



October 14, 2025

BY ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

Re: A. TEICHERT & SON, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Salvador Garibay Flores against A. Teichert & Son, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, agents, and executive employees) (collectively referred to as "Teichert") for violations of California wage-and-hour laws. Mr. Flores seeks penalties for violations of the California Labor Code, which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, et seq., the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") and all other remedies available under PAGA.

Mr. Flores seeks these remedies on behalf of the State of California and "aggrieved employees," as defined herein. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Teichert employed Mr. Flores as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2018 to approximately June 2025, in the State of California.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Flores may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the above-referenced entities within the State of California.

Based on the following facts and theories, Teichert has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and IWC Wage Orders including *inter alia*, Wage Orders 4-2001 and 16-2001.

Teichert required Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees to perform work before their scheduled shifts, after their scheduled shifts, during off-the-clock meal breaks, and/or during rest breaks and failed to compensate Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees for this time. Such work included, but was not limited to, construction labor, attending meetings, responding to work-related communications, transporting materials, travelling between work sites, fueling work vehicles, donning and doffing, and completing other regular tasks/duties.

California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 require employers to pay time-and-a-half or double time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates at one-and-one-half times or double the regular rate of pay, including additional remuneration. During the relevant time period, Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. Therefore, Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each meal or rest period that is not provided. During the relevant time period, Teichert required Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees to work during meal and rest periods and failed to compensate them properly for non-compliant meal and rest periods including, *inter alia*, short, late, interrupted, and missed meal and rest periods. Teichert also required Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees to stay on work premises during rest periods.

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. During the relevant time period, Teichert failed to pay Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including earned and unpaid minimum, overtime, and premium wages as discussed above.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Teichert failed to pay Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, including earned and unpaid minimum, overtime, and premium wages as discussed above.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, Teichert did not provide Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from Teichert were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include the total hours worked by Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees, including time spent working off-the-clock and during meal and rest periods as discussed above.

California Labor Code sections 551 and 552 require that every person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest in a seven-day workweek, that no employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in a workweek, and that an employer shall pay a civil penalty in the amounts of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation. During the relevant time period, Mr. Flores and the aggrieved employees were required to regularly and/or consistently work in excess of six (6) days in a workweek. During the relevant time period, Mr. Flores and the aggrieved employees were required to work in excess of thirty (30) hours in a week and/or six (6) hours in any one (1) day thereof, during workweeks in which they were required to work in excess of six (6) days. During the relevant time period, Mr. Flores and the aggrieved employees were required to work in excess of six (6) days in a workweek without accumulating or being provided the opportunity to take at least one (1) day of rest, and when Mr. Flores and the aggrieved employees accumulated days of rest, they were not actually provided the opportunity to take the equivalent of one (1) day's rest in seven (7) during each calendar month.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, Teichert failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the actual hours worked daily and the wages earned by Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees, including earned and unpaid minimum, overtime, and premium wages as discussed above.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, Teichert did not provide Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled for work performed "off-the-clock."

California Labor Code section 1198 provides that "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 Orders 4-2001 and 16-2001, 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, Teichert failed to pay Mr. Flores 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 at the employee's regular rate of pay for workdays in which Mr. Flores and the other aggrieved employees reported to work and were furnished less than half the usual or scheduled day's work. During the relevant time period, Teichert failed to pay Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees for two (2) hours at the employee's regular rate of pay on days in which Mr. Flores 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.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee 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. During the relevant time period, Mr. Flores and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Teichert. These costs include, but are not limited to, the use of personal phones for business-related purposes,, the purchasing and maintenance of specialty footwear in compliance with company policy, and the purchasing of tools, supplies, and/or equipment for business-related purposes.

Therefore, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, Mr. Flores seeks all applicable penalties arising out of the above-referenced wage, hour, and payroll practices, or which could be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, for violation of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA, including civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 558.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

With kind regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Arman Marukyan', is positioned above the printed name.

Arman Marukyan, Esq.

Cc: (By U.S. Certified Mail / Return Receipt Requested)

A. Teichert & Son, Inc.
c/o C T Corporation System
Agent for Service of Process
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

LAWYERS FOR JUSTICE
450 N. BRAND BLVD., SUITE 900 / GLENDALE, CA 91203

CERTIFIED MAIL



PITNEY-BOWES
\$10.73
US POSTAGESM
FIRST-CLASSSM
028V000312049
Z000000000
ZIP 91203
OCT 14 2023

9589 0710 5270 2988 9568 40
9589 0710 5270 2988 9568 40

PAGA Notice
Salvador Garibay Flores v. A. Teichert &

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

OFFICIAL U

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 | \$ |

A. Teichert & Son, Inc.
c/o C T Corporation System
Agent for Service of Process
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203

38

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.

A. Teichert & Son, Inc.
c/o C T Corporation System
Agent for Service of Process
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203



9590 9402 8473 3186 0555 18

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

9589 0710 5270 2988 9568 40

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature		☐ Agent
X		☐ Addressee
B. Received by (Printed Name)	C. Date of Delivery	
D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes		☐ No
If YES, enter delivery address below:		

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
 - ☐ Mail Restricted Delivery
 - ☐ Priority Mail Express®
 - ☐ Registered Mail™
 - ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
 - ☐ Signature Confirmation™
 - ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt