

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8889 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., SUITE 200

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIFORNIA 90211

TELEPHONE: (310) 432-0000

FACSIMILE: (310) 432-0001

WWW.LELAWFIRM.COM

September 4, 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>SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC</u> Registered Agent for Process of Service c/o Corporate Creations Network Inc. 7801 Folsom Boulevard, Suite #202 Sacramento, CA 95826 <u>Certified No.: 9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 48</u>	<u>SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC</u> Attn.: Legal Department 1501 NW 49th Street, Suite 100 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309 <u>Certified No.: 9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 55</u>
<u>SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC</u> Attn.: Legal Department 990 W 8th St Los Angeles, CA 90017 <u>Certified No.: 9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 62</u>	

From: FRANCISCO NOVA, on behalf of himself and all other current and former aggrieved
California-based hourly non-exempt employees of SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC.

c/o Joseph Lavi, Esq.

Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

Jeffrey D. Klein, Esq.

Javad Tahbazzsalehi, Esq.

LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP

8889 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 200

Beverly Hills, California 90211

Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com

vgranberry@lelawfirm.com

jklein@lelawfirm.com

jtahbazzsalehi@lelawfirm.com

Our firm has been retained by aggrieved employee FRANCISCO NOVA concerning a representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA") against his employers, SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC.

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 FRANCISCO NOVA ("Plaintiff" or "Employee") was employed by SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC ("Defendants" or "Employers") as an hourly non-exempt employee from in or around January 2024, until on or about June 4, 2025. Plaintiff believes Defendant(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:

- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to complete opening procedures prior to clocking in for the start of their shifts, such as unlocking the store and disarming the alarm system, without being paid for such work time.
- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to complete closing procedures after clocking out for the end

of their shifts, such as locking the store and arming the alarm system, without being paid for such work time.

- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to communicate with management and coworkers during their off-the-clock meal breaks without being paid for that time.

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 Defendant'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 Pay Overtime Wages for Overtime Hours Work and/or Failure to Pay Overtime wages at the Proper Overtime Rate of Pay in Violation of Labor Code Section 510 and 1194*

Employee alleges that during his employment, Employer failed to pay him 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.”

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

- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to complete opening procedures prior to clocking in for the start of their shifts, such as unlocking the store and disarming the alarm system, without being paid for such work time.
- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to complete closing procedures after clocking out for the end of their shifts, such as locking the store and arming the alarm system, without being paid for such work time.
- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to communicate with management and coworkers during their off-the-clock meal breaks without being paid for that time.

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 Employers’ 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. 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.*, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2) 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 at the lawful overtime rate for all overtime hours worked, Employee will also seek civil penalties for Defendant'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 overtime wages for all overtime 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).

3. *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 7, §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 7, §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:

- Sometimes 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.
- Sometimes 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 due to missed, late, short and/or on-duty meal breaks, coupled with heavy workload and chronic understaffing.

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 7 at § 11.

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 Defendant'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).

4. *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 7, § 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 employers to permit – and authorizes employees to take – off-duty rest periods.” *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 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 7 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:

- Sometimes 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.
- Sometimes failing to provide Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees a rest period of ten (10) net minutes for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof due to missed, late, short and/or on-duty rest breaks coupled with heavy workload and chronic understaffing.

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 7 at § 12.

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 Defendant'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).

5. *Failure to Indemnify Employees for Employment-Related Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code Section 2802*

Employees allege that during their employment, Employers failed to indemnify them and other current and former California-based employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by them in the discharge of their duties. Labor Code section 2802(a) states, "An employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer..."

Employees allege that during their employment, Employers failed to indemnify them and other current and former California-based employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by them in the discharge of their duties due to Employers' policies, practices, and/or procedures including, but not limited to, the following:

- Sometimes requiring Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees to use or purchase their own tools and/or resources in order to work for Defendants, including but not limited to their cell phone (including both telephone use and cellular data use) for work-related purposes – without reimbursing Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees for such use.

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).

Employers' aforementioned policies, practices, and/or procedures resulted in Employees and other current and former aggrieved California-based employees not receiving indemnification for employment-related expenditures, in violation of Labor Code 2802.

Based on this violation, Employees will seek both restitution for themselves and other current and former aggrieved California-based employees for Employers' violations of Labor Code section 2802 and will seek civil penalties under PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, on behalf of the LWDA against Employers if authorized to file a representative action on behalf of the State of California.

