

FILED

MAR 05 2026

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF FRESNO

BY _____ DEPUTY

1 Megan E Ross (SBN 227776)

Megan@abramsonlabor.com

2 Adam Witkin (SBN 338784)

Adam@abramsonlabor.com

3 **ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP**

4 1700 W. Burbank Boulevard

Burbank, California 91506

5 Tel: (213) 493-6300

6 Fax: (213) 382-4083

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff

8 NATHAN CASTANEDA, individually

and on behalf of others similarly situated

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **FOR THE COUNTY OF FRESNO**

11 NATHAN CASTANEDA, individually and on
12 behalf of others similarly situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15
16 FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY, a
17 California Stock Corporation, and DOES 1
through 25, inclusive,

18 Defendants.

Case No.: 26CECG01119

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES AND ENFORCEMENT ACTION
UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194,
1197 and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum
Wages)
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510
and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7
and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period
Premiums)
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7
(Unpaid Rest Period Premiums)
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a)
(Failure to Provide Accurate Wage
Statements)
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201,
202 and 203 (Untimely Final Wages)
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800
and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse
Necessary Business Expenses)
- (8) Violation of Cal. Business &
Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*
- (9) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2699,
et seq. (Private Attorneys General Act)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff NATHAN CASTANEDA (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follows against Defendants FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive (“Defendants”):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants for California Labor Code violations, unfair business practices, and civil penalties stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wage, failure to pay overtime compensation, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to provide accurate wage statements, failure to maintain accurate time and payroll records, failure to timely pay wages during and upon termination of employment, and failure to reimburse necessary business-related expenses.

2. Plaintiff’s First through Eighth Causes of Action are brought as a class action on behalf of himself and similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members”) pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof of trial.

3. Plaintiff’s Ninth Cause of Action is brought as a representative action on behalf of himself and certain other current and former employees of Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY against whom one of more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”) pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee against whom one or more of the alleged violations occurred. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This is a class action brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

5. The monetary damages, restitution, statutory penalties, and other applicable legal and equitable relief sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and

will be established according to proof at trial.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue because the claims asserted herein are based solely on California law.

8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Fresno.

THE PARTIES

9. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY was and is, an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the state of California, and whose employees are engaged throughout Fresno County and the State of California.

10. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY and/or DOES 1 through 25, each acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants represent and were in accordance with Defendants' official policies.

12. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiff so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

13. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class members, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff and the other class members' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

14. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiff and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and the other class members.

15. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other class members.

16. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

17. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

18. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately November 23, 2024, through approximately sometime in May 2025, as a Branch Supervisor. Defendants jointly and severally employed Plaintiff based in Fresno, California.

20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees. As set forth in more detail below, this pattern and practice of wage abuse involved, *inter alia*, requiring

1 Plaintiff and the class members to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to properly pay
2 overtime wages and minimum wages for all hours worked, failing to provide all meal and rest breaks
3 to which they were entitled and failing to pay meal and rest break premiums when due, failing to
4 timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide accurate
5 wage statements, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses and failing to adhere to
6 other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare
7 Commission Wage Order.

8 21. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff
9 and the class pursuant to California law. Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
10 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so to increase Defendant's
11 profits.

12 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

13 22. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of Plaintiff and all others
14 similarly situated, as members of a proposed class pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
15 § 382. The class satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and
16 superiority requirements under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

17 23. The proposed class is defined as follows:

18 **All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for**
19 **Defendants in the State of California at any time during the period**
20 **from four years prior to the date of the filing of this Complaint until**
21 **final judgment.**

22 24. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

23 25. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is easily
24 ascertainable.

25 26. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all its members is impracticable.
26 While the exact number and identities of class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time, the exact
27 numbers of class members and their identities can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from
28 records maintained by Defendants and their agents.

