Sam Kim, Esq. [SBN 258467]
Yoonis Han, Esq. [SBN 256151]
VERUM LAW GROUP, APC
360 N. Pacific Coast Hwy, Suite 1025
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: (424) 320-2000
Facsimile: (424) 221-5010
skim@verumlg.com
yhan@verumlg.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs SYNTHIA CASTILLO GARCIA, LIZ ADRIANA CHAVEZ, and all other similarly situated persons

[*Additional Counsel on Next Page*]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

SYNTHIA CASTILLO GARCIA, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. KALAVERAS RC INC, a California corporation, and DOES 1-20, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. CIVSB2315395 Assigned for All Purposes to: *The Hon. Christian Towns* Dept.: S-26 **DECLARATION OF SEPIDEH ARDESTANI IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** Date: January 27, 2026 Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: S26

ZACHARY M. CROSNER, ESQ. (SBN 272295)
zach@crosnerlegal.com
JAMIE SERB, ESQ. (SBN 289601)
jamie@crosnerlegal.com
SEPIDEH ARDESTANI, ESQ (SBN 274259)
CROSNER LEGAL, PC
9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Tel: (866) 276-7637
Fax: (310) 510-6429

Attorneys for Plaintiff GILBERT GARCIA, and all other similarly situated persons

Todd M. Friedman, Esq. (SBN 216752)
Adrian R. Bacon, Esq. (SBN 280332)
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340
Woodland Hills, CA 91364
Phone: 323-306-4234
Fax: 866-633-0228
tfriedman@toddflaw.com
abacon@toddflaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ERIK NOLASCO, and all other similarly situated persons

Adib Assassi, Esq. (SBN 301036)
Veronica Cruz, Esq. (SBN318648)
Assassi & Cruz Law Firm, PC
1100 Town and Country Rd.
Orange, CA 92868
Telephone: (949) 688-6009
veronica@aclegalteam.com
adib@aclegalteam.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ERIK NOLASCO, and all other similarly situated persons

DECLARATION OF SEPIDEH ARDESTANI

I, SEPIDEH ARDESTANI, Declare:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice in California and before this Court, and I am a partner with Crosner Legal, PC, counsel of record for plaintiff Gilbert Garcia. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval. If called to testify as to the within facts, I would and could competently do so.

2. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is a true and correct, fully-executed copy of the Parties' Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement Agreement"). Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a true and correct copy of the Class Notice the Parties propose to send to the Class Members. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 is a true and correct copy Plaintiff Garcia's PAGA Notice letter and proof of submission to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 is a true and correct copy of the LWDA's acknowledgment of receipt of the proposed settlement.

3. Other than the related matters that are covered by this settlement, I am unaware of any other pending cases that would overlap with the claims alleged in this case or that would impact on the claims of the class members in this case.

BACKGROUND

4. Defendants own and operate 13 "Kalaveras" restaurants throughout Southern California, serving Mexican and Latin cuisine. Plaintiff Castillo worked as a server for Defendants at the Rancho Cucamonga location from approximately June 2022 to July 2023. Plaintiff Gilbert Garcia worked as a server for Defendants at the Silverlake location, from April 2022 through May 2023. Plaintiff Nolasco worked as a bartender for Defendants at its San Bernardino location, between approximately March 2, 2023, and June 8, 2023.

5. Plaintiffs collectively assert multiple wage and hour claims against Defendants. First, Next, based on review of time sheets and other records produced by Defendants, Plaintiffs also alleged Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked for multiple reasons and

that employees frequently worked "off the clock" finishing up their duties after the scheduled end of a shift but weren't paid for this time. Plaintiffs contend they and the class members did not receive all required meal and rest breaks, or did not receive them on a compliant basis, and never received an extra hour of premium pay in lieu of a missed or non-compliant break. Lastly, Plaintiffs claim they were not reimbursed for certain expenses incurred for payments to "breakers" who covered for other employees while taking their meal breaks.

6. Based on these allegations, on July 10, 2023 Plaintiff Castillo commenced this Action by filing a Complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant Kalaveras RC, Inc., for various Labor Code violations including recovery of unpaid wages, recovery of unpaid overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, unlawful deductions from wages, failure to timely furnish accurate wage statements, violations of Labor Code § 203, et seq., and Unfair Business Practices. On October 9, 2023, Plaintiff Castillo filed a First Amended Complaint to add a claim under the PAGA. On January 22, 2024, Plaintiff Castillo filed doe amendments to add Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras-MV Inc., Kalaveras-NH Inc., Kalaveras SBO Inc., Kalaveras PD Inc., Kalaveras SL, Inc., Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH Inc., and Kalaveras SA Inc.

7. On September 5, 2023, Gilbert Garcia filed a PAGA complaint against Kalaveras SL, Inc., in Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21347, based on various alleged Labor Code violations (the "Garcia Action").

8. On October 24, 2023, by Plaintiff Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez filed a class action complaint against Kalaveras RC, Inc., in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26050, alleging various Labor Code and other wage and hour violations (the "Chavez Action")

9. On December 20, 2023, Plaintiff Erik Nolasco filed a class action complaint against Kalaveras SBO, Inc., and Isaias Brito in the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332776, alleging various Labor Code and other wage and hour violations (the "Nolasco Action")

10. Defendants have at all times denied Plaintiffs' collective allegations and maintained their meal break and payroll policies and procedures comply with California law, that they provided the class members with required meal and rest breaks, and that it paid Plaintiffs and the class members all wages due. Additionally, Defendants strongly contend the case cannot be maintained as any kind of class or representative action, arguing that to the extent class members missed breaks, that such breaks were non-compliant, or that employees worked "off the clock," it was against company policy, and intermittent or infrequent and evidence of such violations would be purely anecdotal. Thus, per Defendants individual issues predominate and trial would be unmanageable.

11. After the Plaintiffs filed their various complaints, the Parties initiated written discovery and, after engaging in meet and confer discussions regarding discovery, potential law and motion, and the merits of the case, they ultimately agreed to attempt a global mediation. They then engaged in significant informal discovery to facilitate an exchange of information necessary to engage in a meaningful mediation. Consequently, Plaintiffs' counsel reviewed payroll records, personnel policies/handbooks, meal break policies, personnel files, and a random sampling of paystubs and time records produced by Defendants. Defendants also provided documents and information reflecting the estimated total amount of workweeks and pay periods they worked, and average hourly pay rates, among other relevant data.

12. The Parties then engaged Michael Loeb, Esq., a respected mediator with extensive wage and hour class action experience and, on November 25, 2024, and March 26, 2025, participated in a two full day mediations with Mr. Loeb. Throughout both days, the arms-length negotiations were hard-fought and adversarial as the Parties exchanged extensive information on their legal and factual positions and made numerous offers and counter-offers. Finally, near the end of the second day, the Parties reached agreement on all major issues and then collaboratively drafted the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") setting forth the full and final settlement terms.

13. Finally, in order to fully effectuate the proposed settlement, the Parties stipulated to the filing of a Second Amended Complaint in this matter to add all Plaintiffs and

Defendants as parties and to incorporate all claims alleged in the various actions. The SAC is the operative complaint for purposes of settlement.

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT TERMS

14. Under the settlement, Defendants will pay $600,000.00 into a common fund, the Gross Settlement Amount or GSA. Attorney's fees of up to one-third of the GSA ($200,000), litigation costs of up to $51,000, enhancement awards of $10,000 each for the plaintiffs (i.e, $40,000 total), settlement administration costs of no more than $21,000, and a payment of $20,000 for PAGA civil penalties (allocated $15,000 to the LWDA and $5,000 to the eligible Aggrieved Employees), all will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount. The remainder of approximately $298,000 will be allocated among the Participating Class Members based on their total weeks worked during the Class Period. No portion of the GSA will revert to Defendants.

15. The settlement provides for conditional certification of a settlement class including all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period (July 10, 2019, through May 25, 2025. The Settlement Class consists of approximately 2,010 individuals.

16. As noted, the settlement obligates Defendants to pay $600,000 to resolve the Settlement Class' claims, inclusive of attorney's fees and costs. Approximately $298,000 from the GSA will be distributed to the Participating Class Members. This is a cash settlement that does not require Participating Class Members to submit a claim form to receive their settlement share. Participating Class Members will receive their settlement checks automatically via First Class U.S. Mail. Twenty percent of each settlement share will be allocated to wages, and the remaining eighty percent will be allocated to penalties and interest. Defendants will pay any and all applicable employer-side payroll taxes separately and in addition to the GSA. Subject to the Court's approval, any amounts not claimed (because a class member does not cash his or her settlement check), plus interest, will be forwarded to the California State Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund.

17. Each Participating Class Member will receive a share of the Net Settlement Amount based on his or her total weeks worked for Defendants in California during the Class Period while employed in a non-exempt position. Thus, each Class Member's Individual Settlement Share will be calculated using criteria typically used in determining appropriate amounts of unpaid wages, unpaid premium wages for missed meal breaks, and potential statutory penalties under applicable law. These methods are intended to ensure each Class Member receives a portion of the available settlement funds corresponding to the relative value of his or her potential claims. The proposed allocation provides a reasonable way to compensate Class Members based on the amount of time they worked for Defendants and the number of instances they missed a meal break, were not provided compensation in lieu of such missed breaks, or lost wages due to the alleged off-the-clock work, regular rate miscalculation, etc. I estimate the average class award to be approximately $146.

18. Subject to the Court's approval, the Parties have agreed on Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix") as the Settlement Administrator. Phoenix is qualified and has significant experience administering class action settlements, including numerous wage and hour matters. Phoenix has agreed to cap its fees and costs at $21,000.00. If the Court approves less than the above amount, the difference will remain in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to the Participating Class Members.

19. The proposed Notice (Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement) sets out information about this case and explains the basic settlement terms in plain language. The Notice also sets forth the individualized information used to calculate Class Members' Individual Settlement Shares and each Class Member's estimated settlement award. The Notice likewise details the procedures for Class Members to dispute their individual information, the procedure for submitting an objection to the Settlement, and the procedure to request exclusion. In sum, the Notice provides the Class Members with the information necessary to evaluate the Settlement and provides fair opportunity to participate in, opt out of, or object to the proposed Settlement. Coupled with the notice procedure, the proposed Notice provides the Settlement Class with the best notice practicable.

20. Class Members will have 45 days to dispute the information in their Notice used to calculate their settlement award and also have 45 days to submit any objections to the settlement or to request exclusion. In the event a Class Member disputes their individual information, the Settlement Administrator will review the Class Member's records as well as any additional information submitted and make a final determination.

21. All Participating Class Members will be deemed to release defendants from all claims alleged in the operative complaint, or that could have been brought based on the allegations in the operative complaint, including PAGA claims. The release is limited to the claims that were actually pleaded or could have been pleaded based on the alleged facts in the operative complaint.

22. The settlement provides Defendants will not oppose a request for attorney's fees not to exceed one-third of the GSA, or $200,000, nor will it oppose a request for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses of up to $51,000.00. Defendant also will not oppose a request for an enhancement award to Plaintiffs of not more than $10,000 each ($40,000 total) in recognition of their time spent on this matter, the risks they undertook on behalf of the class, and the benefit conferred to the class. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel will provide the Court with appropriate summaries and evidence of their efforts and time records in anticipation of the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves less than the above amounts, the difference will remain in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to the Participating Class Members.

23. As noted, the Parties allocated $20,000 from the GSA to resolution of Plaintiffs' claims under PAGA. As required by Labor Code section 2699(*l*)(2), Plaintiffs gave notice of the settlement and the approval hearing to the LWDA via its online portal.

The Proposed Settlement Class Should Be Conditionally Certified

24. First, the class is both sufficiently numerous, consisting of approximately 2,010 individuals, and ascertainable by reference to Defendants' personnel and payroll records.

25. Plaintiffs are all adequate class representatives, as their claims do not conflict with and are not antagonistic to the claims of other class members. Further, their claims are

typical given both are members of the class and their claims arise from the same employment practices and course of conduct giving rise to the claims of the other class members.

26. Common questions of law and fact predominate – particularly for purposes of a settlement class – as the Class Members all were subject to the same break policy and likewise were subject to same alleged failure to accurately record and pay for all hours worked. Since the focus of the claims against Defendants concerns the legality of common policies applied uniformly to the entire class, common issues predominate over individualized inquiries concerning liability. Whether Defendants automatically clocked employees out at the scheduled end of a shift or required servers to pay for a "breaker" in order to take a lunch break, are common questions applicable to all class members. Regardless of the outcome, determining these questions will decide liability for all class members one way or another.

27. Resolving this matter as a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy for multiple reasons, including inter alia: (a) individual joinder of all members of the class is impractical, (b) class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to resolve their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without unnecessary duplication of effort and expense; and (c) the damages suffered by many of the individual class members are relatively small and the expenses and burden of individual litigation would make it difficult or impossible for them to seek redress on their own.

The Proposed Settlement Meets the Dunk and Kullar Factors and is within the Range of Reasonableness

28. Prior to settlement, the parties engaged in extensive informal discovery to facilitate settlement discussions. As a result, Plaintiffs reviewed documents and information regarding Defendants' payroll practices, pay stubs and time records for a sampling of class members, meal and rest break policies, etc., and information from Defendants regarding class size and breakdown, work weeks, rates of pay, and other information used to formulate a damages model. Plaintiffs' counsel is confident they obtained sufficient information to enable

them to understand the law and facts of this case and make an informed decision regarding the proposed settlement and whether it is in the best interests of the class.

29. Using that data, Plaintiffs ran various calculations and estimated Defendants' likely maximum exposure on the class claims at approximately $15.995 million, including $546,430 on the unpaid wage/off the clock claims, $1,676,940 on the meal break claims, $4,133,650 on the rest break claims, $2,209,950 on the wage statement claims, $5,531,885 on the waiting time penalty claims, and $1,896,570.

