



Rebecca Harteker | Attorney

Rebecca@frontierlawcenter.com 
(818) 914-3433 
6200 Canoga Ave., Suite 470 
Woodland Hills, CA 91367



www.frontierlawcenter.com

September 10, 2025

Via Online Filing

<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

Via Certified Mail

ECCO Retail, LLC
1 Northeastern Boulevard
Suite 200
Salem, NH 03079

ECCO Retail, LLC
740 Ventura Blvd
Suite 416
Camarillo, CA 93010

Subject: *Kassitee Adame v. ECCO Retail, LLC*

Dear Representative:

This office represents Kassitee Adame (“Plaintiff”) in connection with Labor Code violation claims related to their employment with ECCO Retail, LLC (“Employer”). Employer can be contacted at:

ECCO Retail, LLC
1 Northeastern Boulevard
Suite 200
Salem, NH 03079

ECCO Retail, LLC
740 Ventura Blvd
Suite 416
Camarillo, CA 93010

Plaintiff has personally suffered each of the Labor Code violations alleged in this letter while employed by Employer within the applicable one-year statute of limitations period. As such, Plaintiff intends to seek PAGA penalties on behalf of herself and all other non-exempt employees of Employer employed in California and who were subjected to any or all of the Labor Code violations referenced herein during the PAGA Period (together with Plaintiff, “Aggrieved Employees”). The PAGA Period begins one year prior to the date of this letter and, because the violations alleged herein are ongoing, the PAGA Period extends beyond the date of this letter.

In response to Labor Code violations alleged below, PAGA provides Employer with specific options to mitigate potential penalties:

Taking All Reasonable Steps to Be in Compliance:

Employer can reduce potential penalties to 15% of the maximum by demonstrating it has already taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all Labor Code provisions identified in this notice prior to receiving it. If Employer believes it has already taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all Labor Code provisions identified in this notice, Employer is encouraged to contact our office to set forth all reasonable steps taken.

If all reasonable steps are taken to be in compliance with all Labor Code provisions identified in this notice within 60 days after receiving it, penalties may be reduced to 30% of the maximum. If Employer intends to take all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all Labor Code provisions identified in this notice, Employer is encouraged to engage in good faith meet-and-confer discussions with our office regarding the alleged violations. Failure to do so may support a finding that all reasonable steps were not taken to comply with the Labor Code provisions identified herein.

Curing Violations:

For certain violations, Employer has the opportunity to fully cure the alleged violations to further reduce penalties or even avoid penalties altogether. Once again, we strongly encourage Employer to promptly initiate meet-and-confer discussions with our office as part of any compliance or cure efforts. Failure to do so may result in a cure that is insufficient.

Employer must notify both our office and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) of any steps taken towards compliance or any attempts to cure. Not only does this approach demonstrate a good faith attempt to come into compliance, but failure to do so could potentially support a finding that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive, thereby leading to increased penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B).

All communications regarding this matter should be directed to:

Frontier Law Center
6200 Canoga Ave., Suite 470
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

This letter is sent pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code section 2699.3. The Labor Code violations being alleged are as follows:

Minimum Wage Violations

Labor Code section 1197 and the applicable Wage Order requires an employer to pay an employee no less than the minimum wage for all hours worked.

Employer failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees the minimum wage for all hours worked because the Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work while off the clock.

Specifically, the Aggrieved Employees were often required to assist customers while off-the-clock.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Minimum Wage Violations

As a result of the above minimum wage violations, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code sections 1197.1 and 2699.

Overtime Violations

Labor Code section 510 and the applicable Wage Order provides that an employee shall be paid one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for any work in excess of eight hours in one workday or 40 hours in any one workweek. Labor Code section 510 and the applicable Wage Order further provides that an employee shall be paid twice their regular rate of pay for any work in excess of 12 hours in one day.

Unpaid Overtime Due to Off the Clock Work

The Aggrieved Employees regularly worked in excess of eight hours in a day and 40 hours in a workweek. Since the Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work off the clock, it follows that this time was often overtime. Thus, the Aggrieved Employees were not paid all overtime wages owed.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Overtime Violations

As a result of the above overtime violations, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 2699.

Meal Break Violations

Labor Code section 512 and the applicable Wage Order provides that an employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, or more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes. Meal periods must be uninterrupted, and the employee must be relieved of all duty.