6. *Failure To Pay Wages for Accrued Paid Sick Days At The Regular Rate of Pay In Violation Of Labor Code Section 246*

Defendants had a policy and/or procedure where Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees accrued paid sick time.

Labor Code section 246, subdivision (a), states in relevant part “[a]n employee who...works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.” Additionally, an employee accrues paid sick days at the rate of no-less-than one (1) hour per every thirty (30) hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment. Labor Code section 246(b).

Here, Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees were employed by Employers for 30 or more days and were entitled to paid sick days. Also, Employee and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees began accruing paid sick days since the beginning of each of their respective employment with Employers.

Labor Code section 246, subdivision (l), provides that an employer shall calculate the paid sick time for non-exempt employees in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee elected to use paid sick time. “The regular rate at which an employee is employed shall be deemed to include all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf, of the employee.” See Division of Labor Standards Enforcement – Enforcement Policies and Interpretations Manual, Section 49.1.2.

In this case, Employee alleges that when he and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees elected to use paid sick time, Employers failed to pay them sick time wages at the proper sick time rate of pay due to Employers’ failure to include all remuneration when calculating the sick time rate of pay. Specifically, Employers maintained a policy, practice, and/or procedure of failing to include all remuneration including but not limited to shift premium pay and commission pay for example, when calculating Employees and other current and former aggrieved California-based hourly non-exempt employees’ regular rate of pay for the purpose of paying sick time. 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).

7. *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.

8. *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 with 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).

9. *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.

10. 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, overtime 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.

11. 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 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 minimum wages, overtime 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.

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, 223, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, 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 & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP



Vincent C. Granberry, Esq.

9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 48

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

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

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

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
 Registered Agent for Process of Service
 c/o Corporate Creations Network Inc.
 7801 Folsom Boulevard, Suite #202
 Sacramento, CA 95826

PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7500-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions

USPS TRACKING#



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

9590 9402 9439 5069 7982 87


**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


DELIVERED TO: DADA Letter
FRANCISCO NORRIS. SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC

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



9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 48

FIRST-CLASS



US POSTAGE
ZIP 90211
02 7H
0006127020 SEP 04 2025
\$011.310

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:

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
Registered Agent for Process of Service
c/o Corporate Creations Network Inc.
7801 Folsom Boulevard, Suite #202
Sacramento, CA 95826

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 48

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

☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery

☒ Certified Mail®

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Collect on Delivery

☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery

☐ Mail

☐ Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Registered Mail™

☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation™

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 55

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

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

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	\$ _____

Postage \$ _____

Postmark Here

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
 Attn.: Legal Department
 1501 NW 49th Street, Suite 100
 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

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

USPS TRACKING#

9590 9402 9439 5069 7982 94

United States Postal Service


First-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 90211

DLVG1JLJTLda: PAGA letter
 Francisco Novas vs. Sixt Rent a Car, LLC

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



9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 55

US POSTAGE PITNEY BOWES
ZIP 90211 \$011.310
02 7H SEP 04 2025
0006127620
FIRST-CLASS

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:

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
Attn.: Legal Department
1501 NW 49th Street, Suite 100
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 55

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 | |
| ☐ Mail Restricted Delivery (00) | |

Domestic Return Receipt

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC

Attn.: Legal Department

1501 NW 49th Street, Suite 100

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309

9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 62

U.S. Postal ServiceTM
CERTIFIED MAIL[®] RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

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

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

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
Attn.: Legal Department
990 W 8th St
Los Angeles, CA 90017

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

USPS TRACKING #



9590 9402 9439 5069 7983 00



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

JLIVGJKEJda: PAGA letter
FRANSSCOWA vs. SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC


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



9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 62

SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC
Attn.: Legal Department
990 W 8th St
Los Angeles, CA 90017

FIRST-CLASS



US POSTAGE
MILITARY BOWES
ZIP 90211 \$011.31
02 7H
0006127620 SEP 04 2025

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
■ 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.		A. Signature X ☐ Agent ☐ Addressee	
1. Article Addressed to:		B. Received by (Printed Name)	C. Date of Delivery
SIXT RENT A CAR, LLC Attn.: Legal Department 990 W 8th St Los Angeles, CA 90017		D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No	
2. Article Number (Transfer from service label) 9589 0710 5270 3098 3387 62		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	
PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053		Mail Restricted Delivery (00) Domestic Return Receipt	