1 27. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all class members, which predominate
2 over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. The common legal and factual
3 questions which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined
4 without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member include, but are not limited to,
5 the following:

- 6 i. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay minimum wages to
7 Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;
- 8 ii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay overtime wages to
9 Plaintiff and the other class members for all overtime hours worked;
- 10 iii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide meal periods to
11 Plaintiff and the other class members;
- 12 iv. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide rest periods to
13 Plaintiff and the other class members;
- 14 v. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees in
15 the State of California for all hours worked, and for all missed, short, late, and/or
16 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks;
- 17 vi. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class
18 members during their employment;
- 19 vii. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in
20 accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 21 viii. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members
22 within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- 23 ix. Whether Defendants failed to comply with wage reporting as required by the California
24 Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, § 226;
- 25 x. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for
26 necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- 27 xi. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- 28 xii. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California

Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

xiii. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

xiv. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

28. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and Plaintiff's interests are coincident with and not antagonistic to those of the other class members Plaintiff seeks to represent. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions and Plaintiff intends to prosecute this action vigorously.

29. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy since individual litigation of the claims of all class members is impracticable. Even if every class member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome on the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented in this Complaint, presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each class member.

30. Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

31. At all times set forth herein, PAGA applied to Plaintiff's employment with Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY.

1 32. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that
2 provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages, and premium wages, to be assessed and collected
3 by the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) for violations of the California
4 Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
5 employee on behalf of herself and other current employees pursuant to procedures outlined in
6 California Labor Code § 2699.3.

7 33. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an “aggrieved employee,” who is
8 any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged
9 violations was committed.

10 34. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY and
11 the alleged violations were committed against him during his time of employment with FRESNO
12 COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY and he is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff and the other
13 employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are
14 current or former employees of Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY and one of
15 more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

16 35. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
17 including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
18 have been met:

19 (a) The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
20 “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the
21 Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the
22 alleged violations.

23 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the employer and the
24 aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged
25 violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice.
26 Upon receipt of the LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-
27 five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the aggrieved
28 employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699 to

1 recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be
2 entitled.

3 36. On November 25, 2025, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the
4 LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY regarding the
5 specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
6 to support the alleged violations, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. **A true and correct**
7 **copy of the Employee's Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.**

8 37. Plaintiff did not receive an LWDA Notice within sixty-five calendar days of providing
9 the Employee's Notice.

10 38. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code § 2699.3(a) to
11 recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of California
12 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
13 2800 and 2802 have been satisfied.

14 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 1194, 1197, AND 1197.1**

16 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wage**

17 **(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)**

18 39. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
19 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

20 40. California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage for
21 employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees,
22 and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Plaintiff and the other class
23 members were frequently suffered or permitted to work “off-the-clock”, such that they were not paid
24 minimum wage for all hours worked.

25 41. Such “off-the-clock” work that Plaintiff and class members were suffered and/or
26 permitted to work, and for which Plaintiff and class members did not receive minimum wage include
27 *inter alia*:

28 a. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and class members to perform work for the benefit of

1 Defendants prior to clocking-in for their shift(s) including *inter alia* performing off-
2 the-clock work before punching in, including collecting gear, checking routes,
3 inspecting the vehicle, and completing other necessary tasks;

4 b. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and class members to perform work for the benefit of
5 Defendants after clocking-out from their shift(s) including *inter alia* answering
6 questions and engaging in work-related conversations;

7 c. suffering or permitting Plaintiff and class members to perform work for the benefit of
8 Defendants while “off-the-clock” during meal periods;

9 d. contacting Plaintiff and class members via email, text and/or phone calls outside of
10 work hours to discuss work matters;

11 42. Moreover, Defendants had a policy, practice and procedure of rounding employee time
12 such that Plaintiff and some or all class members were systematically unpaid and/or underpaid for
13 time worked over the course of their employment.

14 43. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff
15 and the other class members for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194,
16 1197, and 1197.1.

17 44. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiff and class members were
18 performing such work “off-the-clock” because, among other things, Defendants’ management
19 witnessed, authorized, was made aware of, and/or required Plaintiff and class members to perform
20 such work.

21 45. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the minimum wage as
22 required violates California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197 and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections,
23 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage
24 compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorney’s fees.

25 46. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are
26 entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest
27 thereon.

