
FERRARO VEGA

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3160 Camino del Rio South, Suite 308
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

September 14, 2023

AMENDED NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*
(LWDA-CM-928363-23 – Filed Jan. 9, 2023)

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

Pacifica Companies LLC
1775 Hancock Street Suite #200
San Diego, California 92110

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

Prospect Hospitality LP
1775 Hancock Street Suite #200
San Diego, California 92110

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as further written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of The ESTATE OF **KODY HORNBURG and MINA LALLY** (“Plaintiffs”) and all other “aggrieved employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

**PACIFICA COMPANIES LLC;
PROSPECT HOSPITALITY LP**

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

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiffs. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiffs intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that

employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 73, 79.

Through this notice, Plaintiffs requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiffs attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in a settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(k). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case be conducted in coordination with Plaintiffs’ counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiffs, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. This settlement attempt is in compliance with relevant California law. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal. 4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiffs during the PAGA Period, including Plaintiff Hornburg in the position of Bell and Valet Attendant from about March 2020 to July 2022 and Plaintiff Lally in the positions of bartender, host, server or busser from November 2016 through July 2022. During their employment Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

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

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

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

- PAGA CLAIMS –

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

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and

Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal. App. 3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Due to Defendants’ policy and practice of subtracting at least 30 minutes from aggrieved employees’ shifts to reflect meal periods, even if these meal periods were deficient, Plaintiffs and aggrieved employees accumulated unpaid, off-the-clock work hours. Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs or aggrieved employees for hours the employees worked through their meal periods, resulting in unpaid wages. Further, Defendants’ failure to include these work hours caused Plaintiff Lally and other aggrieved employees to receive less than the minimum wage.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 558 (\$50/\$100), 1197.1 (\$100/\$250), 1199 / “Penalties” section of the IWC Wage Orders (\$50/\$100), and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Unpaid Overtime

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

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

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the

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

When Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees worked overtime, Defendants failed to pay the overtime and failed to pay the overtime at the “regular rate of pay.” Defendants also paid Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees referral bonuses and other forms of remuneration including service charges that Defendants failed to include in the overtime rate when employees worked overtime hours. Defendants paid overtime to Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour they worked during the period in which Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees earned commissions, service charges or bonuses, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “at a rate of no less than ***one and one-half times the regular rate of pay*** for an employee” and “***twice*** the regular rate of pay” for double time hours as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. An illustrative example of the regular rate of pay violation is found on Plaintiff Hornburg’s wage statement for the pay period from **05/16/2022** to **05/31/2022** below:

Charge Date	Description	CURRENT EARNINGS DETAIL			
		Rate	Hours/ Units	Amount	Hours Worked
05-31-2022	RESV INCENTIVE	400.0000	1.00	400.00	0.00
05-31-2022	OT PAY	23.2500	8.90	206.93	8.90
05-31-2022	MEAL BREAK PENA	15.5000	1.00	15.50	0.00
05-31-2022	REG PAY	15.5000	75.78	1174.59	75.78

Extract from Plaintiff Hornburg’s Wage Statement for the Pay Period from 05/16/2022 to 05/31/2022

During this pay period, Plaintiff Hornburg earned a “RESV INCENTIVE”, a bonus, of \$400.00 that was not factored in Plaintiff’s overtime rate, as the 8.90 overtime hours was instead paid at a rate of 1.5x Plaintiff’s base rate of \$15.50, rather than the 1.5x of his regular rate of pay. Defendants committed the same “regular rate of pay violation” against Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees as a matter of common payroll administration and company

policy in a manner susceptible to common proof. Additional forms of compensation, like bonuses, service charges and commissions, were required to be included in the regular rate of pay for Plaintiff but were not. This resulted in wage underpayment.

Finally, to the extent Defendants' meal period deduction policy above resulted in overtime hours off-the-clock, Plaintiffs believe and allege Defendants likewise underpaid overtime on shifts where the employees worked through their meal period.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 558 (\$50/\$100), 1199 / "Penalties" section of the IWC Wage Orders) (\$50/\$100), and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

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

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

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

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) "the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;" (2) "by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;" or (3) "for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time." Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

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

To the extent aggrieved employees earned paid sick leave, Defendants violated Labor Code section 246(l) because sick leave was not paid at the lawful regular rate of pay throughout the relevant period. The lawful regular rate must factor in commissions, bonuses, and all other forms of compensation. Based on Defendants' noncompliance with the regular rate of pay requirements applicable to overtime and meal/rest premiums, Plaintiffs allege on information and belief that the regular rate miscalculation equally applied to paid sick leave with respect to the aggrieved employees, resulting in underpayments.