30. We calculated these amounts as follows:

Unpaid Wages/Off the Clock

75,000 work weeks * 0.5 hours OTC/week * $$14.57/hour avg. min. wage = $546,430

Meal Violations

87,752 unique violations * $19.11/hour avg wage = $1,676,940

Rest Violations

216,308 unique violation * $19.11/hour avg wage = $4,133,650

Expense Reimbursement

189,657 recorded meal breaks * 100% violation rate * $10/recorded meal break = $1,896,570

Derivative Wage Statement

1,031 initial violations * $50/violation + 21,584 subsequent violations * $100/violation = $2,209,950

Final Wage Violations

1,462 former employees * (198 hours (6.6 hrs. avg. shift) * $19.11) = $5,531,885

31. On the unpaid wage claims, Plaintiffs argued Defendants had an "auto clock out" policy whereby employees were automatically clocked out at the scheduled end of their shift regardless of whether they were still working. Plaintiffs contended this resulted in modest increments of off the clock work, as they and the Class Members frequently worked several additional minutes after their scheduled start/stop times, which "off the clock" work was neither accounted nor paid for. In response, Defendants took the position that their time keeping policies

are legally compliant, that it accurately tracked and paid for all hours worked consistent with those policies, and that any work done "off the clock" was not sanctioned and done without Defendants' knowledge.

32. For the meal and rest break claims, although Defendants' written policies appear facially compliant, Plaintiffs argued Defendants frequently provided late meal breaks and that there are numerous "de facto" violations for non-compliant meal breaks. Plaintiffs further contend Defendants maintained a policy that obligated servers to pay **$10.00 per meal break**, to a "breaker" without reimbursement. Breakers were scheduled by Defendants to work, solely for the purpose of relieving servers for their meal breaks, and *all* of the breakers' compensation was paid by the employees who used the breakers to take their meal breaks. Per Plaintiffs, there was no other way to take a meal break for the employees.

33. In response, Defendants emphasized the break policies were fully compliant with California law, and that it provided all required meal periods and thereby met its obligations under the Labor Code and Wage Order. Further, Defendant argued to the extent employees missed a meal break or took a non-compliant break, any such discrepancies were aberrational and against company policy and a myriad of individual issues would be required to determine if the potential violation resulted from employee choice or some other reason. Consequently, per the Defendant, individualized inquiries would dominate this issue and render class certification inappropriate. Likewise, Defendant denied any requirement for paying out of pocket in order to take a lunch break.

34. On the rest break claim, Plaintiffs argued rest breaks simply weren't scheduled and were not provided, and they further claimed that the "breaker" system was used only for lunches and therefore there was no way for servers to take a rest break since there was no extra coverage. On the other hand, as with meal breaks, Defendants argued their rest break policies complied with California law and authorized and permitted employees to take all required breaks. Defendants further contended that, in light of the fact that they are not required to maintain a record of rest periods, any evidence of failure to authorize rest periods and/or discouragement from taking rest periods would be purely anecdotal and individual issues would predominate on

liability. Defendants also may contend that it is only liable if Plaintiffs can prove, on a shift-by-shift basis, the aggrieved employees actually did not receive a fully compliant rest break. This arguably would make a trial unmanageable since the number of instances an employee missed a rest break would have to be tested on a case-by-case basis to determine if there was compliance.

35. Plaintiffs' based their expense reimbursement claim on the need to pay $10 to a "breaker" in order to be provided with a meal break, which payments they contend were not reimbursed by Defendants. As noted, Defendants contended no such policy existed and there otherwise were no expenses of any kind incurred by employees that might require reimbursement.

36. Finally, Plaintiffs also alleged derivative claims under Labor Code § 226 (alleged inaccurate wage statement violations) and §§ 201-203 (waiting time penalties). These claims were based on the "off the clock" unpaid wage claim and meal/rest break claims and will rise or fall along with that primary claim, in addition to being subject to "good faith" and other defenses available to Defendant. Accordingly, Plaintiffs discounted the derivative claims significantly in light of these multiple potential defenses.

37. As far as potential PAGA liability, the theoretical penalties theoretically totaled around $10 million should Plaintiffs prevail on all claims and establish violations of the multiple Labor Code sections at issue for every single eligible pay period. As with the class claims, Plaintiffs discounted the potential PAGA penalties for the multi-layered defenses proffered by Defendant on the merits and further discounted these claims since the Court possesses wide discretion to reduce such penalties even if Plaintiffs ultimately prevailed. Accordingly, the Parties allocated $20,000 to PAGA penalties, which amount is reasonable and in line with comparable settlements in other class actions in California. Additionally, the LWDA has been informed of the terms of the PAGA portion of the settlement and will be able to weigh in as necessary.

38. The settlement obviates the significant risk that this Court may find any kind of class or representative resolution unachievable or deny certification of all or some of Plaintiffs' claims. Furthermore, even if Plaintiffs certify of all or some of the claims, continued litigation

would be lengthy and expensive as the parties pursued merits discovery, a probable motion to decertify, as well as trial and possible appeals, and would substantially delay any recovery by the class with no assurance of recovering significantly more than the proposed settlement. While Plaintiffs are confident in the merits of their claims, legitimate controversies exist regarding Plaintiffs' claims. Plaintiffs also recognize proving the amount of wages and penalties due each Class Member would be an expensive, time-consuming, and uncertain proposition.

39. Plaintiffs and their counsel discounted the value of the class claims consistent with the risks discussed above and carefully weighed the likelihood of the class receiving substantially greater benefit if the litigation continued. Plaintiffs and counsel concluded – in light of these very real and substantial risks – settlement on the proposed terms and without prolonged and costly litigation was in the best interests of the class. The overall $600,000 recovery represents a significant percentage of Defendant's potential exposure and, given the risks addressed above, a total recovery for the class of $600,000, which will result in average award of some $146 per class member, is a significant result well within the range of reasonableness considering all potential outcomes, and it will provide direct monetary awards to all Class Members without further delay.

CROSNER LEGAL'S QUALIFICATIONS

40. I graduated from the University of California, Los Angeles in 2004 with a bachelor's in science, obtained my J.D. from Whittier Law School in 2009, and earned a masters in law from Santa Clara University School of Law in 2010. I have been a member of the California Bar since 2010 and have extensive experience in employment matters, including wage and hour litigation. I worked as a wage and hour class action attorney at Gaines & Gaines, APLC from 2012 through 2021 and, prior to joining Gaines & Gaines I worked at Sirkin Law Group as a litigation associate from 2010-2012. I joined Crosner Legal in December 2021, and I am a Partner. I have solely handled employment, wage and hour class actions, and PAGA lawsuits for some 13 years. I was selected for 2020-2021 by Super Lawyers as a "Southern California Rising Star" for employment and labor law.

41. Zach Crosner is a 2010 graduate of University San Diego School of Law, and he has approximately thirteen years of experience as a practicing attorney. For nearly his entire career, his practice has focused on litigation of wage & hour, consumer, and privacy class action and representative action claims. Following graduation, he immediately began working for a nationally recognized plaintiff's complex litigation firm, Casey Gerry, where he worked directly with past presidents of the consumer attorneys and recipients of trial attorneys of the year awards. He also worked for other firms that included former CAALA and CLAY trial attorney of the year recipients. While with these firms, he advocated for the rights of consumers and employees in class action litigation, civil rights and employment litigation, catastrophic injuries, insurance bad faith and appellate litigation.

42. In 2013, he founded the law firm of Crosner Legal, P.C. which since its inception has focused almost exclusively on plaintiff-side class actions lawsuits representing employees, consumers and other victims. Currently, over ninety percent (95%) of his practice is dedicated exclusively to the prosecution of class actions and representative action lawsuits, and his law firm is currently responsible as lead counsel or co-lead counsel for prosecuting over one hundred (100) active wage and hour class actions and/or PAGA representative actions, as well as a multitude of consumer and privacy class actions, in both federal and state courts throughout California. He has been a direct participant in over one hundred (100) class action and/or representative action settlements where he has been approved as adequate lead counsel.

43. Mr. Crosner has been selected by Super Lawyers as a "Southern California Rising Star" for employment and labor law consecutively from 2018 through 2023. Super Lawyers has also named me on their "Up-and-Coming 100" Southern California Rising Stars List for consecutive years from 2021 through 2023. Only 2.5% of lawyers within California are named a Super Lawyer Rising Star and even less are added to their Top Lists. Additionally, he has been selected as a Top 40 Under 40 Civil Plaintiff Attorney by the

National Trial Lawyers, invitation-only organization composed of the premier trial lawyers, from 2019 through 2023. He is an active participant in advocacy groups, including as an executive board member of the Wage and Hour Committee and the Legislative Committee for the California Employment Lawyers Association; a member of the Grassroots Advocacy Team for the National Employment Lawyers Association; Wage and Hour Committee member and Class Action Committee member for the National Trial Lawyers; a member of the American Association for Justice; and a member of the Pound Civil Justice Institute.

44. Jamie Serb is a partner with Crosner Legal and head of the firm's Wage and Hour practice group. She graduated from the University of California, San Diego in 2004, graduated from California Western School of Law in 2013, and has been a member of the California Bar since 2013. She gained extensive experience in wage and hour litigation, beginning work as a class action attorney in 2015 at the Mara Law Firm, PC (previously Turley & Mara Law Firm, APLC; Turley Law Firm, APLC). She has handled wage and hour class actions and PAGA lawsuits for nearly ten years and has assisted in obtaining millions of dollars for employees during her years of practice.

45. Crosner Legal, P.C. has obtained several multi-million dollar wage and hour class action settlements while serving as lead class counsel in recent years, including but not limited to a $1.9 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2015 (*Smith v. Lux Retail North America, Inc.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-01579-WHA (N.D. Cal.)); a $4.1 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2016 (*Aguirre v. Mariani Nut Company, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 34-2016-00190252 (Sacramento Cty. Super Ct.)); a $1.35 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2017 (*Montelone v. Ocean Cities Pizza, Inc.*, Case No. 56-2014-00458249 (Ventura Cty. Super. Ct.)), a $1.8 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2018 (*Latham v. K.W.P.H. Enterprises, Inc. dba American Ambulance*, Case No. 17C-0162 (Kings Cty. Super Ct.)), a $1.3 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2019 (*Means, et al. v. AirGas USA, LLC*, Case No. 17-CV-2160 JGB (C.D. Cal.)), a $1.5 million wage and hour

settlement in 2020 (*Babouchian, et al. v. Wyndham Vacation Ownership, et al.*, Case No. CV18-14601 (San Diego Cty. Super. Ct.), a $1.15 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2020 (*Buford v. Medical Solutions LLC*, Case No. 4:18-CV-04864-YGR (N.D.Cal.)); a $7.25 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2020 in *Avina, et al. v. First Alarm Security & Patrol, Inc.*, Case No. 18CV323753 (Santa Clara Cty. Super Ct.); a $2.2 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2021 (*Ghorchian, et al. v. West Hills Hospital, et al.,* Case No. LS029737 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Ct.));.a $2.85 million dollar wage and hour settlement in 2021 (*Valencia v. The Original Mowbray's Tree Service, Inc.*, Case No. CIVDS1825518 (San Bernardino Cty. Super. Ct.)); a $1 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2022 (*Duong v. Loan Factory, Inc.*, Case No. 21CV382467 (Santa Clara Cty. Super. Ct.)), a $1.4 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2023 in *Correa, et al. v. FedEx Supply Chain, Inc.*, Case No. CIVDS2023369 (San Bernardino Cty. Super. Ct.), a $2.38 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2023 in *Michel, et al. v. Valley Thrift Store, Inc.*, Case No. 21STCV00925 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Ct.); a $2.5 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2023 in *Jajuga v. Pilot Travel Centers*, Case No. CIVDS1931464 (San Bernardino Cty. Super. Ct.); $1.015 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2023 in *Gotishan v. Kyo Autism Therapy*, Case No. CGC-21-596378 (San Francisco Cty. Super. Ct); and a $1.15 million wage and hour PAGA settlement in 2023 in *Vaughn v. Public Health Foundation Enters., Inc.*, Case No. 21STCV18512 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Ct.); a $1.5 million wage and hour class action settlement in *McKinnie v. Iron Mountain*, Case No. 21STCV05707 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Court); a $1.3 million wage and hour class action settlement in *Ellsworth, et al. v. Hallcon*, Case No. 20STCV06618 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Court); a $1.925 million wage and hour class settlement in 224 in *Lo v. Cyberpower, Inc.*, Case No. 21STCV31479 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Ct); a $1.19 million dollar wage and hour class action settlement in 2024 in *Herrera v. Signature Flight Support LLC*, Case No. 22STCV18367 (Los Angeles Cty. Super. Ct.); a $2.65 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2024 in

Shilevinatz v. Airport Terminal Services, Case No. CIVSB2229072 (San Bernardino Cty. Super Ct.); a $1 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2025 in *Hernandez v YZER, LLC*, Case No. 23CV025345 (Alameda Cty. Superior Ct); a $3.9 million wage and hour class action settlement in 2025 in *Bolanos et al. v. Newport Fab*, Case No. 30-2022-01280696-CU-OE-CXC (Orange Cty. Super. Ct.); and a $5,093,537.50 wage and hour class action settlement in 2025 in *Deaver, et al. v Blue Diamond Growers*, Case No. 34-2022-00316490-CU-OE-GDS (Sacramento Cty. Super. Ct.).

46. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the Court approve the settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 11, 2025, at Los Angeles, California.