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND 1198

Unpaid Overtime

(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)

47. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

48. California Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily and/or weekly basis.

49. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek and/or the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

50. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and/or for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

51. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-and-one half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, forty (40) hours in a week, or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

52. Plaintiff and the other class members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week and/or seven (7) consecutive days in a workweek. However, Defendants did not record Plaintiff and the other class members’ actual hours worked and intentionally and willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members. Defendants’ failure to pay correct overtime wages included,

1 *inter alia*: (a) when the combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed *supra* and the on-the-clock
2 work exceed the number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime wages under Labor Code §§ 510
3 and 1198 and/or the applicable Wage Order; (b) when Defendants intentionally, willfully and/or
4 negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight time; (c) when Defendants assigned more work than
5 could reasonably be completed in a workday or workweek to Plaintiff and class members, but refused
6 to authorize the overtime necessary for them to complete the assigned work; and (d) when Defendants
7 failed to include all required wages and remuneration when calculating setting the overtime rate.

8 53. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members as outlined above
9 violates California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 and the applicable Wage Order and is therefore
10 unlawful.

11 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and the other class members are
12 entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

13 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512**

15 **Meal Break Violations**

16 **(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)**

17 55. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
18 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

19 56. California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable Wage Order govern
20 Plaintiff and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

21 57. California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to
22 work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Order.

23 58. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 512(a) provide that an
24 employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5)
25 hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes,
26 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal
27 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

28 59. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 512(a) further provides

1 that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work a work period of more than
2 ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not
3 less than thirty (30) minutes, except if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the
4 second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the
5 first meal period was not waived.

6 60. Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for shifts no longer
7 than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
8 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not
9 less than thirty (30) minutes.

10 61. Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for shifts in excess
11 of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated
12 meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without
13 an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

14 62. Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members
15 to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members for work
16 performed during meal periods. This includes, among other things, requiring Plaintiff and class
17 members to work through their lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiff and class members
18 to take late lunch breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiff and class members to take short lunch
19 breaks, interrupting and/or allowing others to interrupt Plaintiff and class members during their lunch
20 breaks, and failing to relieve Plaintiff and class members of all duties during their lunch breaks.

21 63. Further, because of Defendants' rounding policy, meal breaks were at times incorrectly
22 recorded as compliant, when in reality they were untimely and/or cut short.

23 64. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class
24 members all meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7 and 512 and the
25 applicable Wage Order.

26 65. Defendants' conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Order, and California
27 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a).

28 66. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b),

1 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of
2 pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period was not
3 provided.

4 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226.7**

6 **Rest Break Violations**

7 **(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)**

8 67. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
9 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

10 68. California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order govern Plaintiff
11 and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

12 69. California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to
13 work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

14 70. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and
15 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each
16 work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate
17 of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily
18 work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours."

19 71. Defendants routinely required Plaintiff and the other class members to work three and
20 one-half (3 ½) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a compliant ten (10) minute rest period
21 per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof, worked.

22 72. Moreover, Defendants willfully required, suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the other
23 class members to work during what should have been their rest periods. Defendants also failed to
24 relieve Plaintiff and the other class members of all duties for ten (10) minutes as required for compliant
25 rest breaks.

26 73. As a result, Plaintiff worked through rest periods, took late rest periods, took
27 interrupted rest periods, and/or took short rest periods, if at all.

28 74. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b),

1 Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) additional hour
2 of pay at their regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that compliant rest period(s) were
3 not provided.

4 75. Defendants had no policy and/or practice to pay a premium when rest periods were
5 missed, short, late, and/or interrupted, or otherwise failed to comply with California law, and thus
6 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due to
7 them in violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

8 76. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code § 226.7(c),
9 Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of
10 pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday complaint rest period(s) were not
11 provided.

12 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226(a)**

14 **Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements**

15 **(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)**

16 77. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
17 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

18 78. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
19 every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing,
20 including, but not limited to, the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, total hours
21 worked, and all applicable hourly rates.

22 As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to pay minimum
23 wages, meal break violations and rest break violations), Defendants intentionally and willfully failed
24 to provide Plaintiff and the other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The
25 deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all hours worked, the failure to state the
26 actual gross wages earned, the failure to include meal and rest break premiums, the failure to include
27 correct rates of pay, and other omissions and inaccuracies apparent from the face of the wage
28 statements. Accordingly, Defendants violated California Labor Code 226(a).

79. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

80. Specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a). In addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate number of total hours worked on wage statements, Plaintiff and the other class members have been prevented by Defendants from determining if all hours worked were paid and the extent of the underpayment. Plaintiff had to file this lawsuit, and will further have to conduct discovery, reconstruct time records, and perform computations in order to analyze whether in fact Plaintiff and the other class members were paid correctly and the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate number of total hours worked. This has also delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

81. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000).

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, AND 203

Final Wages Not Timely Paid

(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)

82. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

83. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code § 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code § 202 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72)

1 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention
2 to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

3 84. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in
4 accordance with California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is discharged
5 or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the
6 same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for
7 more than thirty (30) days.

8 85. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (failure to pay overtime, failure to
9 pay minimum wages, meal break violations and rest break violations), at the time that Plaintiff and the
10 other class members' employment with Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed
11 to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code
12 §§ 201 and 202, including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period
13 premium wages, and rest period premium wages, and all wages due to Plaintiff and class members as
14 they became due, as required per California Labor Code § 204.

15 86. As a result, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to all available
16 statutory penalties, including the waiting time penalties provided in California Labor Code § 203,
17 together with interest thereon, as well as other available remedies.

18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802**

20 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses**

21 **(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)**

22 87. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
23 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

24 88. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its
25 employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the
26 discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job duties or in direct
27 consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

28 89. Plaintiff and the other class members incurred necessary business-related expenses and

costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to the use of personal cell phones for work-related purposes.

90. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and costs incurred during the course and scope of employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which Plaintiff and the other class members incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200 *ET. SEQ.*

Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices

(Against All Defendants and DOES 1 – 25)

91. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

92. Each and every one of Defendants' acts and omissions in violation of the California Labor Code and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order as alleged herein, including but not limited to Defendant's failure and refusal to pay overtime compensation, Defendant's failure and refusal to pay minimum wages, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required rest periods and/or pay the required rest break premiums, Defendants' failure to timely pay wages at the correct rate during employment, Defendants' failure and refusal to furnish accurate itemized wage statements, Defendants' failure and refusal to reimburse business-related expenses, and Defendants' failure to timely pay wages upon termination constitutes an unfair and unlawful business practice under California Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

93. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws constitute an unfair and unlawful business practice because Defendants' aforementioned acts and omissions were done repeatedly over a significant period of time, and in a systematic manner, to the detriment of Plaintiff and the other class members.

94. Defendants have avoided payment of overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period premiums, rest period premiums, timely wages at the correct rate of pay, and other benefits as required by the California Labor Code, the California Code of Regulations, and the applicable IWC Wage Order. Further, Defendants have failed to record, report, and pay the correct sums of assessment to the state authorities under the California Labor Code and other applicable regulations.

95. As a result of Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices, Defendants have reaped unfair and illegal profits during Plaintiff and the other class members' tenure at the expense of Plaintiff, the other class members, and members of the public. Defendants should be made to disgorge their ill-gotten gains and to restore them to Plaintiff and the other class members.

96. Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices entitle Plaintiff and the other class members to seek preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including but not limited to orders that Defendants account for, disgorge, and restore to Plaintiff and the other class members the wages and other compensation unlawfully withheld from them. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to restitution of all monies to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2699, *ET SEQ.*

Private Attorneys General Act

(Against Defendant and DOES 1-25)

97. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

98. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code as follows: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in § 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).

1 99. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
2 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to
3 exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

4 100. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “Aggrieved Employees”
5 as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of
6 Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY, and one or more of the alleged violations
7 were committed against them.

8 101. Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY’s conduct, as alleged herein,
9 violates numerous sections of the California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 10 (a) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to pay
11 minimum wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 12 (b) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 for failure to pay overtime
13 wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 14 (c) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
15 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 16 (d) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay required
17 meal period premiums, as set forth more fully below;
- 18 (e) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to provide legally required
19 rest periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 20 (f) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to pay required rest period
21 premiums, as set forth more fully below;
- 22 (g) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 for failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiff
23 and aggrieved employees during employment, as set forth more fully before;
- 24 (h) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all wages
25 at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully below;
- 26 (i) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) for failure to provide accurate wage
27 statements to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, as set forth more fully below;
- 28 (j) Violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d) for failure to keep complete and

1 accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, as set forth
2 more fully below; and

3 (k) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
4 Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses, as set
5 forth more fully below.

