September 4, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:
https://dir.tfaforms.net/128
Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL TO:
(by certified mail to South Coast Medical Center For New Medicine, Inc.)

South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc.
6 Hughes, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92618
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5885 3742 12

Patrick Anthony McCall
Agent for Service of Process for South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc.
625 The City Drive, Ste 345
Orange, CA 92868
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5885 3747 79

Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq*. Penalties - PAGA Notice Letter to LWDA
Leila Z. Dastjerdi v. South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc.
Superior Court for the County of Orange

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Leila Z. Dastjerdi ("Plaintiff") and other similarly aggrieved employees employed as non-exempt, hourly, patient coordinators, receptionists, and in related positions at Defendants' facility and office locations in California during the relevant period (collectively "Aggrieved Employees") for, *inter alia*, violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.7, 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, 2698, and 2699, *et seq*.; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*.

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq*. ("the Act"). Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc., and Does 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as "Defendants").

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act, along with Plaintiff's Class Action Complaint. Plaintiff will be filing an amended complaint in the Class Action currently pending in Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2024-0137034-CU-OE-CXC, to assert the PAGA Claims in this Notice letter.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The Operative Class Action Complaint will provide the details of Plaintiff's class-wide claims and representative claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, will address in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Defendants employed employed other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees in similar and related positions based out of Defendants' medical center in Irvine, California and California facilities. Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees worked at Defendants' behest without being paid all wages due and without being provided all required breaks. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees were employed by Defendants and shared similar job duties and responsibilities, were subjected to the same policies and practices, and endured similar violations at Defendants' hands.

Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock and failed to accurately record the hours they were on the clock, failed to pay them at the appropriate rates for all hours worked, failed to pay all wages due and owing at termination or resignation, and failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements that prevented them from learning of these unlawful pay practices. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with lawful meal and rest periods, as Employees were required to remain under Defendants' control and were not provided with the opportunity to take full uninterrupted and duty-free rest periods and meal breaks, as required by the Labor Code and the applicable paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders.

Defendant South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc. is a California stock corporation that lists its principal address in Irvine, California with the California Secretary of State. It lists a registered corporate agent with an address in Orange, California, in Orange County. South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine ("South Coast") lists its type of business as "Medical Center." The wage statements issued to Plaintiff list South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine as her employer with an address in Irvine, California. South Coast's website explains that: "The Center focuses on a precise, personalized approach to healthcare that includes, prevention, early detection of cancer, and internal medicine."

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing, including compensation for off the clock work, uncompliant meal and rest breaks, and

Defendants' failure to furnish accurate wage statements, all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders.

During the course of Plaintiff's and the Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed (resulting in "off the clock" work) and for all their overtime hours worked, and they were not paid at the required rates for overtime. This has resulted in systematic and ongoing violations of the California Labor Code and relevant IWC Wage Orders. Upon information and belief, Defendants employ other non-exempt, hourly employees as patient coordinators, receptionists, and in similar and related positions based out of their medical center in California.

Plaintiff was generally scheduled to work five days per week for eight hours per shift, with shift times generally spanning from 8:30 a.m. through 5:00 p.m. On many occasions, Plaintiff was also required to work longer shifts with an additional hour or two of time approved by Defendants to be paid at overtime premium rates. However, Plaintiff was required by Defendants to endure substantial off-the-clock work before and after her scheduled shift hours.

Defendants' policy and practice of requiring systematic off-the-clock work flowed in part from their unlawful timekeeping procedures. Defendants required timekeeping entries to be inputted into the company time clock by Employees. While Defendants required time punch records for shift start and end times and meal period beginning and end times, they were oftentimes not recorded contemporaneously with the actual hours worked. Upon arriving to the medical center, Plaintiff generally made her way to the time clock that was located towards the back of the medical center. However, on many occasions, Plaintiff was interrupted with questions and interactions by patients before Plaintiff had a chance to reach the time clock and clock in. Plaintiff believes that she was expected to prioritize these discussions and recalls that such interactions spanned anywhere from 1-10 minutes, depending on the patient and the patient's needs, and Defendants' timekeeping procedures failed to account for this off-the-clock work.

