



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 1 of 7

VIA ONLINE FILING

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, CA 95814

PAGAfiling@dir.ca.gov

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

RE: Eric Daniel Mize v. Riverside PostAcute Care, LLC

Dear Representative:

This office represents Eric Daniel Mize ("**Mr. Mize**") with respect to his claims under the California Labor Code against Riverside PostAcute Care, LLC ("**Employer**"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified mail.

Employer has employed Mr. Mize since approximately March 2019, as an hourly, non-exempt employee. During his employment with Employer, Mr. Mize has been employed as a Certified Nursing Assistant. Employer operates a skilled nursing and rehabilitation facility.

Mr. Mize intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("**PAGA**"). Mr. Mize is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt employees of Employer ("**Aggrieved Employees**"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employer violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Mr. Mize's employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("**IWC Wage Order**") including *inter alia*, IWC Wage Order No. 5. The claims made on behalf of Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employer has engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

First, Employer regularly required Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, but failed to pay them overtime compensation for such work. Employer also failed to provide Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees with adequate training as to



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 2 of 7

the payment of overtime compensation, all in an effort to keep its workers uninformed as to their legal right to overtime compensation. In addition, Employer regularly required Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employer and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Moreover, this off-the-clock work typically caused Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in week, resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation.

In addition to requiring Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation, Employer also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in a failure to pay Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for all hours actually worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employer failed to pay overtime to Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employer has failed to pay Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek unpaid wages; PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employer failed to provide Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees with legally-compliant 30-minute meal periods. Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were required by Employer to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employer regularly required Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. On the occasions that Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short.

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 3 of 7

prevented Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employee's right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), and 1198.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employer failed to authorize and permit Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees take legally-compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employer required Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 4 of 7

provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employee's right to receive rest periods.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

As to each pay period, Employer has failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 5 of 7

California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

Employer has failed to maintain accurate records relating to Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. IWC Wage Order No. 5 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employer. These costs include, but are not limited to, expenses for uniforms.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO PAY REPORTING TIME

Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1198, "the employment of any employee... under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Industrial Wage Orders] is unlawful." The applicable Industrial Wage Orders, including *inter alia*, Wage Order No. 5-2001, require that for each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay. Further, if an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting, said employee shall be paid for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay.

During the relevant time period, Employer failed to pay Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees half the usual or scheduled day's work in an amount no less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours



237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 6 of 7

at the employee's regular rate of pay for workdays in which Mr. Mize and the other Aggrieved Employees reported to work and were furnished less than half the usual or scheduled day's work. Employer also failed to pay Mr. Mize and other Aggrieved Employees for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay on days in which Mr. Mize and the other Aggrieved Employees were required to report for work a second time in one workday and were furnished less than two (2) hours of work upon the second reporting.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Upon the termination of employment, Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due to them within twenty-four (24) hours or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employer's practices of requiring Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employer failed to pay Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employer also failed to pay Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums, and rest period premiums, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Mr. Mize and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203, 1199, and 2699(f)(2); and attorneys' fees and costs.

Therefore, on behalf of himself, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, Mr. Mize may seek all applicable penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Amir Nayebdadash', is written over a horizontal line.

Amir Nayebdadash

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (9415 5118 9956 2704 0340 50)

RIVERSIDE POSTACUTE CARE, LLC
8781 Lakeview Ave.
Riverside, CA 92509



PROTECTION LAW GROUP LLP

237 California Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Amir Nayebdadash, Esq.
amir@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

March 3, 2023
Page 7 of 7

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (9415 5118 9956 2704 0308 47)

RIVERSIDE POSTACUTE CARE, LLC
721 N. Euclid, Suite 200
Anaheim, CA 92801

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (9415 5118 9956 2704 0104 36)

RIVERSIDE POSTACUTE CARE, LLC
Attn: Amanda Garcia, Agent for Service of Process
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203