

November 19, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter on Behalf of LUIS QUIRINO ROCHA and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employer:
Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

BAE SYSTEMS, INC.
2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 100
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042
Certified Tracking #9589-0710-5270-2510-2589-30)

BAE SYSTEMS, INC.
c/o UNITED AGENT GROUP INC.
7801 FOLSON BLVD.,
SUITE 202
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826
Certified Tracking #9589-0710-5270-2510-2589-47)

TRADE TEAM USA, LLC
4339 INDIAN RIVER RD
CHESAPEAKE, VA 23325
Certified Tracking #9589-0710-5270-2568-9659-65)

TRADE TEAM USA, LLC
c/o C T CORPORATION SYSTEM
330 N BRAND BLVD
SUITE 700,
GLENDALE, CA 91203
Certified Tracking #9589-0710-5270-2568-9659-72)

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time this PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice concerns LUIS QUIRINO ROCHA’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employers: BAE SYSTEMS, INC. and TRADE TEAM USA, LLC (“Employer”). Employee was a non-exempt hourly employee and worked for Employer as a maintenance worker at, without limitation, 2205 Belt Street, San Diego, CA 92113. Employee worked for Employer from approximately July of 2025 through approximately August 2025. Employee’s duties included, but were not limited to, cleaning and maintaining company facilities.

Employee seeks to represent all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 210, 221, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 233, 234, 245, 246, 351, 353, 404, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7, 432.8,

510, 511, 512, 551, 552, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1198, 1198.5, 1475, 1695.55, 1771, 1774, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 2800, 2802, 2810.3, 2810.5, 2699, among others, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, sections 3395 and 3396, Business and Professions Code sections 16600, 16700, and 17200, Government Code section 12952, as well as applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former employees of Defendants working during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees of Defendants that worked during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees.” The “PAGA Period” covers the three years preceding the date this letter was submitted to the LWDA and continues past that date into perpetuity.

Employer knew, or should have known, that Employee and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, and that Employee and Aggrieved Employees were not receiving all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to track all minutes actually worked by Employee and Aggrieved Employees and failing to pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for all minutes worked at the proper rates of pay.

Employer engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to suffer under Employer’s control by waiting in long lines to clock in. By way of example, Employee and, upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees had to wait in line for clocking in before the beginning of each shift.

Moreover, upon information and belief, Employer detrimentally rounded, edited and/or manipulated time entries so the hours recorded were less than the hours actually worked.

Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the minimum wage and overtime laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the minimum wage and overtime laws, including potential violations for completing pre-shift duties before clocking in, completing post-shift duties after clocking out, making phone calls off the clock, and donning or doffing required uniforms or safety gear while off the clock. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 1197, 1182.12, and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked. Thus, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer’s conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1,

1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to work excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Employer regularly denied Employee and Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, meal periods that may appear on the record to be 30 minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes due to walking time to get to a designated break area and requiring that employees carry radios during meal periods. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the meal period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the meal period laws, including potential violations for unprovided meals, late meals, short meals, interrupted meals, auto-deducted meals, meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties, and meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7.

Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at his or her regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved to work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the Aggrieved Employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation, failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, walking time to get to a designated break area; and requiring Employee carry radios during rest periods. Given Employee personally suffered these violations

of the rest period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the rest period laws, including potential violations for unprovided rest periods, short rest periods, interrupted rest periods, rest periods where Aggrieved Employees are required to clock-out, rest periods for which Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties, and rest periods for which Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continues to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn entitles Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Employee and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; 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 by the employee. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections

226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully and/or intentionally failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned Aggrieved Employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed, all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for the use of personal cellular phone for work purposes, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer is liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for the costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set

forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy of failing to provide all temporary workers, including without limitation, Employee, with owed wages weekly by not later than the regular payday of the following week. Employee is informed and believes that this has resulted in a violation of Labor Code sections 201.3 and 1198. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code section 201.3, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations thereto and Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201.3, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, purported confidentiality agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Employer also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within five (5) years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employer would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Sarah H. Cohen

Sarah H. Cohen