Additionally, Defendants instructed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to record in the timekeeping system that they took a thirty for a meal period and did so before the fifth hour of work as required under the Labor Code and Wage Orders. Defendants instructed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to thus record compliant meal breaks without regard to whether they were actually taken on time or for the full duration or were interrupted by patient and management demands and other work requirements. Additionally, by deducting 30 minutes for a meal period that was generally not lawfully provided, Defendants effectively and unlawfully deducted at least 30 minutes of hours worked from each Employee's daily work shifts.

Defendants' managers also expected Plaintiff to be available to work and respond to work-related inquiries after scheduled work hours. Defendants' managers, colleagues, and patients regularly contacted Plaintiff by calling her personal cell phone regarding work-related matters and scheduling and would do so throughout the workday, during meal periods, and after work hours. Plaintiff estimates that she spent about 3-4 hours a week off the clock responding to patients' questions and arranging schedules. These off-the-clock hours were not recorded, and Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff for such work. Additional off-the-clock work occurred in the form of the unlawful deduction of 30 minutes of hours worked for an alleged thirty-minute long meal period that was provided generally untimely or were interrupted by patients, managers, and work demands.

Overtime hours were generally not allowed, and Plaintiff was frequently reminded by Defendants' managers to clock out before the eight-hour mark of any given shift even if she was compelled to continue working or otherwise remain under Defendants' control. This strict overtime avoidance policy compelled Plaintiff to work many hours off the clock and without compensation. Additionally, to whatever extent Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees performance-based bonuses and any other form of remuneration such as shift differentials and the like in addition to hourly pay, Defendants failed to include it in the regular rate used to calculate and pay the overtime they did pay.

Plaintiff was therefore not paid for all her hours worked at the required minimum, overtime, and double time wage rates due to Defendants' uniformly applied and unlawful policy and practice of requiring her to work off the clock and without pay. Defendants systematically underpaid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by failing to pay them at the required overtime rates for all hours over eight in a work shift or over forty in a work week, and all hours over twelve in a day at the required double time rate. Upon information and belief, the Aggrieved Employees were bound by similar scheduling and timekeeping policies and endured similar violations at Defendants' hands as Plaintiff.

Defendants have failed to maintain timekeeping records for Plaintiff that would permit Plaintiff to discover the nature and extent of the off-the-clock work Defendants required and the actual hours Plaintiff worked or the breaks she received. By failing to pay for all hours worked, and by under-recording regular hours to the detriment of the the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants have committed knowing and intentional ongoing violations of the record-keeping requirements under the Labor Code, including section 1174, by either failing to maintain records or retaining inaccurate ones.

The failure to pay for all hours worked and underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful compensation policies and practices, which upon information and belief applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees based out of Defendants' California medical centers. As a result of the above-described unlawful requirements to work off the clock, the failure to accurately record all hours worked and pay wages at the correct rates, and the other wage violations they endured at Defendants' hands, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight hours in any given day and/or more than forty hours in any given week.

Therefore, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Employees for all hours worked and failing to pay minimum wages for all time worked, as required by California law. Also, Defendants had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Employees overtime compensation at premium overtime rates for all hours worked in excess of eight hours a day and/or forty hours a week in violation of Labor Code § 510 and the corresponding sections of IWC Wage Orders.

Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with their required meal periods and at least two ten-minute rest breaks as required at a minimum for Plaintiff's scheduled shift durations. The above-described off-the-clock work contributed to Defendants' common policy of failing to provide lawful meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, as required under the Labor Code and Paragraph 11 of the IWC Wage Order(s). Defendants similarly failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take all required 10-minute rest breaks, as required under the Labor Code and Paragraph 12 of the IWC Wage Order(s).

More specifically, Plaintiff worked shifts that entitled her to at least one meal period. While managers instructed Plaintiff to take a thirty-minute break before the fifth hour of work, such policy was rarely enforced. Meal periods were not scheduled, and instead, Plaintiff was expected by management to take her meal period only after working attending to the needs of the medical center. To whatever extent the meal period policy was enforced, it went by the wayside quickly as there always seemed to be a patient issue to resolve, a phone call to take, or a message to respond to. This led to systematically late and on-duty meal periods that were incessantly interrupted by patient and management demands and required job duties and tasks to be performed, which required Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks. Defendants' managers also required Plaintiff to carry her cell phone with her during her meal periods in case there was a work demand she had to attend to, thus exerting further control over her during what were supposed to be duty-free break time. These management expectations also contributed to the Aggrieved Employees working through meal periods or not taking them or taking them late so work could be accomplished, or they were otherwise required to remain under Defendants' control during meal periods.