Declarant

EXHIBIT 1

CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND CLASS NOTICE

This Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made by and between plaintiffs Synthia Castillo Garcia, Gilbert Garcia, Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez, and Erik Nolasco, on the one hand, individually and on behalf of the Class to be certified for settlement purposes only, the alleged Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and on the other hand, defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras-MV Inc., Kalaveras-NH Inc., Kalaveras SBO Inc., Kalaveras PD Inc., Kalaveras RC Inc., Kalaveras SL, Inc., Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA, and Isaias Ocampo Brito (collectively, "Defendants"), subject to the approval of the Court. The Agreement refers to Plaintiffs and Defendants collectively as "Parties," or individually as "Party."

1. DEFINITIONS.

1.1 "Action" means the Plaintiffs' lawsuit alleging wage and hour violations against Defendants captioned *Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC Inc., et. al*., initiated on July 10, 2023 and pending in Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino with Case Number CIVSB2315395.

1.2 "Administrator" means Phoenix Settlement Administrators, the neutral entity the Parties have agreed to appoint to administer the Settlement.

1.3 "Administration Expenses Payment" means the amount the Administrator will be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to reimburse its reasonable fees and expenses in accordance with the Administrator's "not to exceed" bid submitted to the Court in connection with Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.4 "Aggrieved Employee" means all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the PAGA Period (April 25, 2022 through May 25, 2024).

1.5 "Class" means all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period (July 10, 2019 through May 25, 2025).

1.6 "Class Counsel" means Verum Law Group, APC, Crosner Legal, P.C., Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C., and Assassi & Cruz Law Firm P.C.

1.7 "Class Counsel Fees Payment" and "Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment" mean the amounts allocated to Class Counsel for reimbursement of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses, respectively, incurred to prosecute the Action.

1.8 "Class Data" means Class Member identifying information in Defendants' possession including the Class Member's name, last-known mailing address, Social

Security number, email address (if available), and number of Class Period Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods.

1.9 "Class Member" or "Settlement Class Member" means a member of the Class, as either a Participating Class Member or Non-Participating Class Member (including a Non-Participating Class Member who qualifies as an Aggrieved Employee).

1.10 "Class Member Address Search" means the Administrator's investigation and search for current Class Member mailing addresses using all reasonably available sources, methods and means including, but not limited to, the National Change of Address database, skip traces, and direct contact by the Administrator with Class Members.

1.11 "Class Notice" means the COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL, to be mailed to Class Members in English with a Spanish translation, in the form, without material variation, attached as **Exhibit A** and incorporated by reference into this Agreement.

1.12 "Class Period" means the period from July 10, 2019 through May 25, 2025.

1.13 "Class Representative" means the named Plaintiffs in the operative complaint in the Action seeking Court approval to serve as a Class Representative.

1.14 "Class Representative Service Payment" means the payment to the Class Representative for initiating the Action and providing services in support of the Action.

1.15 "Court" means the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino.

1.16 "Defendants" means named Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras-MV Inc., Kalaveras-NH Inc., Kalaveras SBO Inc., Kalaveras PD Inc., Kalaveras RC Inc., Kalaveras SL, Inc., Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA, and Isaias Ocampo Brito.

1.17 "Defense Counsel" means Payne & Fears LLP.

1.18 "Effective Date" means the date by when both of the following have occurred: (a) the Court enters a Judgment on its Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement; and (b) the Judgment is final. The Judgment is final as of the latest of the following occurrences: (a) if no Participating Class Member objects to the Settlement, the day the Court enters Judgment; (b) if one or more Participating Class Members objects to the Settlement, the day after the deadline for filing a notice of appeal from the Judgment; or if a timely appeal from the Judgment is filed, the day after the appellate court affirms the Judgment and issues a remittitur.

1.19 "Final Approval" or "Final Approval Order" means the Court's Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.20 "Final Approval Hearing" means the Court's hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.21 "Final Judgment" means the Judgment entered by the Court upon granting Final Approval of the Settlement.

1.22 "Gross Settlement Amount" means $600,000.00 which is the total amount Defendants agree to pay under the Settlement. The Gross Settlement Amount will be used to pay Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, Class Representative Service Payment and the Administrator's Expenses.

1.23 "Individual Class Payment" means the Participating Class Member's pro rata share of the Net Settlement Amount calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the Class Period.

1.24 "Individual PAGA Payment" means the Aggrieved Employee's pro rata share of 25% of the PAGA Penalties calculated according to the number of Workweeks worked during the PAGA Period.

1.25 "Judgment" means the judgment entered by the Court based upon the Final Approval.

1.26 "LWDA" means the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the agency entitled, under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

1.27 "LWDA PAGA Payment" means the 75% of the PAGA Penalties paid to the LWDA under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (i).

1.28 "Net Settlement Amount" means the Gross Settlement Amount, less the following payments in the amounts approved by the Court: Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Administration Expenses Payment. The remainder is to be paid to Participating Class Members as Individual Class Payments.

1.29 "Non-Participating Class Member" means any Class Member who opts out of the Settlement by sending the Administrator a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

1.30 "Operative Complaint" means the Second Amended Complaint filed on July 8, 2025.

1.31 "PAGA Pay Period" means any Pay Period during which an Aggrieved Employee worked for Defendants for at least one day during the PAGA Period.

1.32 "PAGA Period" means the period from April 25, 2022 through May 25, 2025.

1.33 "PAGA" means the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698. et seq.).

1.34 “PAGA Notice” means Plaintiffs’ June 29, 2023, July 29, 2023, Ocober 20, 2023, October 27, 2023, December 19, 2023, February 2, 2024, and February 5, 2024 letters to Defendants and the LWDA providing notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a).

1.35 “PAGA Penalties” means the total amount of PAGA civil penalties ($20,000.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, allocated 25% to the Aggrieved Employees ($5,000.00) and the 75% to LWDA ($15,000.00) in settlement of PAGA claims.

1.36 “Participating Class Member” means a Class Member who does not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion from the Settlement.

1.37 “Plaintiffs” means Synthia Castillo Garcia, Gilbert Garcia, Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez, and Erik Nolasco, the named plaintiffs in the Action.

1.38 “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.39 "Preliminary Approval Order" means the proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

1.40 “Released Class Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.2 below.

1.41 “Released PAGA Claims” means the claims being released as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

1.42 “Released Parties” means: Defendants, and each of their past, present and/or future, direct and/or indirect, officers, directors, members, managers, employees, agents, representatives, attorneys, insurers, partners, investors, shareholders, administrators, parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, predecessors, successors, assigns, clients, and joint venturers.

1.43 “Request for Exclusion” means a Class Member’s submission of a written request to be excluded from the Class Settlement signed by the Class Member.

1.44 "Response Deadline" means 45 days after the Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, and shall be the last date on which Class Members may: (a) fax, email, or mail Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement, or (b) fax, email, or mail his or her Objection to the Settlement. Class Members to whom Notice Packets are resent after having been returned undeliverable to the Administrator shall have an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Response Deadline has expired.

1.45 “Settlement” means the disposition of the Action effected by this Agreement and the Judgment.

1.46 "Workweek" means any week during which a Class Member worked for Defendants for at least one day, during the Class Period.

2. RECITALS.

2.1 On July 10, 2023 Plaintiff Synthia Castillo Garcia ("Plaintiff Castillo") commenced this Action by filing a Complaint alleging causes of action against Defendant Kalaveras RC, Inc., for various Labor Code violations including recovery of unpaid wages, recovery of unpaid overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, unlawful deductions from wages, failure to timely furnish accurate wage statements, violations of Labor Code § 203, et seq., and Unfair Business Practices (the "Action"). On October 9, 2023, Plaintiff Castillo filed a First Amended Complaint to add a claim under the PAGA. On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff Castillo filed doe amendments to add Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras-MV Inc., Kalaveras-NH Inc., Kalaveras SBO Inc., Kalaveras PD Inc., Kalaveras SL, Inc., Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH Inc., and Kalaveras SA Inc.

2.2 On September 5, 2023, Gilbert Garcia filed a PAGA complaint against Kalaveras SL, Inc., in Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV21347, based on various alleged Labor Code violations (the "Garcia Action").

2.3 On October 24, 2023 by Plaintiff Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez filed a class action complaint against Kalaveras RC, Inc., in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 23STCV26050, alleging various Labor Code and other wage and hour violations (the "Chavez Action");

2.4 On December 20, 2023, Plaintiff Erik Nolasco filed a class action complaint against Kalaveras SBO, Inc., and Isaias Brito in the San Bernardino County Superior Court, Case No. CIVSB2332776, alleging various Labor Code and other wage and hour violations (the "Nolasco Action").

2.5 On November 25, 2024 and March 26, 2025, the Parties to the Action, the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the Nolasco Action participated in two all-day mediations presided over by Michael Loeb, Esq. which led to this Agreement to settle each of the actions.

2.6 Prior to mediation, Plaintiffs obtained, through formal and informal discovery, a 25% sampling of time and pay records, each Plaintiff's personnel file, Defendants' and employee handbooks in effect during the Class Period. Plaintiffs' investigation was sufficient to satisfy the criteria for court approval set forth in *Dunk v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 *and Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc*. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116, 129-130 ("*Dunk/Kullar*").

2.7 The Parties to the Action, the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the Nolasco Action agreed to consolidate each of the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the

Nolasco Action into the Action for purposes of settlement, and, to that end, agreed to dismiss the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the Nolasco Action, and that the Plaintiffs in the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the Nolasco Action would join the Action, and assert all claims and causes of action in the Garcia Action, the Chavez Action, and the Nolasco Action, in the Action in an amended pleading, such that the Action would encompass all claims and causes of action asserted in those lawsuits.

2.8 On July 8, 2025 Plaintiff Castillo filed a Second Amended Complaint adding Plaintiffs Gilbert Garcia, Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez Chavez, and Erik Nolasco as representative plaintiffs and adding Defendants Kalaveras CVSA, and Isaias Ocampo Brito, and their respective causes of action against Defendants. Defendants deny the allegations in the Operative Complaint, deny any failure to comply with the laws identified in in the Operative Complaint and deny any and all liability for the causes of action alleged.

2.9 Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subd.(a), Plaintiffs gave timely written notice to Defendants and the LWDA by sending PAGA Notices.

2.10 The Court has not granted class certification.

3. MONETARY TERMS.

3.1 **Gross Settlement Amount**. Defendants promise to pay $600,000.00 and no more as the Gross Settlement Amount and to separately pay any and all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments. Defendants have no obligation to pay the Gross Settlement Amount (or any payroll taxes) prior to the deadline stated in Paragraph 4.3 of this Agreement. The Administrator will disburse the entire Gross Settlement Amount without asking or requiring Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees to submit any claim as a condition of payment. None of the Gross Settlement Amount will revert to Defendants.

3.2 **Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount**. The Administrator will make and deduct the following payments from the Gross Settlement Amount, in the amounts specified by the Court in the Final Approval Order:

3.2.1 **To Plaintiffs**: Class Representative Service Payments to each Class Representative of not more than $10,000.00 each (totaling $40,000.00) (in addition to any Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment the Class Representative is entitled to receive as a Participating Class Member). Defendants will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for a Class Representative Service Payments that does not exceed this amount. As part of the Final Approval motion, Plaintiffs will seek Court approval for any Class Representative Service Payments no later than 16 court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves a Class Representative

Service Payment less than the amount requested, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will pay the Class Representative Service Payment using IRS Form 1099. Plaintiffs assume full responsibility and liability for employee taxes owed on the Class Representative Service Payment.

3.2.2 **To Class Counsel**: A Class Counsel Fees Payment of not more than 1/3, which is currently estimated to be $200,000.00 and a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment of not more than $51,000.00. Defendants will not oppose requests for these payments provided that do not exceed these amounts. As part of the Final Approval motion, Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will request approval of the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Litigation Expenses Payment. If the Court approves a Class Counsel Fees Payment and/or a Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment less than the amounts requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. Released Parties shall have no liability to Class Counsel or any other Plaintiffs' Counsel arising from any claim to any portion any Class Counsel Fee Payment and/or Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment. The Administrator will pay the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Expenses Payment using one or more IRS 1099 Forms. Class Counsel assumes full responsibility and liability for taxes owed on the Class Counsel Fees Payment and the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and holds Defendants harmless, and indemnifies Defendants, from any dispute or controversy regarding any division or sharing of any of these Payments.

3.2.3 **To the Administrator**: An Administrator Expenses Payment not to exceed $21,000.00 except for a showing of good cause and as approved by the Court. To the extent the Administration Expenses are less or the Court approves payment less than $21,000.00, the Administrator will retain the remainder in the Net Settlement Amount.

3.2.4 **To Each Participating Class Member**: An Individual Class Payment calculated by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members during the Class Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Participating Class Member's Workweeks.

3.2.4.1 **Tax Allocation of Individual Class Payments**. 20% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of wage claims (the "Wage Portion"). The Wage Portions are subject to tax withholding and will be reported on an IRS W-2 Form. The 80% of each Participating Class Member's Individual Class Payment will be allocated to settlement of claims for interest and penalties (the "Non-Wage Portion"). The

Non-Wage Portions are not subject to wage withholdings and will be reported on IRS 1099 Forms. Participating Class Members assume full responsibility and liability for any employee taxes owed on their Individual Class Payment.

3.2.4.2 Effect of Non-Participating Class Members on Calculation of Individual Class Payments. Non-Participating Class Members will not receive any Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will retain amounts equal to their Individual Class Payments in the Net Settlement Amount for distribution to Participating Class Members on a pro rata basis.

3.2.5 **To the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees**: PAGA Penalties in the amount of $20,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount, with 75% ($15,000.00) allocated to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% ($5,000.00) allocated to the Individual PAGA Payments.

3.2.5.1 The Administrator will calculate each Individual PAGA Payment by (a) dividing the amount of the Aggrieved Employees' 25% share of PAGA Penalties ($5,000.00) by the total number of PAGA Period Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period and (b) multiplying the result by each Aggrieved Employee's PAGA Period Pay Periods. Aggrieved Employees assume full responsibility and liability for any taxes owed on their Individual PAGA Payment.