The failure to calculate and pay paid sick leave at one of the lawful rates set forth in Labor Code § 246(l)(1)-(3) and 247 *et seq.* was applied as a matter of common policy and practice to aggrieved employees in those periods where they earned additional payments, commissions, bonuses, or other forms of non-excludable remuneration, such as the RESV INCENTIVE, and also received paid sick leave.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Failure To Provide Meal Periods And
Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

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

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

is “exceedingly narrow” and applies only when (1) “the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty” and (2) *both* “the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period.” *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal. 5th 444, 459.

Defendants routinely impeded or prohibited Plaintiffs from taking a meal period each workday as Defendants failed to relieve them of all job duties and failed to relinquish control over their activities due to numerous factors including staffing shortages, a lack of trained personnel scheduled or made available by Defendants to assume their duties during a meal period, and work demands placed on them by supervisors to the extent they could not take a meal period. Also, when Defendants did not provide compliant meal periods, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees a meal period premium at the “regular rate of compensation” because the premiums paid did not factor all forms of remuneration into the rate. Furthermore, Defendants required Plaintiffs to work “off-the-clock” by retroactively altering aggrieved employees’ timesheets to show compliant meal periods, even if aggrieved worked through their meal periods that day.

An illustrative example of the regular rate of pay violation is found on Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from **05/16/2022** to **05/31/2022**.

Charge Date	Description	CURRENT EARNINGS DETAIL			
		Rate	Hours/ Units	Amount	Hours Worked
05-31-2022	RESV INCENTIVE	400.0000	1.00	400.00	0.00
05-31-2022	OT PAY	23.2500	8.90	206.93	8.90
05-31-2022	MEAL BREAK PENA	15.5000	1.00	15.50	0.00
05-31-2022	REG PAY	15.5000	75.78	1174.59	75.78

Extract from Plaintiff Hornburg’s Wage Statement for the Pay Period from 05/16/2022 to 05/31/2022

Plaintiff’s wage statement shows Plaintiff’s meal period penalty was paid at Plaintiff’s base hourly rate, instead of Plaintiff’s regular rate of pay, which would have factored in Plaintiff’s bonus. Indeed, Defendant’s maintained a policy and practice of not paying meal period premiums at the regular rate of compensation in accordance with California law.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Failure To Provide Rest Periods And
Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

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

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

Defendants routinely impeded or prohibited Plaintiffs from taking rest periods each workday as Defendants failed to relieve them of all job duties and failed to relinquish control over their activities due to numerous factors including staffing shortages, a lack of trained personnel scheduled or made available by Defendants to assume their duties during a rest period, and work demands placed on them by supervisors to the extent they could not take a rest period. On information and belief, Defendants had a policy and practice of not paying rest period premiums to employees who were unable to take their rest periods. To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the correct regular rate of compensation to aggrieved employees, which would have factored in bonuses and other forms of compensation. As discussed throughout this correspondence, Defendants had a non-compliant policy and practice of miscalculating and underpaying the regular rate of pay applicable to overtime and other premiums. Based on this practice, Plaintiffs alleges the rest period premiums were equally deficient with respect to payments made to the aggrieved employees.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

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

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

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

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

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, and Labor Code section 210 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

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

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

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

As discussed throughout this letter, Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to

timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties on behalf of aggrieved employees and the State of California as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3

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

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

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2), Defendants failed to accurately list the total hours worked and further violated Labor Code section 226(a)(8) by failing to accurately identify the name and address of the employer. In violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub. Specifically, Defendants applied the inaccurate hourly rates on employee wage statements in those respective periods where there was a regular rate violation, as described above. The amounts (gross and net) and hourly rates stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow

confusion among Plaintiffs and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 226.3 (\$250/\$1,000) and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

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

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

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

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

As a result, Plaintiffs may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code section 1174.5 (\$500) and 2699 (\$100/\$200), along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

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

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

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiffs and the aggrieved

employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

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

- CONCLUSION -

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nicholas J. Ferraro".

Nicholas J. Ferraro

Cc Defense Counsel Robert Blumberg
rblumberg@littler.com

Defense Counsel Brooke Hammond
bhammond@littler.com

Co-Counsel Geoffrey Chackel, Chackel Law, PC
geoff@chackellaw.com