Additionally, Defendants instructed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to input into the timekeeping system that they took a full thirty minutes for a meal period as required under the Labor Code and Wage Orders. Defendants instructed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to thus record compliant meal breaks without regard to whether they were taken for the full duration or were interrupted by patient and management demands and other work requirements. Plaintiff recalls that her meal periods were interrupted on about 2-3 occasions per week, and despite this fact, Defendants required Plaintiff to record that she took a thirty-minute meal period on each work shift without regard to whether it was actually taken or was otherwise unlawful.

Therefore, meal period violations systematically occurred throughout all of Plaintiff's work shifts where Defendants both failed to provide a lawful meal period or penalty payment and then also unlawfully deducted 30 minutes from Plaintiff's hours worked for the day. To the extent Defendants ever did pay Plaintiff a meal period premium, they failed to include all forms of remuneration beyond hourly wages in the regular hourly rate used to pay the one-hour premium payment. Upon information and belief, the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to similar unlawful policies and practices and endured similar violations as Plaintiff.

Defendants thus failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five hours during a shift without receiving compliant meal periods. Additionally, as addressed above, Defendants followed a practice of requiring off-the-clock work in a manner that would impact when Employees were to receive meal periods and rest breaks and required them to respond to work calls and inquiries and other demands during breaks, thus leading to further violations.

Upon information and belief, Defendants' systems did not automatically generate a meal period premium under Labor Code § 226.7 for meal periods that commenced after five hours into a work shift or in the event the time punch records reflected a meal period of less than thirty minutes. However, upon information and belief, in the event Defendants did pay any meal period premiums, they did so at the employee's customary regular rate of hourly compensation without including all forms of remuneration in that hourly rate calculation, for example by omitting performance-based bonuses and the like from the rate at which meal premiums were paid.

Defendants thus followed uniformly applied policies of not providing all required meal periods to their Employees. Meal periods were often not properly provided, as work demands and computer and phone time impermissibly shortened their breaks. Even when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were able to take a meal period, it was generally interrupted by work duties or was taken after the fifth hour of work. Additionally, as addressed above, Defendants followed a practice of requiring off-the-clock work in a manner that would impact when Employees were to receive meal periods and rest breaks, thus leading to further violations.

As a result, Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all legally required off-duty, unpaid meal periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. As further detailed above, Defendants also failed to pay Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Employee's effective regular hourly rate of compensation for each meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Similar violations resulted from Defendants' failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the the Aggrieved Employees to take duty-free, net ten-minute rest breaks for every four hours of shift work, or major fraction thereof. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were either not authorized permitted the opportunity to take a rest break, or were required to remain under Defendants' control and respond to calls and instructions from management and job and patient demands if and when they even attempted to take one. Upon information and belief, Defendants thus also failed to authorize and permit employees to leave the premises during rest breaks, evidencing Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to remain under their control during required off-duty rest break times.
Rest breaks were neither scheduled nor contemplated by Defendants. During Plaintiff's entire employment duration with Defendants, she cannot recall a time when she took a break, despite being entitled to receive at least two paid, timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free ten minute rest

breaks during each of her work shifts. Defendants' managers also failed to inform_Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that they were entitled to receive at least two ten-minute rest breaks during shifts of at least eight hours.

During rest periods, employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were and are under Defendants' control when they are working through rest breaks and remaining under Defendants' control. In the event that Defendant's ever did provide a rest break, Defendants provided either impermissibly shortened or untimely meal and rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were thus not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods, were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks, and were not provided with one hour's wages in lieu thereof. They were required to remain on-duty during breaks or portions of their breaks, thus making them either untimely or shortened and on-duty, and they were also prevented from leaving the premises and otherwise remain under Defendants' control during rest breaks under Defendants' uniformly applied policies and practices.