3.2.5.2 If the Court approves PAGA Penalties of less than the amount requested, the Administrator will allocate the remainder to the Net Settlement Amount. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

4. SETTLEMENT FUNDING AND PAYMENTS.

4.1 **Class Workweeks and Aggrieved Employee Pay Periods**. The Parties have agreed to the terms set forth herein based on their estimate that the Class Members have worked less than 75,000 workweeks during the Class Period. However, should the actual number of workweeks worked by the Class Members during the Class Period exceed 75,000 workweeks, the release period will end on the date the Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

4.2 Class Data. Not later than 30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Defendants will simultaneously deliver the Class Data to the Administrator, in the form of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. To protect Class Members' privacy rights, the Administrator must maintain the Class Data in confidence, use the Class Data only for purposes of this Settlement and for no other

purpose, and restrict access to the Class Data to Administrator employees who need access to the Class Data to effect and perform under this Agreement. Defendants have a continuing duty to immediately notify Class Counsel if it discovers that the Class Data omitted class member identifying information and to provide corrected or updated Class Data as soon as reasonably feasible. Without any extension of the deadline by which Defendants must send the Class Data to the Administrator, the Parties and their counsel will expeditiously use best efforts, in good faith, to reconstruct or otherwise resolve any issues related to missing or omitted Class Data.

4.3 **Funding of Gross Settlement Amount**. Defendants shall fully fund the Gross Settlement Amount, and also fund the amounts necessary to fully pay Defendants' share of payroll taxes by transmitting the funds to the Administrator no later than 14 days after the Effective Date.

4.4 **Payments from the Gross Settlement Amount**. Within 14 days after Defendants fund the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will mail checks for all Individual Class Payments, all Individual PAGA Payments, the LWDA PAGA Payment, the Administration Expenses Payment, the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment, and the Class Representative Service Payment. Disbursement of the Class Counsel Fees Payment, the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and the Class Representative Service Payment shall not precede disbursement of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments.

4.4.1 The Administrator will issue checks for the Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments and send them to the Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees via First Class U.S. Mail, postage prepaid. The face of each check shall prominently state the date (not less than 180 days after the date of mailing) when the check will be voided. The Administrator will cancel all checks not cashed by the void date. The Administrator will send checks for Individual Settlement Payments to all Participating Class Members (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator will send checks for Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees including Non-Participating Class Members who qualify as Aggrieved Employees (including those for whom Class Notice was returned undelivered). The Administrator may send Participating Class Members a single check combining the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment. Before mailing any checks, the Settlement Administrator must update the recipients' mailing addresses using the National Change of Address Database.

4.4.2 The Administrator must conduct a Class Member Address Search for all other Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees whose checks are retuned undelivered without USPS forwarding address. Within 7 days of receiving a returned check the Administrator must re-mail checks to the

USPS forwarding address provided or to an address ascertained through the Class Member Address Search. The Administrator need not take further steps to deliver checks to Participating Class Members and Aggrieved Employees whose re-mailed checks are returned as undelivered. The Administrator shall promptly send a replacement check to any Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee whose original check was lost or misplaced, requested by the Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee prior to the void date.

4.4.3 For any Participating Class Member and/or Aggrieved Employee whose Individual Class Payment check or Individual PAGA Payment check is uncashed and cancelled after the void date, the Administrator shall transmit the funds represented by such checks to the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Class Member thereby leaving no "unpaid residue" subject to the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 384, subd. (b).

4.4.4 The payment of Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments shall not obligate Defendants to confer any additional benefits or make any additional payments to Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees (such as 401(k) contributions or bonuses) beyond those specified in this Agreement.

5. RELEASES OF CLAIMS. Effective on the date when Defendants fully fund the entire Gross Settlement Amount and funds all employer payroll taxes owed on the Wage Portion of the Individual Class Payments, Plaintiffs, and Class Members will release claims against all Released Parties as follows:

5.1 **Plaintiffs' Release**. Plaintiffs and their respective former and present spouses, representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns generally, release and discharge Released Parties from all claims, transactions, or occurrences that occurred during the Class Period (except as to the pending wrongful termination case filed by Plaintiff Chavez), including, but not limited to: (a) all claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged, based on the facts contained, in the Garcia Action, Chavez Action, Nolasco Action, or the Operative Complaint and (b) all PAGA claims that were, or reasonably could have been, alleged based on facts contained in the Garcia Action, Chavez Action, Nolasco Action, or the Operative Complaint, Plaintiffs' PAGA Notices, or ascertained during the Action and released under 5.2, below ("Plaintiffs' Release"). With respect to the PAGA claims, Plaintiffs give this release for themselves, and the persons described above, but also for the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.3. Plaintiffs' Release does not extend to any claims or actions to enforce this Agreement, or to any claims for vested benefits, unemployment benefits, disability benefits, social security benefits,

workers' compensation benefits that arose at any time, or based on occurrences outside the Class Period. Plaintiffs acknowledge that Plaintiffs may discover facts or law different from, or in addition to, the facts or law that Plaintiffs now knows or believes to be true but agrees, nonetheless, that Plaintiffs Release shall be and remain effective in all respects, notwithstanding such different or additional facts or Plaintiffs discovery of them.

5.1.1 **Plaintiffs' Waiver of Rights Under California Civil Code Section 1542**. For purposes of Plaintiffs' Release, Plaintiffs expressly waive and relinquish the provisions, rights, and benefits, if any, of section 1542 of the California Civil Code (except as specified above), which reads:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, AND THAT IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

5.2 **Release by Participating Class Members**: Plaintiffs and the Class Members may hereafter discover facts or legal arguments in addition to or different from those they now know or currently believe to be true with respect to the claims, causes of action and legal theories of recovery in the Action which are the subject matter of the Released Claims (hereinafter defined). Regardless, the discovery of new facts or legal arguments shall in no way limit the scope or definition of the Released Claims, and by virtue of this Agreement, Plaintiffs and the Class Members shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the final judgment approved by the Court, shall have, fully, finally, and forever settled and released all of the Released Claims against the Released Parties as defined in this Agreement. All causes of action and factual or legal theories/allegations that were alleged in the Garcia Action, Chavez Action, Nolasco Action, and Operative Complaint in the Action and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notices to the LWDA, or that could have been brought in the Action and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notices to the LWDA based on those same factual or legal theories/allegations, against the Released Parties. This Release includes, but is not limited to, claims for violation of, or recovery under, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act; the applicable IWC Wage Order; and Business & Professions Code section 17200-17208. This Release also includes, but is not limited to, the following claims for relief: (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for

expenditures; (i) unfair business practices; (j) all damages, penalties, restitution, attorneys' fees, interest, and other amounts recoverable in connection with the above legal authorities and/or claims for relief under local, California, and federal law (collectively, the "Class Released Claims"). The period of the Release shall extend from July 10, 2019 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

5.3 **Release by Aggrieved Employees**: All aggrieved employees, including Non Participating Class Members who are PAGA Members, are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, all the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts occurring within the PAGA Period, facts stated in the Operative Complaints in Garcia Action, Chavez Action, Nolasco Action, and the Action, the PAGA Notices and ascertained in the course of the Action including, e.g., any and all claims relating to (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (j) attorneys' fees, and other amounts recoverable under PAGA (the "PAGA Released Claims"). The period of the PAGA Release shall extend from April 25, 2022 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

6. MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL. The Parties agree to jointly prepare and file a motion for preliminary approval ("Motion for Preliminary Approval") as follows:

6.1 **Defendants' Declaration in Support of Preliminary Approval**. Within _____ days of the full execution of this Agreement, Defendants will prepare and deliver to Class Counsel a signed Declaration from Defendants and Defense Counsel disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator. In their Declarations, Defense Counsel and Defendants shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.2 **Plaintiffs' Responsibilities**. Plaintiffs will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all documents necessary for obtaining Preliminary Approval, including: (i) a draft of the notice, and memorandum in support, of the Motion for Preliminary Approval that includes an analysis of the Settlement under *Dunk/Kullar* and a request for approval of the PAGA Settlement under Labor Code Section 2699, subd. (f)(2)); (ii) a draft proposed Order Granting Preliminary Approval; (iii) a draft proposed Class Notice; (iv) a signed declaration from the Administrator attaching its "not to

exceed" bid for administering the Settlement and attesting to its willingness to serve; competency; operative procedures for protecting the security of Class Data; amounts of insurance coverage for any data breach, defalcation of funds or other misfeasance; all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members; and the nature and extent of any financial relationship with Plaintiffs, Class Counsel or Defense Counsel; (v) a signed declaration from Plaintiffs confirming willingness and competency to serve and disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with Class Members, and the Administrator; (v) a signed declaration from each Class Counsel firm attesting to its competency to represent the Class Members; its timely transmission to the LWDA of all necessary PAGA documents (initial notice of violations (Labor Code section 2699.3, subd. (a)), Operative Complaint (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(1)), this Agreement (Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l)(2)); (vi) a redlined version of the parties' Agreement showing all modifications made to the Model Agreement ready for filing with the Court; and (vii) all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflict of interest with Class Members, the Administrator. In their Declarations, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel Declaration shall aver that they are not aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

6.3 **Responsibilities of Counsel**. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and for appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

6.4 **Duty to Cooperate**. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval or conditions Preliminary Approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together on behalf of the Parties by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

7. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

7.1 **Selection of Administrator**. The Parties have jointly selected to serve as the Administrator and verified that, as a condition of appointment, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a

fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for payment of Administration Expenses. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

7.2 **Employer Identification Number**. The Administrator shall have and use its own Employer Identification Number for purposes of calculating payroll tax withholdings and providing reports state and federal tax authorities.

7.3 **Qualified Settlement Fund**. The Administrator shall establish a settlement fund that meets the requirements of a Qualified Settlement Fund ("QSF") under US Treasury Regulation section 468B-1.

7.4 **Notice to Class Members**.

7.4.1 No later than three (3) business days after receipt of the Class Data, the Administrator shall notify Class Counsel that the list has been received and state the number of Class Members, PAGA Members, Workweeks, and Pay Periods in the Class Data.

7.4.2 Using best efforts to perform as soon as possible, and in no event later than 14 days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will send to all Class Members identified in the Class Data, via first-class United States Postal Service ("USPS") mail, the Class Notice with Spanish translation, if applicable substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as **Exhibit A**. The first page of the Class Notice shall prominently estimate the dollar amounts of any Individual Class Payment and/or Individual PAGA Payment payable to the Class Member, and the number of Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if applicable) used to calculate these amounts. Before mailing Class Notices, the Administrator shall update Class Member addresses using the National Change of Address database.

7.4.3 Not later than 3 business days after the Administrator's receipt of any Class Notice returned by the USPS as undelivered, the Administrator shall re-mail the Class Notice using any forwarding address provided by the USPS. If the USPS does not provide a forwarding address, the Administrator shall conduct a Class Member Address Search, and re-mail the Class Notice to the most current address obtained. The Administrator has no obligation to make further attempts to locate or send Class Notice to Class Members whose Class Notice is returned by the USPS a second time.

7.4.4 The deadlines for Class Members' written objections, Challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods, and Requests for Exclusion will be extended an additional 14 days beyond the 45 days otherwise provided in the Class Notice for all Class Members whose notice is re-mailed. The

Administrator will inform the Class Member of the extended deadline with the re-mailed Class Notice.

7.4.5 If the Administrator, Defendants or Class Counsel are contacted by or otherwise discovers any persons who believe they should have been included in the Class Data and should have received Class Notice, the Parties will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith in an effort to agree on whether to include them as Class Members. If the Parties agree, such persons will be Class Members entitled to the same rights as other Class Members, and the Administrator will send, via email or overnight delivery, a Class Notice requiring them to exercise options under this Agreement not later than 14 days after receipt of Class Notice, or the deadline dates in the Class Notice, which ever are later.

7.5 Requests for Exclusion (Opt-Outs).

7.5.1 Class Members who wish to exclude themselves (opt-out of) the Class Settlement must send the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail, a signed written Request for Exclusion not later than 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed). A Request for Exclusion is a letter from a Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or telephone number. To be valid, a Request for Exclusion must be timely faxed, emailed, or postmarked by the Response Deadline.

7.5.2 The Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

7.5.3 Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Participating Class Member under this Agreement, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions of the Settlement, including the Participating Class Members' Release and Aggrieved Employee Release under Paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 of this

Agreement, regardless of whether the Participating Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

7.5.4 Every Class Member who submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion is a Non-Participating Class Member and shall not receive an Individual Class Payment or have the right to object to the class action components of the Settlement. Because future PAGA claims are subject to claim preclusion upon entry of the Judgment, Non-Participating Class Members who are Aggrieved Employees are deemed to release the claims identified in Paragraph 6.4 of this Agreement and are eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment.

7.6 **Challenges to Calculation of Workweeks**. Each Class Member shall have 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data. The Administrator's determination of each Class Member's allocation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. The Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all challenges to calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods to Defense Counsel and Class Counsel and the Administrator's determination the challenges.

7.7 Objections to Settlement.

7.7.1 Only Participating Class Members may object to the class action components of the Settlement and/or this Agreement, including contesting the fairness of the Settlement, and/or amounts requested for the Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Class Representative Service Payment.

7.7.2 Participating Class Members may send written objections to the Administrator, by fax, email, or mail. In the alternative, Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. A Participating Class Member who elects to send a written objection to the Administrator must do so not later than 45 days after the Administrator's mailing of the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was re-mailed).

7.7.3 Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement.

7.8 **Administrator Duties**. The Administrator has a duty to perform or observe all tasks to be performed or observed by the Administrator contained in this Agreement or otherwise.

7.8.1 **Website, Email Address and Toll-Free Number**. The Administrator will establish and maintain and use an internet website to post information of interest to Class Members including the date, time and location for the Final Approval Hearing and copies of the Settlement Agreement, Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Preliminary Approval, the Class Notice, the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and Class Representative Service Payment, the Final Approval and the Judgment. The Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes and emails.

7.8.2 **Requests for Exclusion (Opt-outs) and Exclusion List**. The Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion from Settlement submitted (whether valid or invalid).

7.8.3 **Weekly Reports**. The Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received, objections received, challenges to Workweeks and/or Pay Periods received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments ("Weekly Report"). The Weekly Reports must include provide the Administrator's assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

7.8.4 **Workweek and/or Pay Period Challenges**. The Administrator has the authority to address and make final decisions consistent with the terms of this Agreement on all Class Member challenges over the calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods. The Administrator's decision shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

7.8.5 **Administrator's Declaration**. Not later than 14 days after the Response Deadline, the Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of the Class Notice, the total number of Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion from the Settlement it received (both valid or invalid), the number of written objections and attach the Exclusion List. The Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration(s) in Court.

7.8.6 **Final Report by Settlement Administrator**. Within 10 days after the Administrator disburses all funds in the Gross Settlement Amount, the Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with a final report detailing its disbursements by employee identification number only of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 15 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Administrator's declaration in Court.

8. CLASS SIZE ESTIMATES. The Parties have agreed to the terms set forth herein based on their estimate that the Class Members have worked less than 75,000 workweeks during the Class Period. However, should the actual number of workweeks worked by the Class Members during the Class Period exceed 75,000 workweeks, the release period will end on the date the Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

9. DEFENDANTS' RIGHT TO WITHDRAW. If the number of valid Requests for Exclusion identified in the Exclusion List exceeds 5% of the total of all Class Members, Defendants may, but are not obligated, elect to withdraw from the Settlement. The Parties agree that, if Defendants withdraw, the Settlement shall be void ab initio, have no force or effect whatsoever, and that neither Party will have any further obligation to perform under this Agreement; provided, however, Defendants will remain responsible for paying all Settlement Administration Expenses incurred to that point. Defendants must notify Class Counsel and the Court of its election to withdraw not later than seven days after the Administrator sends the final Exclusion List to Defense Counsel; late elections will have no effect.

10. MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL. Not later than 16 court days before the calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs will file in Court, a motion for final approval of the Settlement that includes a request for approval of the PAGA settlement under Labor Code section 2699, subd. (l), a Proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiffs shall provide drafts of these documents to Defense Counsel as soon as practicable prior to filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

10.1 **Response to Objections**. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Participating Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than five court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.

10.2 **Duty to Cooperate**. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel Fees Payment, Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment and/or Administrator Expenses Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

10.3 **Continuing Jurisdiction of the Court**. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Action, and the Settlement solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement and/or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters, and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.

10.4 **Waiver of Right to Appeal**. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Class Counsel Fees Payment and Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment reflected set forth in this Settlement, the Parties, their respective counsel, and all Participating Class Members who did not object to the Settlement as provided in this Agreement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs, and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment

becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the amount of the Net Settlement Amount.

10.5 **Appellate Court Orders to Vacate, Reverse, or Materially Modify Judgment**. If the reviewing Court vacates, reverses, or modifies the Judgment in a manner that requires a material modification of this Agreement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Participating Class Members or Aggrieved Employees), this Agreement shall be null and void. The Parties shall nevertheless expeditiously work together in good faith to address the appellate court's concerns and to obtain Final Approval and entry of Judgment, sharing, on a 50-50 basis, any additional Administration Expenses reasonably incurred after remittitur. An appellate decision to vacate, reverse, or modify the Court's award of the Class Representative Service Payment or any payments to Class Counsel shall not constitute a material modification of the Judgment within the meaning of this paragraph, as long as the Gross Settlement Amount remains unchanged.

11. AMENDED JUDGMENT. If any amended judgment is required under Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Parties will work together in good faith to jointly submit and a proposed amended judgment.

12. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

12.1 **No Admission of Liability, Class Certification, or Representative Manageability for Other Purposes**. This Agreement represents a compromise and settlement of highly disputed claims. Nothing in this Agreement is intended or should be construed as an admission by Defendants that any of the allegations in the Operative Complaint have merit or that Defendants have any liability for any claims asserted; nor should it be intended or construed as an admission by Plaintiffs that Defendants' defenses in the Action have merit. The Parties agree that class certification and representative treatment is for purposes of this Settlement only. If, for any reason the Court does grant Preliminary Approval, Final Approval or enter Judgment, Defendants reserve the right to contest certification of any class for any reasons, and Defendants reserve all available defenses to the claims in the Action, and Plaintiffs reserves the right to move for class certification on any grounds available and to contest Defendants' defenses. The Settlement, this Agreement, and the Parties' willingness to settle the Action will have no bearing on, and will not be admissible in connection with, any litigation (except for proceedings to enforce or effectuate the Settlement and this Agreement).

12.2 **Confidentiality Prior to Preliminary Approval**. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants and Defense Counsel separately agree that, until the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement is filed, they and each of them will not disclose, disseminate and/or publicize, or cause or permit another person to disclose, disseminate or publicize, any of the terms of the Agreement directly or indirectly,

specifically or generally, to any person, corporation, association, government agency, or other entity except: (1) to the Parties' attorneys, accountants, or spouses, all of whom will be instructed to keep this Agreement confidential; (2) counsel in a related matter; (3) to the extent necessary to report income to appropriate taxing authorities; (4) in response to a court order or subpoena; or (5) in response to an inquiry or subpoena issued by a state or federal government agency. Each Party agrees to immediately notify each other Party of any judicial or agency order, inquiry, or subpoena seeking such information. Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants and Defense Counsel separately agree not to, directly or indirectly, initiate any conversation or other communication, before the filing of the Motion for Preliminary Approval, any with third party regarding this Agreement or the matters giving rise to this Agreement except to respond only that "the matter was resolved," or words to that effect. This paragraph does not restrict Class Counsel's communications with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

12.3 **No Solicitation**. The Parties separately agree that they and their respective counsel and employees will not solicit any Class Member to opt out of or object to the Settlement, or appeal from the Judgment. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to restrict Class Counsel's ability to communicate with Class Members in accordance with Class Counsel's ethical obligations owed to Class Members.

12.4 **Integrated Agreement**. Upon execution by all Parties and their counsel, this Agreement together with its attached exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement between the Parties relating to the Settlement, superseding any and all oral representations, warranties, covenants, or inducements made to or by any Party.

12.5 **Attorney Authorization**. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel separately warrant and represent that they are authorized by Plaintiffs and Defendants, respectively, to take all appropriate action required or permitted to be taken by such Parties pursuant to this Agreement to effectuate its terms, and to execute any other documents reasonably required to effectuate the terms of this Agreement including any amendments to this Agreement.

12.6 **Cooperation**. The Parties and their counsel will cooperate with each other and use their best efforts, in good faith, to implement the Settlement by, among other things, modifying the Settlement Agreement, submitting supplemental evidence and supplementing points and authorities as requested by the Court. In the event the Parties are unable to agree upon the form or content of any document necessary to implement the Settlement, or on any modification of the Agreement that may become necessary to implement the Settlement, the Parties will seek the assistance of a mediator and/or the Court for resolution.

12.7 **No Prior Assignments**. The Parties separately represent and warrant that they have not directly or indirectly assigned, transferred, encumbered, or purported to assign,

transfer, or encumber to any person or entity and portion of any liability, claim, demand, action, cause of action, or right released and discharged by the Party in this Settlement.

12.8 **No Tax Advice**. Neither Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, Defendants nor Defense Counsel are providing any advice regarding taxes or taxability, nor shall anything in this Settlement be relied upon as such within the meaning of United States Treasury Department Circular 230 (31 CFR Part 10, as amended) or otherwise.

12.9 **Modification of Agreement**. This Agreement, and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed, or waived only by an express written instrument signed by all Parties or their representatives, and approved by the Court.

12.10 **Agreement Binding on Successors**. This Agreement will be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors of each of the Parties.

12.11 **Applicable Law**. All terms and conditions of this Agreement and its exhibits will be governed by and interpreted according to the internal laws of the state of California, without regard to conflict of law principles.

12.12 **Cooperation in Drafting**. The Parties have cooperated in the drafting and preparation of this Agreement. This Agreement will not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting.

12.13 **Confidentiality**. To the extent permitted by law, all agreements made, and orders entered during Action and in this Agreement relating to the confidentiality of information shall survive the execution of this Agreement.

12.14 **Use and Return of Class Data**. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Cal. Evid. Code §1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendants in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or in connection with the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement, and no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute, or rule of court. Not later than 90 days after the date when the Court discharges the Administrator's obligation to provide a Declaration confirming the final pay out of all Settlement funds, Plaintiffs shall destroy, all paper and electronic versions of Class Data received from Defendants unless, prior to the Court's discharge of the Administrator's obligation, Defendants make a written request to Class Counsel for the return, rather than the destructions, of Class Data.

12.15 **Headings**. The descriptive heading of any section or paragraph of this Agreement is inserted for convenience of reference only and does not constitute a part of this Agreement.

12.16 **Calendar Days**. Unless otherwise noted, all reference to "days" in this Agreement shall be to calendar days. In the event any date or deadline set forth in this

Agreement falls on a weekend or federal legal holiday, such date or deadline shall be on the first business day thereafter.

12.17 **Notice**. All notices, demands or other communications between the Parties in connection with this Agreement will be in writing and deemed to have been duly given as of the third business day after mailing by United States mail, or the day sent by email or messenger, addressed as follows:

To Plaintiffs:

Zachary Crosner
zach@crosnerlegal.com
Jamie Serb
jamie@crosnerlegal.com
Sepideh Ardestani
sepideh@crosnerlegal.com
Crosner Legal, P.C.
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Sam Kim
skim@verumlg.com
Verum Law Group, APC
360 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 1025
El Segundo, CA 90245

Adrian R. Bacon
abacon@toddflaw.com
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.
21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Adib Assassi
adib@aclegalteam.com
Assassi & Cruz Law Firm, PC
1100 W. Town & Country Rd., Suite 1250
Orange, CA 92868

To Defendants:
Philip K. Lem
pkl@paynefears.com
Payne & Fears, LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1100
Irvine, CA 92614

12.18 **Execution in Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.

12.19 **Stay of Litigation**. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process.

12.20 **The Agreement is Enforceable**: All the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall, when fully executed, become fully enforceable subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. If any Party fails to perform under the terms of this Agreement, this Agreement will be final, binding and enforceable pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. In the event that the terms of the Agreement are enforced, the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Gilbert Garcia

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Synthia Castillo Garcia

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez

Dated: 07/26/2025

Erik Nolasco Quintero (Jul 26, 2025 13:06:48 PDT)
_____
Plaintiff Erik Nolasco

Docusign Envelope ID: BAE4B932-E3E6-42E8-8586-6DA4B2ECADF6

12.18 **Execution in Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.

12.19 **Stay of Litigation**. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process.

12.20 **The Agreement is Enforceable**: All the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall, when fully executed, become fully enforceable subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. If any Party fails to perform under the terms of this Agreement, this Agreement will be final, binding and enforceable pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. In the event that the terms of the Agreement are enforced, the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Gilbert Garcia

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Synthia Castillo Garcia

Dated: 7/28/2025

DocuSigned by:
_____
1D2A2BD7219A4CD...
Plaintiff Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez

Dated: _____

_____
Plaintiff Erik Nolasco

Docusign Envelope ID: DD5BD1B4-4015-4C06-A207-D713D9CE8C49

12.18 **Execution in Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts by facsimile, electronically (i.e. DocuSign), or email which for purposes of this Agreement shall be accepted as an original. All executed counterparts and each of them will be deemed to be one and the same instrument if counsel for the Parties will exchange between themselves signed counterparts. Any executed counterpart will be admissible in evidence to prove the existence and contents of this Agreement.

12.19 **Stay of Litigation**. The Parties agree that upon the execution of this Agreement the litigation shall be stayed, except to effectuate the terms of this Agreement. The Parties further agree that upon the signing of this Agreement that pursuant to CCP section 583.330 to extend the date to bring a case to trial under CCP section 583.310 for the entire period of this settlement process.

12.20 **The Agreement is Enforceable**: All the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall, when fully executed, become fully enforceable subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. If any Party fails to perform under the terms of this Agreement, this Agreement will be final, binding and enforceable pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, subject to and conditioned upon court approval of the proposed settlement in the Action and/or bankruptcy court. In the event that the terms of the Agreement are enforced, the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

Dated: 08 / 14 / 2025

Gilbert Garcia

Plaintiff Gilbert Garcia

Dated: 7/28/2025

DocuSigned by:

ED33C8E70D1A4CD...

Plaintiff Synthia Castillo Garcia

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Liz Adriana Martinez Chavez

Dated: _____

Plaintiff Erik Nolasco

Doc ID: 5a9911ee32b847eb34e2404a2a31160d7fbd2d58

Dated: _____

Isaias Ocampo Brito for:
Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras MV Inc, Kalaveras-NH Inc, Kalaveras SBO Inc, Kalaveras PD Inc, Kalaveras RC Inc, Kalaveras SL Inc, Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH, Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA

Dated: _____

Isaias Ocampo Brito

Dated: 08/14/2025

CROSNER LEGAL, P.C.

Zachary Crosner, Esq.
Jamie Serb, Esq.
Sepideh Ardestani, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: 7/28/2025

VERUM LAW GROUP, P.C.

Sam Kim, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: 7-25-25

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

Adrian Bacon

Adrian Bacon, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: 7-25-25

ASSASSI & CRUZ LAW FIRM, PC

Adib Assassi

Doc ID: 5a9911ee32b847eb34e2404a2a31160d7fbd2d58

Dated: 8/8/25

Isaias Ocampo Brito for:
Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras MV Inc, Kalaveras-NH Inc, Kalaveras SBO Inc, Kalaveras PD Inc, Kalaveras RC Inc, Kalaveras SL Inc, Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH, Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA

Dated: 8/8/25

Isaias Ocampo Brito

Dated: _____

CROSNER LEGAL, P.C.

Zachary Crosner, Esq.
Jamie Serb, Esq.
Sepideh Ardestani, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: _____

VERUM LAW GROUP, P.C.

Sam Kim, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: _____

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

Adrian Bacon, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: _____

ASSASSI & CRUZ LAW FIRM, PC

Adib Assassi, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

Dated: August 13, 2024

PAYNE & FEARS LLP

Philip K. Lem, Esq.
Attorneys for Defendants

COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL

(*Synthia Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC, Inc., et. al.*

San Bernardino Superior Court case number CIVSB2315395)

The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully!

It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras MV Inc, Kalaveras-NH Inc, Kalaveras SBO Inc, Kalaveras PD Inc, Kalaveras RC Inc, Kalaveras SL Inc, Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH, Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA, and Isaias Ocampo Brito ("Defendants") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by former employees of Defendants ("Plaintiffs") and seeks payment of (1) minimum wages, (2) overtime wages, (3) premium wages in lieu of missed/denied meal and rest periods, (3) reimbursement of out-of-pocket business expenses, (4) penalties for failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and (5) penalties for failure to issue accurately itemized wage statements for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period (July 10, 2019 through May 25, 2025 "), or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier) ("Class Members) and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the PAGA Period Period (April 25, 2022 through May 25, 2025, or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier) ("Aggrieved Employees").

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA").

Based on Defendants' records, and the Parties' current assumptions, your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be $_____ (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be $_____. The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to Defendants' records you are not eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment under the Settlement because you didn't work during the PAGA Period.)

The above estimates are based on Defendants' records showing that you worked _____ workweeks during the Class Period and you worked _____ pay periods during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 4 of this Notice.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have

carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendants to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendants.

If you worked for Defendants during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

1. **Do Nothing**. You don't have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment and/or an Individual PAGA Payment. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims and PAGA Period penalty claims against Defendants.

2. **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement**. You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting the written Request for Exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment. You will, however, preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period wage claims against Defendants, and, if you are an Aggrieved Employee, remain eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

Defendants will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

You Don't Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement. If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendants that are covered by this Settlement (Released Claims).

You Can Opt-Out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement. The Opt-out Deadline is DATE . If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section 6 of this Notice.

You Cannot Opt-out of the PAGA Portion of the Proposed Settlement. Defendants must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees and the Aggrieved Employees must give up their rights to pursue Released Claims (defined below).

Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement. Written objections must be submitted by DATE. All Class Members who do not opt-out ("Participating Class Members") can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court's decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how

much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiffs who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiffs. Other than the PAGA portion of this Settlement, you can object to any aspect of this Settlement. See Section 7 of this Notice.

You Can Participate in the Final Approval Hearing. The Court's Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on DATE. You don't have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court's virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section 8 of this Notice.

You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks/Pay Periods. Written Challenges Must be Submitted by DATE. The amount of your Individual Class Payment and PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many Pay Periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Workweeks and number of Pay Periods you worked according to Defendants' records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by DATE. See Section 4 of this Notice.

1. WHAT IS THE ACTION ABOUT?

Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants. The Action accuses Defendants of violating California labor laws by failing to pay all (1) minimum wages, (2) overtime wages, (3) premium wages in lieu of missed/denied meal and rest periods, (3) reimbursement of out-of-pocket business expenses, (4) penalties for failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and (5) penalties for failure to issue accurately itemized wage statements for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period Based on the same and other wage and hour claims, Plaintiffs have also asserted a claim for civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.) ("PAGA"). Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys ("Class Counsel") in the Action.

Defendants strongly deny violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contends it complied with all applicable laws.

2. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE ACTION HAS SETTLED?

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendants violated any laws. In the meantime, Plaintiffs and Defendants hired an experienced, neutral mediator in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating an end to the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement ("Agreement") and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiffs and Defendants have negotiated a proposed Settlement that is subject to the Court's Final Approval. Both sides agree the proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendants do not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims.

Plaintiffs and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendants have agreed to pay a fair, reasonable, and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine whether to finally approve the Settlement.

3. WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT?

Defendants Will Pay $600,000.00 as the Gross Settlement Amount (Gross Settlement). Defendants have agreed to deposit the Gross Settlement into an account controlled by the Administrator of the Settlement. The Administrator will use the Gross Settlement to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel's attorney's fees and expenses, the Administrator's expenses, and penalties to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). Assuming the Court grants Final Approval, Defendants will fund the Gross Settlement not more than 14 days after the Judgment entered by the Court becomes final. The Judgment will be final on the date the Court enters Judgment, or a later date if Participating Class Members object to the proposed Settlement or the Judgment is appealed.

Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement. At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:

- Up to $200,000.00 (1/3 of the Gross Settlement) to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and up to $51,000.00 for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.
- Up to $40,000.00 as Class Representative Service Payments for filing the Action, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. Class Representative Service Payments will be the only monies Plaintiffs will receive other than Plaintiffs' Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment.
- Up to $21,000.00 to the Administrator for services administering the Settlement.
- Up to $20,000.00 for PAGA Penalties, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% in Individual PAGA Payments to the Aggrieved Employees based on their PAGA Period Pay Periods.

Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

Net Settlement Distributed to Class Members. After making the above deductions in amounts approved by the Court, the Administrator will distribute the rest of the Gross Settlement (the "Net Settlement") by making Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members based on their Class Period Workweeks.

Taxes Owed on Payments to Class Members. Plaintiffs and Defendants are asking the Court to approve an allocation of 20% of each Individual Class Payment to taxable wages ("Wage Portion")

and 80% to penalties and interest ("Non-Wage Portion.). The Wage Portion is subject to withholdings and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms. Defendants will separately pay employer payroll taxes it owes on the Wage Portion. The Individual PAGA Payments are counted as penalties rather than wages for tax purposes. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments and the Non-Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

Although Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed to these allocations, neither side is giving you any advice on whether your Payments are taxable or how much you might owe in taxes. You are responsible for paying all taxes (including penalties and interest on back taxes) on any payments received from the proposed Settlement. You should consult a tax advisor if you have any questions about the tax consequences of the proposed Settlement.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the monies will be deposited with the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in your name. If the payment represented by your check is sent to the Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund, you should consult the rules of the Fund for instructions on how to retrieve your money.

Requests for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (Opt-Outs). You will be treated as a Participating Class Member, participating fully in the Settlement, unless you notify the Administrator in writing, not later than DATE, that you wish to opt-out. The easiest way to notify the Administrator is to send a written and signed Request for Exclusion by the Response Deadline. The Request for Exclusion should be a letter from a you or your representative setting forth your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement electing to be excluded from the Settlement. Excluded Class Members (i.e., Non-Participating Class Members) will not receive Individual Class Payments, but will preserve their rights to personally pursue wage and hour claims against Defendants.

You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement. Class Members who exclude themselves from the Class Settlement (Non-Participating Class Members) remain eligible for Individual PAGA Payments and are required to give up their right to assert PAGA claims against Defendants based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Action.

The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendants will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendants.

Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, Phoenix Settlement Administrators (the "Administrator") to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members' Requests for Exclusion. The Administrator will also decide Class Member Challenges over Workweeks, mail and re- mail settlement checks and tax forms, and perform other tasks necessary to administer the Settlement. The Administrator's contact information is contained in Section 9 of this Notice.

Participating Class Members' Release. Plaintiffs and the Class Members may hereafter discover facts or legal arguments in addition to or different from those they now know or currently believe to be true with respect to the claims, causes of action and legal theories of recovery in the Actions which are the subject matter of the Released Claims (hereinafter defined). Regardless, the discovery of new facts or legal arguments shall in no way limit the scope or definition of the Released Claims, and by virtue of this MOU, Plaintiffs and the Class Members shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the final judgment approved by the Court, shall have, fully, finally, and forever settled and released all of the Released Claims against the Released Parties as defined in this MOU. All causes of action and factual or legal theories/allegations that were alleged in the operative complaints in the Actions and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notice[s] to the LWDA, or that could have been brought in the Actions and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notice[s] to the LWDA based on those same factual or legal theories/allegations, against the Released Parties. This Release includes, but is not limited to, claims for violation of, or recovery under, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act; the applicable IWC Wage Order; and Business & Professions Code section 17200-17208. This Release also includes, but is not limited to, the following claims for relief: (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; (i) unfair business practices; (j) all damages, penalties, restitution, attorneys' fees, interest, and other amounts recoverable in connection with the above legal authorities and/or claims for relief under local, California, and federal law (collectively, the "Class Released Claims"). The period of the Release shall extend from July 10, 2019 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Release. All aggrieved employees, including Non Participating Class Members who are PAGA Members, are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, all the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts occurring within the PAGA Period, facts stated in the operative complaints in the Actions, the PAGA Notices and ascertained in the course of the Actions including, e.g., any and all claims relating to (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (j) attorneys' fees, and other amounts recoverable under PAGA (the "PAGA Released Claims"). The period of the PAGA Release shall extend from April 25, 2022 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

4. HOW WILL THE ADMINISTRATOR CALCULATE MY PAYMENT?

Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members, and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Workweeks worked by each individual Participating Class Member.

Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing $5,000.00 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Pay Periods worked by each individual Aggrieved Employee.

Workweek/Pay Period Challenges. The number of Workweeks you worked during the Class Period and the number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, as recorded in Defendants' records, are stated in the first page of this Notice. You have until DATE to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you. You can submit your challenge by signing and sending a letter to the Administrator via mail, email or fax. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

You need to support your challenge by sending copies of pay stubs or other records. The Administrator will accept Defendants' calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods based on Defendants' records as accurate unless you send copies of records containing contrary information. You should send copies rather than originals because the documents will not be returned to you. The Administrator will resolve Workweek and/or Pay Period challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendants' Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

5. HOW WILL I GET PAID?

Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single check to every Participating Class Member (i.e., every Class Member who doesn't opt-out) including those who also qualify as Aggrieved Employees. The single check will combine the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment.

Non-Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single Individual PAGA Payment check to every Aggrieved Employee who opts out of the Settlement (i.e., every Non-Participating Class Member).

Your check will be sent to the same address as this Notice. If you change your address, be sure to notify the Administrator as soon as possible. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

6. HOW DO I OPT-OUT OF THE CLASS SETTLEMENT?

Submit a written and signed letter with your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement that you do not want to participate in the Settlement. The Administrator will exclude you based on any writing communicating your request be excluded. Be sure to personally sign your request, identify the Action as *Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC Inc. et. al.,* and include

your identifying information (full name, address, telephone number, approximate dates of employment, and social security number for verification purposes). You must make the request yourself. If someone else makes the request for you, it will not be valid. The Administrator must be sent your request to be excluded by DATE, or it will be invalid. Section 9 of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

7. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiffs and Defendants are asking the Court to approve. At least 16 court days before the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel and/or Plaintiffs will file in Court (1) a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and stating (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiffs is requesting as a Class Representative Service Payment. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is in Section 9 of this Notice) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on the Administrator's Website _____ (url) or the Court's website _____ (url).

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement or the Motion for Final Approval may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. The deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is DATE. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action *Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC Inc. et. al*, and include your name, current address, telephone number, and approximate dates of employment with Defendants and sign the objection. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. See Section 8 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing.

8. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on DATE at TIME in Department _____ of the San Bernardino Superior Court, located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210. At the Hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and how much of the Gross Settlement will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiffs, and the Administrator. The Court will invite comment from objectors, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel before making a decision. You can attend (or hire a lawyer to attend) either personally or virtually via _____ Check the Court's website for the most current information.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. You should check the Court's website beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing.

9. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The Agreement sets forth everything Defendants and Plaintiffs have promised to do under the proposed Settlement. The easiest way to read the Agreement, the Judgment or any other Settlement documents is to go to San Bernardino Superior Court's website at https://cap.sb-court.org/. You can also telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court website by going to (https://cap.sb-court.org/) and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. CIVSB2315395.

DO NOT TELEPHONE THE SUPERIOR COURT TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.

Class Counsel:

Zachary Crosner
zach@crosnerlegal.com
Jamie Serb
jamie@crosnerlegal.com
Sepideh Ardestani
sepideh@crosnerlegal.com
Crosner Legal, P.C.
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Sam Kim
skim@verumlg.com
Verum Law Group, APC
360 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 1025
El Segundo, CA 90245

Adrian R. Bacon
abacon@toddflaw.com
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.
21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Adib Assassi
adib@aclegalteam.com
Assassi & Cruz Law Firm, PC
1100 W. Town & Country Rd., Suite 1250
Orange, CA 92868

Settlement Administrator: Name of Company:

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Fax Number:

10. WHAT IF I LOSE MY SETTLEMENT CHECK?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void you should consult the Unclaimed Property Fund for instructions on how to retrieve the funds.

11. WHAT IF I CHANGE MY ADDRESS?

To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

4899-9598-0360.1

EXHIBIT 2

COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL

(*Synthia Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC, Inc., et. al.*

San Bernardino Superior Court case number CIVSB2315395)

The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it carefully!

It's not junk mail, spam, an advertisement, or solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.