6 102. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5,
7 Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of
8 civil penalties for Plaintiff, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against Defendant
9 FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY for violations of Labor Code sections set forth herein,
10 including penalties under California Labor Code §§ 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and
11 1197.1, penalties under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and
12 remedies as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

13 103. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by Aggrieved
14 Employees shall be distributed as follows: sixty-five percent (65%) to the LWDA for the enforcement
15 of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and
16 thirty-five (35%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

17 104. Plaintiff retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the civil
18 penalties owed by Defendant FRESNO COUNTY PRIVATE SECURITY Plaintiff therefore seeks an
19 award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 2699(g)(1), and
20 any other applicable statute.

21 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 Plaintiff, on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against
23 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

24 **Class Certification**

- 25 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 26 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
- 27 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 28 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current/last

known contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

6. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 1197.1 for Plaintiff and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;

7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a);

9. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194.2;

10. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

11. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

12. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

13. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194;

14. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

15. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

16. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

17. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c);

18. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

19. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein;

20. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause Action

21. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

22. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

23. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(c);

24. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

25. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

26. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

27. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

28. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(g);

29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for Plaintiff and the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

33. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

34. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

35. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

36. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

37. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein;

38. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

///

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

39. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all the other class members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

40. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

41. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

42. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

43. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

44. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a), (f), and (g), plus costs and attorneys' fees; and

45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: March 4, 2026

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP



By: _____

Megan E. Ross
Adam Witkin

*Attorneys for Plaintiff
NATHAN CASTANEDA, individually and on
behalf of others similarly situated*

1 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

2
3 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

4
5 DATED: March 4, 2026

ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

6
7
8 

9 By: _____

Megan E. Ross
Adam Witkin

10
11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
12 *NATHAN CASTANEDA, individually and on*
13 *behalf of others similarly situated*

EXHIBIT A



1700 W Burbank Boulevard,
Burbank, CA 91506

t | 213.493.6300
f | 213.336.3704

www.AbramsonLaborGroup.com

November 25, 2025

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

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

Re: *Nathan Castaneda v. Fresno County Private Security*

Dear Representative,

Our firm represents Nathan Castaneda in regard to certain potential workplace related claims against Fresno County private security (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Claimant from approximately November 23, 2024, through sometime in May 2025, as a non-exempt employee. During employment with Employers, Claimant was employed as a Branch Supervisor at its location at 1195 W Shaw Ave, Ste B Fresno, CA 93711.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC Wage Orders”). The claims made on behalf of Claimant 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

Employers have engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and IWC Wage Orders require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and IWC Wage Orders further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice the regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time period, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, the uncompensated work described herein was often performed when Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees had already worked eight (8) hours in a day and/or forty (40) hours in week resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation. Finally, Employers failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers have failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199;

and attorneys' fees and costs.

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

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a). A second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes must be provided before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a). When an employer fails to provide a meal or rest period, an hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally-compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other 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. Meal periods, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other 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, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; 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

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes rest for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. When an employer fails to authorize and permit a rest period, an hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation is owed to the employee. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take legally-compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant 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, Claimant and other 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, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other 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, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other 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, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant 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

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described herein, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. The wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees also failed to include the name of the legal entity that employed Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 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, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; 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. The IWC Wage Orders require employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to personal cell phone use for work.

Accordingly, Employers violated the IWC Orders and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

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

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, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), 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 Employers' practices of requiring Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant

to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this time.

If you have any questions regarding the forgoing, please contact the undersigned.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "MEG E. ROSS", is written over a faint, circular embossed seal.

Megan E. Ross, Esq.
ABRAMSON LABOR GROUP

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
Fresno County Private Security
1195 W Shaw Ave, Ste B
Fresno, CA 93711

Thornton Davidson, P.C.
Thornton Davidson, Esq.
1195 W. Shaw Ave., Ste. A
Fresno, California 93711