

LAW OFFICES OF
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., SUITE 200
BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211
TELEPHONE: (310) 432-0000
FACSIMILE: (310) 432-0001
WWW.LELAWFIRM.COM

January 12, 2023

**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

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL:

Orchard Post Acute

Attn: Legal Department
4840 E. Tulare Ave
Fresno, California 93727

Certified No.:7022 3330 0002 1393 5373

From: LANISHIA STANLEY, on behalf of herself and all other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees of ORCHARD POST ACUTE.

c/o Joseph Lavi, Esq.
Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.
Danielle E. Montero, Esq.
LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com
vgranberry@lelawfirm.com
dmontero@lelawfirm.com
wht2@lelawfirm.com

My firm has been retained by aggrieved employee LANISHIA STANLEY concerning a representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA") against her employers, ORCHARD POST ACUTE.

I am 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 her 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 LANISHIA STANLEY (“Employee”) was employed by ORCHARD POST ACUTE (“Defendants” or “Employers”) as an hourly non-exempt employee from in or around July 28, 2022, until on or about November 21, 2022.

1. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages for Overtime Hours Work

Employee alleges that during her employment, Employer failed to pay her and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for the overtime hours that they worked at their overtime rate of pay.

Labor Code section 510, subdivision (a), states in relevant part:

“Eight hours of labor constitutes a day’s work. 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. 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 at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.”

Further, Labor Code section 1198 provides,

The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

Labor Code section 1194 provides, “...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.”

In this case, 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 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 including, but not limited to, for example, “Bonus Pay” and “Shift Differential Pay” when calculating Employee and other current

and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating and paying meal period premium wages.

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. To the extent that the foregoing unpaid time resulted from Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees being subject to the control of Employer when they worked more than eight (8) hours in a workday, more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven days in a workweek, Employer failed to pay them at their overtime rate of pay for all the overtime hours they worked.

Employer's foregoing policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Employer failing to pay Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees at their overtime rate of pay for all overtime hours worked, in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1198, and the Wage Order.

Based on these violations, Employee intends to seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, and 558, subdivisions (a)(1)-(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 pay overtime wages for overtime hours worked, Employee will seek statutory penalties under Labor Code 226(a)(1) because the failure to pay such overtime wages rendered Employee's and other current and former aggrieved, California-based, hourly non-exempt employees' pay calculations inaccurate and in violation of Labor Code section 226(e)(2)(B)(i).

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

Employee alleges that during her 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 5, §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 5, §11.

In this case, 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 including, but not limited to, for example, “Bonus Pay” and “Shift Differential Pay” when calculating Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating and paying meal period premium wages.

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 5 at § 11.

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. 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 seek statutory penalties under Labor Code section 226(a)(1) because the failure to pay meal period premiums and/or pay meal period premiums rendered Employee’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ pay calculations inaccurate and in violation of Labor Code section 226(e)(2)(B)(i).

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

Employee alleges that during her 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 5, § 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 5 at § 12.

In this case, 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 including, but not limited to, for example, “Bonus Pay” and “Shift Differential Pay” when calculating Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating and paying rest period premium wages.

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 5 at § 12.

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. 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 seek statutory penalties under Labor Code section 226(a)(1) because the failure to pay rest period premiums and/or pay rest period premiums rendered Employee’s and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ pay calculations inaccurate and in violation of Labor Code section 226(e)(2)(B)(i).

4. *Failure to Produce Requested Records in Violation of Labor Code Sections 226 and 1198.5*

Employee alleges that Employer failed to provide her and, on information and belief, other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt drivers with their employment records in response to their written requests.

An employer must afford current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to the employer. Labor Code §226(b). An employer who receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request. Labor Code §226(c). Additionally, every current and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee’s performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Labor Code §1198.5(a). Upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some

limited exceptions. Labor Code §1198.5(b)(1). Failure to comply with these requests allows for a civil penalty seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750), pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198.5(k) and 226(f).

Employee requested to Employer for her payroll records, timecards, and personnel records pursuant to Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. However, Employer failed to produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code section 226 and 1198.5. Employee is informed and believes and thereon alleges that other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees also sent written requests for their employment records, but Employer failed to timely produce the requested employment records, in violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5.

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

5. *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 her and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees' earned wages (including overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, meal period premium wages at the proper rate, and/or rest period premium wages at the proper rate), 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.

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.

6. Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements

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 overtime wages at the proper overtime rate of pay, meal period premium wages at the proper rate, and/or rest period premium wages at the proper rate), in violation of Labor Code section 226.

Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties under Labor Code section 226.3, and 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.

7. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages

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 until 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 Overtime wages for overtime hours worked, 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.

Based on these violations, Employee will seek civil penalties under 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.

8. *Employer's Other Violations of the California Labor Code*

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 (“*Huff*”), as an aggrieved employee, Employee has standing, and intends, on behalf of LWDA, to pursue civil penalties against Employer for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employer. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against the employer for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Employee, as an “aggrieved” employee affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby does, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for unrelated Labor Code violations by Employer.

CONCLUSION

My 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, 1198.5 and the 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 & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP



Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

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 Required \$
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postmark
Here

Postage

\$

Total

\$

Sent

Street

City

Orchard Post Acute
 Attn: Legal Department
 4840 E. Tulare Ave
 Fresno, California 93727

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

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:

Orchard Post Acute
 Attn: Legal Department
 4840 E. Tulare Ave
 Fresno, California 93727



9590 9402 7625 2122 2103 81

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7022 3330 0002 1393 5373

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

☐ Agent

X

☐ 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

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

Restricted Delivery

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

Domestic Return Receipt

USPS TRACKING #



9590 9402 7625 2122 2103 81



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 & Ebrahimiian, LLP
8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200
Beverly Hills, California 90211

Stanley v. Orchard Post Acute.

JL/1G/WHT2/4R-PAGA letter

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:

Orchard Post Acute
Attn: Legal Department
4840 E. Tulare Ave
Fresno, California 93727



9590 9402 7625 2122 2103 81

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7022 3330 0002 1393 5373

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

☐ Priority Mail Express®

☐ Registered Mail™

☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery

☒ Signature Confirmation™


☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Restricted Delivery

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


Domestic Return Receipt

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



7022 3330 0002 1393 5373

FIRST-CLASS



US POSTAGE

02 1P

0001217907

JAN 12 2023

MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 90211

Orchard Post Acute
Attn: Legal Department
4840 E. Tulare Ave
Fresno, California 93727