You may be eligible to receive money from an employee class action lawsuit ("Action") against Defendants Kalaveras RS Inc., Kalaveras-Cov Inc., Kalaveras Mon Inc., Kalaveras MV Inc, Kalaveras-NH Inc, Kalaveras SBO Inc, Kalaveras PD Inc, Kalaveras RC Inc, Kalaveras SL Inc, Kalaveras BB Inc., Kalaveras LH, Inc., Kalaveras SA Inc., Kalaveras CVSA, and Isaias Ocampo Brito ("Defendants") for alleged wage and hour violations. The Action was filed by former employees of Defendants ("Plaintiffs") and seeks payment of (1) minimum wages, (2) overtime wages, (3) premium wages in lieu of missed/denied meal and rest periods, (3) reimbursement of out-of-pocket business expenses, (4) penalties for failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and (5) penalties for failure to issue accurately itemized wage statements for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period (July 10, 2019 through May 25, 2025 "), or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier) ("Class Members) and (2) penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA") for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California during the PAGA Period Period (April 25, 2022 through May 25, 2025, or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier) ("Aggrieved Employees").

The proposed Settlement has two main parts: (1) a Class Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual Class Payments, and (2) a PAGA Settlement requiring Defendants to fund Individual PAGA Payments and pay penalties to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA").

Based on Defendants' records, and the Parties' current assumptions, your Individual Class Payment is estimated to be $_____ (less withholding) and your Individual PAGA Payment is estimated to be $_____. The actual amount you may receive likely will be different and will depend on a number of factors. (If no amount is stated for your Individual PAGA Payment, then according to Defendants' records you are not eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment under the Settlement because you didn't work during the PAGA Period.)

The above estimates are based on Defendants' records showing that you worked _____ workweeks during the Class Period and you worked _____ pay periods during the PAGA Period. If you believe that you worked more workweeks during either period, you can submit a challenge by the deadline date. See Section 4 of this Notice.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have

carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Defendants to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members and Aggrieved Employees to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Defendants.

If you worked for Defendants during the Class Period and/or the PAGA Period, you have two basic options under the Settlement:

1. **Do Nothing**. You don't have to do anything to participate in the proposed Settlement and be eligible for an Individual Class Payment and/or an Individual PAGA Payment. As a Participating Class Member, though, you will give up your right to assert Class Period wage claims and PAGA Period penalty claims against Defendants.

2. **Opt-Out of the Class Settlement**. You can exclude yourself from the Class Settlement (opt-out) by submitting the written Request for Exclusion or otherwise notifying the Administrator in writing. If you opt-out of the Settlement, you will not receive an Individual Class Payment. You will, however, preserve your right to personally pursue Class Period wage claims against Defendants, and, if you are an Aggrieved Employee, remain eligible for an Individual PAGA Payment. You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the proposed Settlement.

Defendants will not retaliate against you for any actions you take with respect to the proposed Settlement.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

You Don't Have to Do Anything to Participate in the Settlement. If you do nothing, you will be a Participating Class Member, eligible for an Individual Class Payment and an Individual PAGA Payment (if any). In exchange, you will give up your right to assert the wage claims against Defendants that are covered by this Settlement (Released Claims).

You Can Opt-Out of the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement. The Opt-out Deadline is DATE . If you don't want to fully participate in the proposed Settlement, you can opt-out of the Class Settlement by sending the Administrator a written Request for Exclusion. Once excluded, you will be a Non-Participating Class Member and no longer eligible for an Individual Class Payment. Non-Participating Class Members cannot object to any portion of the proposed Settlement. See Section 6 of this Notice.

You Cannot Opt-out of the PAGA Portion of the Proposed Settlement. Defendants must pay Individual PAGA Payments to all Aggrieved Employees and the Aggrieved Employees must give up their rights to pursue Released Claims (defined below).

Participating Class Members Can Object to the Class Settlement but not the PAGA Settlement. Written objections must be submitted by DATE. All Class Members who do not opt-out ("Participating Class Members") can object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement. The Court's decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how

much will be paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiffs who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiffs. Other than the PAGA portion of this Settlement, you can object to any aspect of this Settlement. See Section 7 of this Notice.

You Can Participate in the Final Approval Hearing. The Court's Final Approval Hearing is scheduled to take place on DATE. You don't have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court's virtual appearance platform. Participating Class Members can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. See Section 8 of this Notice.

You Can Challenge the Calculation of Your Workweeks/Pay Periods. Written Challenges Must be Submitted by DATE. The amount of your Individual Class Payment and PAGA Payment (if any) depend on how many workweeks you worked at least one day during the Class Period and how many Pay Periods you worked at least one day during the PAGA Period, respectively. The number of Workweeks and number of Pay Periods you worked according to Defendants' records is stated on the first page of this Notice. If you disagree with either of these numbers, you must challenge it by DATE. See Section 4 of this Notice.

1. WHAT IS THE ACTION ABOUT?

Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants. The Action accuses Defendants of violating California labor laws by failing to pay all (1) minimum wages, (2) overtime wages, (3) premium wages in lieu of missed/denied meal and rest periods, (3) reimbursement of out-of-pocket business expenses, (4) penalties for failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and (5) penalties for failure to issue accurately itemized wage statements for all non-exempt hourly employees employed by Defendants in the State of California at any time during the Class Period Based on the same and other wage and hour claims, Plaintiffs have also asserted a claim for civil penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq.) ("PAGA"). Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys ("Class Counsel") in the Action.

Defendants strongly deny violating any laws or failing to pay any wages and contends it complied with all applicable laws.

2. WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT THE ACTION HAS SETTLED?

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendants violated any laws. In the meantime, Plaintiffs and Defendants hired an experienced, neutral mediator in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating an end to the case by agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a lengthy written settlement agreement ("Agreement") and agreeing to jointly ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action and enforcing the Agreement, Plaintiffs and Defendants have negotiated a proposed Settlement that is subject to the Court's Final Approval. Both sides agree the proposed Settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendants do not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims.

Plaintiffs and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendants have agreed to pay a fair, reasonable, and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine whether to finally approve the Settlement.

3. WHAT ARE THE IMPORTANT TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT?

Defendants Will Pay $600,000.00 as the Gross Settlement Amount (Gross Settlement). Defendants have agreed to deposit the Gross Settlement into an account controlled by the Administrator of the Settlement. The Administrator will use the Gross Settlement to pay the Individual Class Payments, Individual PAGA Payments, Class Representative Service Payment, Class Counsel's attorney's fees and expenses, the Administrator's expenses, and penalties to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). Assuming the Court grants Final Approval, Defendants will fund the Gross Settlement not more than 14 days after the Judgment entered by the Court becomes final. The Judgment will be final on the date the Court enters Judgment, or a later date if Participating Class Members object to the proposed Settlement or the Judgment is appealed.

Court Approved Deductions from Gross Settlement. At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Gross Settlement, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:

- Up to $200,000.00 (1/3 of the Gross Settlement) to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and up to $51,000.00 for their litigation expenses. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.
- Up to $40,000.00 as Class Representative Service Payments for filing the Action, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. Class Representative Service Payments will be the only monies Plaintiffs will receive other than Plaintiffs' Individual Class Payment and any Individual PAGA Payment.
- Up to $21,000.00 to the Administrator for services administering the Settlement.
- Up to $20,000.00 for PAGA Penalties, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% in Individual PAGA Payments to the Aggrieved Employees based on their PAGA Period Pay Periods.

Participating Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.

Net Settlement Distributed to Class Members. After making the above deductions in amounts approved by the Court, the Administrator will distribute the rest of the Gross Settlement (the "Net Settlement") by making Individual Class Payments to Participating Class Members based on their Class Period Workweeks.

Taxes Owed on Payments to Class Members. Plaintiffs and Defendants are asking the Court to approve an allocation of 20% of each Individual Class Payment to taxable wages ("Wage Portion")

and 80% to penalties and interest ("Non-Wage Portion.). The Wage Portion is subject to withholdings and will be reported on IRS W-2 Forms. Defendants will separately pay employer payroll taxes it owes on the Wage Portion. The Individual PAGA Payments are counted as penalties rather than wages for tax purposes. The Administrator will report the Individual PAGA Payments and the Non-Wage Portions of the Individual Class Payments on IRS 1099 Forms.

Although Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed to these allocations, neither side is giving you any advice on whether your Payments are taxable or how much you might owe in taxes. You are responsible for paying all taxes (including penalties and interest on back taxes) on any payments received from the proposed Settlement. You should consult a tax advisor if you have any questions about the tax consequences of the proposed Settlement.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check issued for Individual Class Payments and Individual PAGA Payments will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the monies will be deposited with the California Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund in your name. If the payment represented by your check is sent to the Controller's Unclaimed Property Fund, you should consult the rules of the Fund for instructions on how to retrieve your money.

Requests for Exclusion from the Class Settlement (Opt-Outs). You will be treated as a Participating Class Member, participating fully in the Settlement, unless you notify the Administrator in writing, not later than DATE, that you wish to opt-out. The easiest way to notify the Administrator is to send a written and signed Request for Exclusion by the Response Deadline. The Request for Exclusion should be a letter from a you or your representative setting forth your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement electing to be excluded from the Settlement. Excluded Class Members (i.e., Non-Participating Class Members) will not receive Individual Class Payments, but will preserve their rights to personally pursue wage and hour claims against Defendants.

You cannot opt-out of the PAGA portion of the Settlement. Class Members who exclude themselves from the Class Settlement (Non-Participating Class Members) remain eligible for Individual PAGA Payments and are required to give up their right to assert PAGA claims against Defendants based on the PAGA Period facts alleged in the Action.

The Proposed Settlement Will be Void if the Court Denies Final Approval. It is possible the Court will decline to grant Final Approval of the Settlement or decline enter a Judgment. It is also possible the Court will enter a Judgment that is reversed on appeal. Plaintiffs and Defendants have agreed that, in either case, the Settlement will be void: Defendants will not pay any money and Class Members will not release any claims against Defendants.

Administrator. The Court has appointed a neutral company, Phoenix Settlement Administrators (the "Administrator") to send this Notice, calculate and make payments, and process Class Members' Requests for Exclusion. The Administrator will also decide Class Member Challenges over Workweeks, mail and re- mail settlement checks and tax forms, and perform other tasks necessary to administer the Settlement. The Administrator's contact information is contained in Section 9 of this Notice.

Participating Class Members' Release. Plaintiffs and the Class Members may hereafter discover facts or legal arguments in addition to or different from those they now know or currently believe to be true with respect to the claims, causes of action and legal theories of recovery in the Actions which are the subject matter of the Released Claims (hereinafter defined). Regardless, the discovery of new facts or legal arguments shall in no way limit the scope or definition of the Released Claims, and by virtue of this MOU, Plaintiffs and the Class Members shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the final judgment approved by the Court, shall have, fully, finally, and forever settled and released all of the Released Claims against the Released Parties as defined in this MOU. All causes of action and factual or legal theories/allegations that were alleged in the operative complaints in the Actions and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notice[s] to the LWDA, or that could have been brought in the Actions and/or Plaintiffs' PAGA notice[s] to the LWDA based on those same factual or legal theories/allegations, against the Released Parties. This Release includes, but is not limited to, claims for violation of, or recovery under, Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 218.5, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 233, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802; the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act; the applicable IWC Wage Order; and Business & Professions Code section 17200-17208. This Release also includes, but is not limited to, the following claims for relief: (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; (i) unfair business practices; (j) all damages, penalties, restitution, attorneys' fees, interest, and other amounts recoverable in connection with the above legal authorities and/or claims for relief under local, California, and federal law (collectively, the "Class Released Claims"). The period of the Release shall extend from July 10, 2019 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

Aggrieved Employees' PAGA Release. All aggrieved employees, including Non Participating Class Members who are PAGA Members, are deemed to release, on behalf of themselves and their respective former and present representatives, agents, attorneys, heirs, administrators, successors, and assigns, all the Released Parties from all claims for PAGA penalties that were alleged, or reasonably could have been alleged, based on the facts occurring within the PAGA Period, facts stated in the operative complaints in the Actions, the PAGA Notices and ascertained in the course of the Actions including, e.g., any and all claims relating to (a) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (b) failure to pay overtime wages; (c) failure to provide meal breaks; (d) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (e) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (f) failure to pay to pay sick pay wages; (g) failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (h) failure to indemnify employees for expenditures; and (j) attorneys' fees, and other amounts recoverable under PAGA (the "PAGA Released Claims"). The period of the PAGA Release shall extend from April 25, 2022 to when Class Members and aggrieved employees have collectively worked 75,000 workweeks or the date of preliminary approval, whichever is earlier.

4. HOW WILL THE ADMINISTRATOR CALCULATE MY PAYMENT?

Individual Class Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Class Payments by (a) dividing the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks worked by all Participating Class Members, and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Workweeks worked by each individual Participating Class Member.

Individual PAGA Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual PAGA Payments by (a) dividing $5,000.00 by the total number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by all Aggrieved Employees and (b) multiplying the result by the number of Pay Periods worked by each individual Aggrieved Employee.

Workweek/Pay Period Challenges. The number of Workweeks you worked during the Class Period and the number of PAGA Pay Periods you worked during the PAGA Period, as recorded in Defendants' records, are stated in the first page of this Notice. You have until DATE to challenge the number of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods credited to you. You can submit your challenge by signing and sending a letter to the Administrator via mail, email or fax. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

You need to support your challenge by sending copies of pay stubs or other records. The Administrator will accept Defendants' calculation of Workweeks and/or Pay Periods based on Defendants' records as accurate unless you send copies of records containing contrary information. You should send copies rather than originals because the documents will not be returned to you. The Administrator will resolve Workweek and/or Pay Period challenges based on your submission and on input from Class Counsel (who will advocate on behalf of Participating Class Members) and Defendants' Counsel. The Administrator's decision is final. You can't appeal or otherwise challenge its final decision.

