections. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, et seq., under Labor Code sections 6401.9(g), 6317(d), and 2699(f) on behalf of LWDA, against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

7. *Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code 226*

Labor Code section 226(a) states that "[a]n employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee...an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee...(3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer...and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee...."

Employee alleges that as a derivative of Employee's claims above, Employer failed to provide accurate wage and hour statements to Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who were subject to Employer's control for

uncompensated time and who did not receive all their earned wages (including minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages), as such failures rendered Employee's and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' pay calculations inaccurate and resulted in their wage statements being inaccurate with respect to gross wages earned, total hours worked, net wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code sections 226(a)(1, 2, 5 & 9). Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, under Labor Code section 226.3 and/or Labor Code section 2699(f)(2) on behalf of LWDA, against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

8. *Failure to Timely Pay all Earned Wages and Final Wages due at Time of Separation of Employment in Violation of Labor Code Sections 201, 202, 203*

Labor Code section 201(a) states that "[i]f an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." Labor Code section 202(a) continues, "[i]f an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter...." Finally, Labor Code section 203(a) provides, "[i]f an employer willfully fails to pay...any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days...."

As a result of the aforementioned violations of the Labor Code, Employee alleges that he was not paid his final wages in a timely manner as required by Labor Code section 203. Earned wages (including minimum wages, meal period premium wages, and/or rest period premium wages) (all described above), were not paid at the time of Employee's separation of employment. Employee is informed and believes and thereon alleges that former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees who separated from Employer, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, were not paid all wages due in a timely manner, as required by Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Plaintiff believes these failures were willful and intentional. Plaintiff also believes these failures were malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2) on behalf of LWDA, against Employer if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Re: *Sermeno v. International Paper Company*
July 21, 2025
Page 10 of 10

CONCLUSION

Our client intends to file a representative action pursuant to PAGA concerning his wage claims as warranted by Employer's violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 6401.7, 6401.9 and sections 3, 4, 11 and 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. This letter is being sent to you as an inquiry into whether LWDA wishes to investigate my client's claims for civil penalties associated with Employer's violations of the Labor Code, as alleged herein. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at the above-listed information.

Very truly yours,

LAVI & EBRAHERIAN, LLP


Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY

Registered Agent for Service of Process

c/o C T Corporation System

330 North Brand Blvd, Suite 700

Glendale, CA 91203

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3395 47

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery☒ Certified Mail®☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery☐ Insured Mail☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☒ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING #

9590 9402 9516 5069 4647 39

United States
Postal ServiceFirst-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box •

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, CA 90211JLIVG/IK1JT/AM: PAGA LETTER
SERMENO V. INTERNATIONAL PAPER

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY

Registered Agent for Service of Process

c/o C T Corporation System

330 North Brand Blvd, Suite 700

Glendale, CA 91203

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3395 47

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent

☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

☐ Adult Signature

☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery

☒ Certified Mail®

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Collect on Delivery

☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

☐ Insured Mail

☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery

(over \$500)

☐ Priority Mail Express®

☐ Registered Mail™

☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery

☒ Signature Confirmation™

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2004 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

U.S. Postal Service™

CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy)

☐ Return Receipt (electronic)

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Adult Signature

☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark

Postage

\$

Total \$

\$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

LAW OFFICES OF
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., SUITE 200
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211

CERTIFIED MAIL



9589 0710 5270 3098 3395 47

FIRST-CLASS



US POSTAGE

IMMEDIATE DELIVERY

ZIP 90211
02 7H
0006127620

\$ 002.440

JUL 21 2025

INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY

Registered Agent for Service of Process

c/o C T Corporation System

330 North Brand Blvd, Suite 700

Glendale, CA 91203

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

**INTERNATIONAL PAPER
COMPANY**

Attn: Legal Department
6211 Descanso Ave
Buena Park, CA 90620

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3396 53

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

- ☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Adult Signature | ☐ Priority Mail Express® |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | ☐ Registered Mail™ |
| ☒ Certified Mail® | ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | ☒ Signature Confirmation™ |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery | |
| ☐ Insured Mail | |
| ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500) | |

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING#



9590 9402 9439 5069 7994 75



First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

**United States
Postal Service**

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4® in this box•

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

JL/VG/JK/IT/AM: PAGIA LETTER
SERMENO v. INTERNATIONAL PAPER

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

INTERNATIONAL PAPER
COMPANY

Attn: Legal Department
6211 Descanso Ave
Buena Park, CA 90620

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3396 53

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery☒ Certified Mail®☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

☐ Insured Mail
Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
(over \$500)

☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery☒ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail OnlyFor delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy)

\$

☐ Return Receipt (electronic)

\$

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery

\$

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature

Postage

\$

Total Postage

\$

Sent To

INTERNATIONAL PAPER
COMPANY

Attn: Legal Department
6211 Descanso Ave
Buena Park, CA 90620

Postmark
Here

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions