

December 11, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter on Behalf of VICTORIO PEREZ and Aggrieved Employees
Under California Labor section 2699.3

Via Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested:

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SAN BERNARDINO
1201 EAST HIGHLAND AVENUE
SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92404
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643576507948)

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF SAN BERNARDINO
505 E. MOUNTAIN VIEW STREET
BARSTOW, CA 92311
(CMRR Tracking #9414809898643576508518)

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 VICTORIO PEREZ’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employer: The Roman Catholic Bishop of San Bernardino (“Employer”). Employee was a non-exempt hourly employee and worked for Employer as a janitor at, without limitation, 505 E Mountain View St Barstow, CA 92311. Employee worked for Employer from approximately July of 1993 through approximately May of 2025. Employee’s duties included, but were not limited to, maintaining the building and ensuring the building is clean.

Employee seeks to represent all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Employer during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 206.5, 210, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 234, 245, 246, 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1198, 1197, 1197.1, 2800, 2802, 2810.5, 2699, among others, as well as applicable Wage Orders, Employee seeks to represent all current and former employees of Employer’s working during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Employee seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees of Employer 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.

Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay. Employer knew, or should have known, that Employee and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, yet failed to pay Employee and Aggrieved Employees all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains a practice or policy of failing to track all minutes actually worked by Employee and Aggrieved Employees by engaging, suffering, or permitting Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock. Specifically, 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 due to the fact there was only one available computer to use to clock in, which sometimes malfunctioned and required assistance from a manager.

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. By way of example, the time records produced by Employer show the time Employee clocked in, with a second column showing the rounded time. On February 9, 2023, the first column shows Plaintiff clocked in at 8:38 a.m., but the rounded time shows 8:45 p.m.

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 failing to pay for all hours worked; incorrectly calculating the regular rate of pay; and requiring employees to work through meal periods. 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, 510, 1197, 1198, 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 was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1197.1, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Non-Compliant Meal Periods:

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, by interrupting meal periods; providing short meal periods; and requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal periods. For example, Employee's meal periods were interrupted when he had to receive deliveries such as wine or candles and set them inside the church. However, Employee was not provided with additional time for his meal period, thereby cutting it short. Employee also had to carry a walkie-talkie during meal periods, and eventually, his personal cell phone due to functionality issues with the walkie-talkie. 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, auto-deducted meals, 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 Labor Code sections 512, 1198 and applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and therefore 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. 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 is thus liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Non-Compliant Rest Periods:

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, by failing to provide rest periods all together and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call 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 short rest periods, rest periods where Aggrieved Employees are

required to clock-out, 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, 558, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Inaccurate and Inadequate Recordkeeping Practices:

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. Employer also failed to provide all documents requested by Employee August 155, 2025, in violation of these Labor Code sections, including but not limited to wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226. 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, 1199, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Inaccurate Itemized Wage Statements:

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; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; and the legal name and address of the employer, which Employee states under information and belief because Employer failed to provide wage statements as requested under Labor Code section 226 and Employee does not recall the wage statements including this information. 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 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, 1199, 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Timely Pay Employees at Time of Separation:

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, 1199 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 further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Provide Wage Theft Notices:

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (i.e., the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment; any allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Employer; the name of the employer, including any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office and the telephone number of the employer; the name, address and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that Employer's failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employer to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed

upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1198 and 2810.5. Among other relief, Aggrieved Employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations' civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Reimburse Employees:

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, for their costs incurred for the purchase of food for meetings, and 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. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages Owed:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay Employee and 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 does 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 Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1199 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 was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened 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 the LWDA or a court issued a finding or determination to the Employer within five (5) years of any of violations described above, that Employer's policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 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 set forth above, Employee alleges Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer is additionally 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 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/ Jason W. Rothman
Jason W. Rothman

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
December 11, 2025
Page 8

cc:

David P. Colella, Esq.
Fullerton, Lemann, Schaefer & Dominick LLP
1809 S. Commercenter West
P.O. Box 1271
San Bernardino, CA 92402-1271