From at least four years prior to the filing of this lawsuit and continuing to the present, Defendants have also consistently violated Labor Code § 221 by unlawfully collecting or deducting the Employees' earned wages, including by the above described off the clock work and on-duty work while on unpaid meal breaks. In addition to failing to authorize and permit rest breaks, Defendants unlawfully deducted up to 30 additional minutes for alleged thirty-minute long meal periods that were rarely provided or otherwise received without violation. Thus, by deducting 30 minutes for a meal that was generally not lawfully provided if at all, Defendants effectively and unlawfully deducted up to 30 minutes of hours worked from each Employee's daily work shifts. By not compensating Employees for all hours worked and other deductions from total wages, Defendants unlawfully deducted wages earned in violation of Labor Code § 221.

Defendants also violated California Labor Code § 246 by not providing all required paid sick days to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Labor Code § 246 provides that an 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 as specified in this section." Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees with all their required and earned sick days, in violation of Labor Code § 246. Additionally and upon information and belief, Defendants have failed to provide COVID-19 supplemental sick leave to the Aggrieved Employees during the relevant time period, including by failing to provide two work weeks of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave as required under Labor Code §§ 248.1 and 248.2 and including damages and penalties as these sections are enforced through Labor Code § 248.5, which requires that: "If paid sick days were unlawfully withheld, the dollar amount of paid sick days withheld from the employee multiplied by three, or two hundred fifty dollars ($250), whichever amount is greater, but not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), shall be included in the administrative penalty." Plaintiff accordingly seeks this relief available for Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their required and earned sick days and all their COVID-19 supplemental sick leave in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, and the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Defendants have also consistently failed to provide the Aggrieved Employees with timely, accurate, and itemized wage statements, in writing, as required by California wage-and-hour laws, including by the above-described requirement of off the clock work, failure to pay all overtime and double time wages owed and failure to pay them at the appropriate premium rates, and failure to pay premium wages for unprovided or otherwise unlawful meal and rest breaks, or by miscalculating any overtime or meal period or rest break premium wages and by the systematic and unlawful deductions Defendants took from Employee wages. Defendants have also made it difficult to account with precision for the unlawfully withheld wages and meal and rest period compensation owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, during the liability period, including because they did not calculate the regular rate of pay correctly when paying overtime or meal period premiums and because they did not implement and preserve a record-keeping method as required for non-exempt employees by California Labor Code §§ 226, 1174(d), and paragraph 7 of the applicable California Wage Orders. Upon information and belief, time clock punches were not maintained or were not accurately maintained for work shifts and meal periods, which were automatically presumed by Defendants to have been lawfully provided when they were not. Defendants also failed to accurately record and pay for all regular and overtime hours worked and submitted by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, including by failing to pay all overtime hours at the correctly calculated overtime premium rate. Defendants also failed to accurately list the name of the entity that is the Aggrieved Employees and failed to accurately list total hours worked during a pay period.

Defendants have thus also failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) by inaccurately reporting total hours worked and total wages earned by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, along with the appropriate applicable rates, among others requirements. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are therefore entitled to penalties not to exceed $4,000.00 for each employee pursuant to Labor Code § 226(b). Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, and wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked.

Defendants also required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated. They were required to endure off the clock work addressed above during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods and were not provided with sick pay and supplemental sick leave and were subjected to systematic off the clock work. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday or failed to pay it at the correct rate, as addressed above. Therefore, Defendants have also followed a uniform and consistent policy of failing to pay all wages owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination or within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California wage-and-hour laws, including Labor Code § 203.

Additionally, Defendants have regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the course of performing their required job duties without reimbursement. These included the cell phone-related expenses Plaintiff incurred in responding to calls and text messages regarding work-related inquiries from managers, colleagues, and patients. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees must be reimbursed for these necessary business expenses under Labor Code § 2802 and Defendants systematically failed to do so.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:
As addressed above and in further detail in the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages
Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he 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." The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

