

October 13, 2025

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL (RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED)

Agent for Service of Process for MidPen Property Management Corporation:
Matthew O Franklin
303 Vintage Park Dr., Suite 250
Foster City, CA 94404

Re: Robinson Barrientos v. MidPen Property Management Corporation

Dear Labor and Workforce Development Agency and MidPen Property Management Corporation:

This letter shall serve as Robinson Barrientos' ("Mr. Barrientos") written notice as required by California Labor Code 2699.3(a)(1) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by MidPen Property Management Corporation ("MPMC"), including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Mr. Barrientos intends to seek civil penalties against MPMC under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") on his own behalf and on behalf of all other non-exempt employees currently or formerly employed by MPMC in California during the statutory period ("Aggrieved Employees"). Mr. Barrientos is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that there are at least 100 Aggrieved Employees in the statutory period.

Labor Code Provisions Alleged to Have Been Violated

Mr. Barrientos alleges MPMC violated the following Labor Code provisions: Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802.

Facts and Theories Supporting Each Alleged Violation

Mr. Barrientos was employed by MPMC in San Jose, California as a non-exempt maintenance technician from approximately February 2025 to approximately August 2025.

Minimum, Overtime, and Sick Wages

Throughout the statutory period, MPMC failed to pay Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees at least the legal minimum wage for all hours worked due to MPMC's policy and practice of requiring Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees to report to work without furnishing no less than half of their usual or scheduled 8-hour day's work without payment of no less than 4 hours of pay. Further, MPMC failed to pay Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees all overtime and sick wages due to MPMC's policy and practice of failing to include the value of lodging and utilities paid by MPMC to Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees as part of wages in the regular rate of pay. As a result, MPMC failed to pay Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees for all minimum, overtime, and sick wages due in violation of Labor Code §§ 246, 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Meal Periods

Throughout the statutory period, MPMC failed to provide Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees with 30-minute meal periods for every 5 hours worked as required by Labor Code § 512. Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees frequently worked shifts over five hours and did not receive lawful meal periods because they were discouraged from taking meal periods, were interrupted during their meal periods, were required to remain on call during meal periods, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all lawful meal periods, among other reasons. Further, when Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees worked shifts over ten hours, they did not receive a second meal period. As a result, their meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted. MPMC failed to pay Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they suffered a meal period violation. As a result, MPMC failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premiums in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.

Rest Periods

Throughout the statutory period, MPMC failed to authorize and permit Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees to take 10-minute rest periods for every 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof. Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees were required and/or incentivized to work through their rest periods, discouraged from taking their rest periods, required to remain on call during their rest periods, and/or were not relieved of all duties in order to take all rest periods. MPMC failed to pay Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees an additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when they suffered a rest period violation. As a result, MPMC failed to permit rest periods and pay rest period premiums in violation of Labor Code § 226.7.

Reimbursement

Throughout the statutory period, MPMC failed to reimburse necessary business expenditures in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Specifically, MPMC made it necessary for Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees to use their personal devices in order to clock in and out on a mobile application. MPMC failed to reimburse Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees for this expense of using their personal devices for work purposes.

Wage Statements

Due to MPMC's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, MPMC failed to provide Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements that accurately reported 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 § 226. This failure was knowing and intentional.

Timing of Wage Payments

Due to MPMC's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, MPMC failed to pay all wages due during Mr. Barrientos' and other Aggrieved Employees' employment and at the end of their employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, and 210. This failure was willful and intentional.

///



Recordkeeping

Due to MPMC's wage, meal period, rest period, and deduction violations as alleged above, MPMC failed to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked each day by Mr. Barrientos and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5.

Based on these violations, Mr. Barrientos seeks civil penalties, injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees and costs under PAGA. Enclosed and incorporated herein is the class action complaint Mr. Barrientos will be filing on behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees against MPMC. Mr. Barrientos intends to amend the complaint to add a cause of action under PAGA 65 days after the date of this notice pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A).

Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Fawn F. Bekam", written in a cursive style.

Fawn F. Bekam

Enclosure: Class Action Complaint