Labor Code section 226.7 further provides that an employee is entitled to one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each day that a compliant meal period was not provided.

The Aggrieved Employees' meal breaks were regularly missed due to understaffing. In rare cases when the Aggrieved Employees were able to take meal breaks, they were often interrupted by work duties.

An employer provides compliant meal breaks to its employees "if it relieves its employees of all duty, relinquishes control over their activities and permits them a reasonable

opportunity to take an uninterrupted 30-minute break.” (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1040 (2012)).

Here, the Aggrieved Employees were required to remain on premises and on call.

Meal Breaks Were Impeded / Discouraged

Not only must an employer affirmatively relieve its employees of all duty during their meal breaks, it also must not “impede or discourage” its employees from taking compliant meal breaks. (*Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1040 (2012)).

Here, Employer impeded or discouraged its employees from taking compliant meal breaks due to understaffing and not being able to relieve them for a full uninterrupted meal break.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Meal Break Violations

As a result of the above meal break violations, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Rest Break Violations

Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable Wage Order requires employers to authorize and permit its employees to take rest periods based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of 10 minutes net per four hours or major fraction thereof. Employees must be relieved of all duties during their rest breaks.

Labor Code section 226.7 further provides that an employee is entitled to one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for each day that a compliant rest break was not provided.

The Aggrieved Employees’ rest breaks were regularly missed due to understaffing and constant on call requirements.

On Premises Rest Breaks

An employer generally may not place restrictions on its employees during their rest breaks, such as requiring its employees to remain on the premises and subject to the employer’s control. In fact, the California Division of Labor Standards and Enforcement has provided the following guidance on its website:

Q. Can my employer require that I stay on the work premises during my rest period?

A. No, your employer cannot impose any restraints not inherent in the rest period requirement itself. In *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269, the California Supreme Court held that the rest period requirement

"obligates employers to permit-and authorizes employees to take-off-duty rest periods. That is, during rest periods employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time." (citation omitted) As a practical matter, however, if an employee is provided a ten minute rest period, the employee can only travel five minutes from a work post before heading back to return in time.

Here, since the Aggrieved Employees were not allowed to leave the work premises during their rest breaks, they were subject to Employer's control during the rest breaks. Thus, the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with compliant rest breaks.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Rest Break Violations

As a result of the above rest break violations, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code section 2699.

Wage Statement Violations

Labor Code section 226 requires an employer to provide wage statements to its employees which include, among other things, gross and net wages earned, total hours worked, the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate, all deductions, applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Employer failed to provide wage statements which accurately reflected this information.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Wage Statement Violations

As a result of the wage statement violations detailed above, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code sections 226.3 and 2699.

Suitable Seating Violation

Labor Code section 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable Wage Order. Specifically, section 1198 requires that "the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the [...] standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee [...] under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful."

The applicable Wage Order provides that "[a]ll working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats." It further states that "[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties."

Here, Employer did not provide the Aggrieved Employees with suitable seating as required by the Wage Order because Aggrieved Employees were required to stand at all times when working, even while performing tasks that could have been completed while sitting down.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Suitable Seating Violations

As a result of the suitable seating violations detailed above, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code section 2699.

Waiting Time Penalties

Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require that an employer provide an employee with all wages due and payable either: (a) immediately upon termination, or (b) within 3 days of the employee's resignation. When an employer fails to comply with the above, the employee is entitled to the equivalent of a day's wage at their regular rate of pay for each day the employer is late, for up to 30 days. (Labor Code section 203). Employer failed to pay all wages owed at the conclusion of the Aggrieved Employees' employment.

Civil Penalties Applicable to Waiting Time Penalties

Because of Employer's failure to pay all wages at the conclusion of employment and to pay the resulting waiting time penalties, Employer is subject to the civil penalties listed in Labor Code section 2699.

Reservation of Rights

The facts and claims contained herein are based on the information available at the time of this writing. Therefore, if through discovery and/or expert review, Plaintiff becomes aware of additional facts or theories of liability, they expressly reserve the right to revise these facts and/or add any new claims by amending and/or supplementing this letter or by adding applicable causes of action to the complaint which will relate back to the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

/s/

Rebecca Harteker