Defendants failed to pay Employees the minimum wages they were owed, including by their consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for all hours worked. Employees would work hours and not receive wages, including as alleged above in connection with off the clock work, including all the time required to remain on duty and under Defendants' control during breaks and due to the work demands placed upon them by Defendants' management and due to unlawful rounding. Defendants, and each of them, have also intentionally and improperly rounded, changed, adjusted and/or modified Employee hours, or required Employees to do so, and imposed difficult to attain job and shift scheduling requirements on Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in off the clock work and underpayment of all wages owed to Employees over a period of time, while benefiting Defendants. During the relevant time period, Defendants thus regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Aggrieved Employees, including by requiring systematic off the clock work. Defendants' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Aggrieved Employees as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees as to minimum wage pay.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional, and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including hours at their required regular, overtime, and double-time rates. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and improperly rounded, changed, adjusted and/or modified certain employees' hours, including Plaintiff's, or required Aggrieved Employees to do so, or otherwise caused them to work off the clock to avoid paying Aggrieved Employees all earned and owed straight time and overtime wages and other benefits, in violation of the California Labor Code, the California Code of Regulations and the IWC Wage Orders and guidelines set forth by the Division of Labor Standards and Enforcement.

Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiff and other similarly situated non-exempt employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties or to attend and participate in company required activities or remain under Defendant's control. When considered in combination with the unlawful rounding to their detriment, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime rates or the correct overtime rate (addressed above) for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Based on information and belief, Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiff and other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods due to the work demands placed upon them by Defendants' management, were provided with breaks late and well after the fifth hour of work, could not be relieved to take breaks, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty breaks or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required breaks due to Defendants' policies and practices.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or interrupted by having to respond to work demands or remain under Defendant's control, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants generally failed to authorize and permit any rest breaks, or provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations, and Defendants' policies and procedures required Aggrieved Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks to respond job requirements or simply failed to authorize and permit them at all.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest break not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their effective hourly rates of pay for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff is seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks, and unlawfully received or collected wages, as discussed above, and failed to list accurate rates of pay due to miscalculations of overtime and premium pay. In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code §226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, …"

<u>Unlawfully Collecting or Receiving Wages in Violation of Labor Code § 221</u>
Labor Code § 221 provides, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." As discussed above, Defendants have consistently violated Labor Code § 221 by unlawfully collecting or deducting the Employees' earned wages, including by the above described off the clock work and unlawful rounding and overtime miscalculation. By not compensating Employees for all hours worked, Defendant unlawfully deducted wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees, in violation of Labor Code § 221.

In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558. Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

<u>Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204</u>
In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods and by rounding. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday, or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees, and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, by unlawful rounding and off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiff asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days and COVID-19 Supplemental Sick Leave
Defendants violated California Labor Code § 246 by not providing all required paid sick days to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Labor Code § 246 provides that an 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 as specified in this section." Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees with all their required and earned sick days and paid at the correct rates, in violation of Labor Code § 246. Defendants have also failed to provide COVID-19 supplemental sick leave and paid at the correct rates to the Aggrieved Employees during the relevant time period, including by failing to provide two work weeks of COVID-19 supplemental paid sick leave as required under Labor Code §§ 248.1 and 248.2 and including damages and penalties as these sections are enforced through Labor Code § 248.5, which requires that: "If paid sick days were unlawfully withheld, the dollar amount of paid sick days withheld from the employee multiplied by three, or two hundred fifty dollars ($250), whichever amount is greater, but not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), shall be included in the administrative penalty."

Plaintiff accordingly seeks this relief available for Defendants' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with all their required and earned sick days and all their COVID-19 supplemental sick leave in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, and the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses Under Labor Code § 2802
Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay for necessary work-related expenses they incurred. These included the cell phone-related expenses Plaintiff incurred in responding to work communications from supervisors and tools such as a thermometer and blood pressure cuff. Defendants thus uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work-related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees.

Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California

Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*
Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*.

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*. and Recovery Bases:
After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: 201, 202, 203, 204, 221, 226, 226.7, 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1185, 1194, 1194.1, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, and 2698 *et seq*., including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days and COVID-19 Supplemental Sick Leave: For Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their required and earned sick days and all their COVID-19 supplemental sick leave in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, and the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 246, 248.1, 248.2, 248.5, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(d) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code §226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, …";

(e) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) Unlawful Deductions and Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' unlawful deductions from wages and for Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 221, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 221, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1); and

(g) All Other Alleged Violations of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders: For any above-addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter therefore provides the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc., a California stock corporation and any other named Defendants. To prevent the violations described herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Regards,
D.LAW, INC.

Alvin B. Lindsay
a.lindsay@d.law
William Tran
w.tran@d.law

Cc: South Coast Medical Center for New Medicine, Inc., a California stock corporation by Certified Mail