5. HOW WILL I GET PAID?

Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single check to every Participating Class Member (i.e., every Class Member who doesn't opt-out) including those who also qualify as Aggrieved Employees. The single check will combine the Individual Class Payment and the Individual PAGA Payment.

Non-Participating Class Members. The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single Individual PAGA Payment check to every Aggrieved Employee who opts out of the Settlement (i.e., every Non-Participating Class Member).

Your check will be sent to the same address as this Notice. If you change your address, be sure to notify the Administrator as soon as possible. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

6. HOW DO I OPT-OUT OF THE CLASS SETTLEMENT?

Submit a written and signed letter with your name, present address, telephone number, and a simple statement that you do not want to participate in the Settlement. The Administrator will exclude you based on any writing communicating your request be excluded. Be sure to personally sign your request, identify the Action as *Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC Inc. et. al.,* and include

your identifying information (full name, address, telephone number, approximate dates of employment, and social security number for verification purposes). You must make the request yourself. If someone else makes the request for you, it will not be valid. The Administrator must be sent your request to be excluded by DATE, or it will be invalid. Section 9 of the Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

7. HOW DO I OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT?

Only Participating Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiffs and Defendants are asking the Court to approve. At least 16 court days before the Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel and/or Plaintiffs will file in Court (1) a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and stating (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiffs is requesting as a Class Representative Service Payment. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is in Section 9 of this Notice) will send you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on the Administrator's Website _____ (url) or the Court's website _____ (url).

A Participating Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement or the Motion for Final Approval may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiffs are too high or too low. The deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is DATE. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Make sure you identify the Action *Castillo Garcia et. al. v. Kalaveras RC Inc. et. al*, and include your name, current address, telephone number, and approximate dates of employment with Defendants and sign the objection. Section 9 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

Alternatively, a Participating Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. See Section 8 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing.

8. CAN I ATTEND THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on DATE at TIME in Department _____ of the San Bernardino Superior Court, located at 247 West Third Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0210. At the Hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and how much of the Gross Settlement will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiffs, and the Administrator. The Court will invite comment from objectors, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel before making a decision. You can attend (or hire a lawyer to attend) either personally or virtually via _____ Check the Court's website for the most current information.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. You should check the Court's website beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing.

9. HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?

The Agreement sets forth everything Defendants and Plaintiffs have promised to do under the proposed Settlement. The easiest way to read the Agreement, the Judgment or any other Settlement documents is to go to San Bernardino Superior Court's website at https://cap.sb-court.org/. You can also telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court website by going to (https://cap.sb-court.org/) and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. CIVSB2315395.

DO NOT TELEPHONE THE SUPERIOR COURT TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE SETTLEMENT.

Class Counsel:

Zachary Crosner
zach@crosnerlegal.com
Jamie Serb
jamie@crosnerlegal.com
Sepideh Ardestani
sepideh@crosnerlegal.com
Crosner Legal, P.C.
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Sam Kim
skim@verumlg.com
Verum Law Group, APC
360 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 1025
El Segundo, CA 90245

Adrian R. Bacon
abacon@toddflaw.com
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman, P.C.
21031 Ventura Blvd., Suite 340
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Adib Assassi
adib@aclegalteam.com
Assassi & Cruz Law Firm, PC
1100 W. Town & Country Rd., Suite 1250
Orange, CA 92868

Settlement Administrator: Name of Company:

Email Address:

Mailing Address:

Telephone:

Fax Number:

10. WHAT IF I LOSE MY SETTLEMENT CHECK?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void you should consult the Unclaimed Property Fund for instructions on how to retrieve the funds.

11. WHAT IF I CHANGE MY ADDRESS?

To receive your check, you should immediately notify the Administrator if you move or otherwise change your mailing address.

4899-9598-0360.1

EXHIBIT 3

Los Angeles Office
9440 Santa Monica Blvd.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
kiara@crosnerlegal.com
direct: (424) 335-5236
office: (866) 276-7637
fax: (310) 510-6429

June 29, 2023

VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY:
California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL:

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SL Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras SL Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM

To: California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and Kalaveras SL Inc
Date: June 29, 2023
Subject: *Gilbert Garcia v. Kalaveras SL Inc*

Introduction

This office represents PLAINTIFF, Gilbert Garcia (hereinafter "PLAINTIFF") in connection with PLAINTIFF's claims under the California Labor Code. PLAINTIFF was, at all relevant times herein mentioned, an employee of the following entity and individual managing agents of said

entity: Kalaveras SL Inc (hereinafter, this entity and its managing agents are collectively referred to as "DEFENDANTS"). DEFENDANTS may be contacted directly at the addresses listed above.

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice ("NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") and on behalf of all current and former exempt employees employed by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of this notice ("EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES"), hereby gives written notice ("NOTICE") of PLAINTIFF's claims against DEFENDANTS. This NOTICE is being provided via online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and DEFENDANTS via certified mail to their Agent(s) for Service of Process and/or entity mailing address as provided to the California Secretary of State.

This NOTICE also serves to demonstrate PLAINTIFF's reasonable attempt at settlement with DEFENDANTS. If DEFENDANTS are interested in settling this matter before a lawsuit is filed, DEFENDANTS may contact Crosner Legal, P.C., at the address listed at the close of this NOTICE. This settlement attempt is in compliance with relevant California law. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

This NOTICE is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5. This NOTICE further reserves any and all rights by PLAINTIFF to amend this notice to include, amend, or add further charges upon discovery of new violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code. In addition, to the extent that entities and/or other individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code sections including, but not limited to sections 558.1 and 1197.1—PLAINTIFF reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue. Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this NOTICE. Consequently, DEFENDANTS are on notice that PLAINTIFF continues its investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of *any* of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein. For violations that are curable under § 2699.3(c) and that DEFENDANTS intend to cure within the statutory time period set forth in §§ 2699 and 2699.3(c), the DEFENDANTS shall provide notice including a description of the actions taken to cure. If the alleged violation is not cured within the statutory time period, PLAINTIFF will commence a civil action pursuant to section 2699. For all other violations that are not curable, an action pursuant to section 2699(a) and 2699(f) will commence after the requirements under 2699.3 are fulfilled.

Based on the following summary of facts and theories upon which PLAINTIFF will base PLAINTIFF's claims, PLAINTIFF requests that the LWDA regard this NOTICE as written notice of PLAINTIFF's intent to seek civil penalties against DEFENDANTS. Under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, a PAGA representative has authority to seek penalties for all known violations committed by the employer – regardless of whether the representative experienced all violations personally. *Id.* at 760-761. Moreover, under *Johnson v.*

Maxim Healthcare Servs., Inc., (2021) 66 Cal. App. 5th 924, 929, an employee may pursue a claim under PAGA even when that employee's individual claim is time-barred.

PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, alleges that the specific provisions of California law that DEFENDANTS have violated, requiring this NOTICE, include but are not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 208, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 351, 353, 432, 432.5, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and all applicable Wage Orders.

The Named Entities Are Joint Employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES

California courts have recognized that the definition of "employer" for purposes of enforcement of the California Labor Code goes beyond the concept of traditional employment to reach irregular working arrangements for the purpose of preventing evasion and subterfuge of California's labor laws. *Martinez v. Combs* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35, 65. As such, anyone who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, engages, suffers, or permits any person to work or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person, may be liable for violations of the California Labor Code as to that person.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS and unknown entities operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized human resources as set forth herein. Under California law, in determining whether two defendant entities are liable as an integrated enterprise, courts consider four factors: (1) centralized control of labor relations; (2) interrelation of operations; (3) common management; and (4) common ownership or financial control. *Laird v. Capital Cities/Abc, Inc.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 727, 737 (overruled on other grounds, *Reid v. Google, Inc.* (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 512 (2010).)

PLAINTIFF believes and hereon asserts that DEFENDANTS and unknown entities must be classified as joint employers of PLAINTIFF for purposes of liability for civil penalties under PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered and permitted PLAINTIFF to perform services from which they benefited, and furthermore that the aforementioned entities had the right to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF at all relevant times herein, so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. By reason of their status as joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, they are each liable for civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders as to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1

Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. DEFENDANTS, at all relevant times, were an employer or person acting on behalf of employer(s) who violated

PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code. The California Legislature defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as "*a natural person* who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer." The "managing agent" definition mirrors that found in California's punitive damages statute (subdivision (b) of section 3294 of the Civil Code). Under that statute and supporting case law, "managing agents" are all employees who exercise substantial independent authority and judgment in their corporate decision-making such that their decisions ultimately determine corporate policy. *White v. Ultramar, Inc.* (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 563, 566-67. For the reasons set forth above and others, at all relevant times, any above-listed individuals meet the criteria of managing agents under California law, and therefore, may be held liable under California Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, and 1194 as further described in detail below.

PLAINTIFF intends to further name any unknown individuals responsible for violations arising under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 after further discovery. PLAINTIFF will ask the Court to relate the amendment of the PAGA charge and the operative complaint to the date of filing of these charges. PLAINTIFF asks and demands that DEFENDANTS put these individuals on notice immediately to provide them as much notice possible to mount in defense. In the alternative, PLAINTIFF also offers to DEFENDANTS to place those individuals on notice if DEFENDANTS voluntarily provides their contact information.

General Information

DEFENDANTS own, operate, manage and/or staff its employees to work at the facilities, restaurants and/or other location(s) in California. DEFENDANTS own, operate and/or manage and/or staff its employees to work at including but not limited to, the facilities, locations and/or restaurants operating under the name(s) "Kalaveras" and/or "Kalaveras Cantina Urbana" located in including but not limited to the following cities and/or neighborhoods in California: Bellflower, Chino Hills, Long Beach, Marina Del Rey, Montebello, Moreno Valley, Newport Beach, North Hollywood, Orange, Pasadena, Puente Hills, Rancho Cucamonga, Redondo Beach, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Pedro, Santa Monica, Silver Lake, Simi Valley, West Los Angeles, and Whittier.. DEFENDANTS, through its various locations serve the restaurant, food, and/or food services industry.[1] Although DEFENDANTS may operate a successful company or have a noble mission, DEFENDANTS do not comply with California's labor laws.

PLAINTIFF is a former employee of DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of bartender and/or a similar title(s) and/or position(s) from in or around April 2022 through in or around May 2023. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS at DEFENDANTS' Los Angeles (Silver Lake), California location(s). PLAINTIFF regularly worked at least five (5) to seven (7) hours per day, at least two (2) to five (5) days per week. DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF an hourly rate for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked. PLAINTIFF also earned tips as part of his compensation.

[1] *See* https://kalaveras.com/. Last visited on June 29, 2023.

Among other things, DEFENDANTS (1) failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete time records for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (2) failed and continue to fail to pay PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked; (3) failed and continue to fail to pay PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at least minimum wage for all hours worked and overtime/regular rates for corresponding work; (4) failed and continue to fail to pay proper overtime wages for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation into the overtime premium pay calculations; (5) failed and continue to fail to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with proper meal and/or rest breaks, and/or compensate PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of compensation for missed/improper meal and/or rest periods; (6) refused and continue to refuse to make and/or falsely denied the amount of payments due to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, including but not limited to, owed sick pay; (7) failed and continue to fail to place PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on proper notice of their workplace rights, including but not limited to owed sick pay; (8) failed and continue to fail to provide legally compliant wage statements to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (9) made unlawful deductions from PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' paychecks; (10) failed and continue to fail to timely pay wages to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES during employment and/or upon separation of employment; (11) failed and continue to fail to reimburse PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses incurred on behalf of DEFENDANTS; (12) conducted and continue to conduct illegal criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of PLAINTIFF's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' hire and continued employment; (13) required and continue to require PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to disclose arrests not resulting in convictions and/or to disclose convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired and continue to inquire into PLAINTIFF's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES', and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' criminal history on their employment applications and sign off on same as a condition of employment; (14) failed and continue to fail to provide suitable seating; and (15) required and continue to require PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a term or condition that violates the law as a condition of employment. Further descriptions of the above-mentioned violations and others are explained below.

Labor Code Violations

Recordkeeping Requirement Violations: California Labor Code section 1174 requires employers to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 similarly requires employers to keep accurate time records reflecting the times during which allowed meal periods were provided each day.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage statements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by virtue of DEFENDANTS' time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices.

DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS' failure to relieve PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed, and continue to fail, to record the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed and continue to fail, to record the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work shifts.

Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

DEFENDANTS' failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.[2]

Violations of Labor Code Sections 226(b)-(c), 1198.5, and 432:

Time and Pay Records

Labor Code section 226 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 require that employers keep the following information on file for each employee for a minimum of three years: The employee's dates of employment; the employee's hourly rates and the corresponding number of hours worked by the employee at each hourly rate, when the employee begins and ends each work period (including meal periods) and split intervals; total hours worked by the employee; all deductions; gross wages earned; and net wages earned.

[2] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

Section (b) of Labor Code section 226 further requires employers to "afford current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment upon reasonable request to the employer." Section (c) of Labor Code section 226 provides that, "an employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or receive a copy of records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A violation of this subdivision is an infraction." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar ($750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 226(f).

Personnel Records

In addition to their right to time and pay records, employees, and their representatives, have the right to inspect and receive a copy of their personnel files pursuant to Labor Code section 1198.5. This statute applies to both former and current employees. Labor Code section 432 further specifies that employers must furnish copies of all employment records bearing the employee's signature.

Labor Code section 1198.5 also requires that the file be made available for inspection or receipt within a "reasonable" amount of time, but "not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives a written request." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe likewise entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar ($750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 1198.5(k).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely produce or make available a current or former employee's personnel records and/or payroll records when requested pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to timely produce complete payroll and personnel records when requested by NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to penalties under Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.

Meal Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must be provided before the end of the 10th hour of work. *Ibid*. Meal periods can be waived, but only under the following circumstances: (1) if an employee's total work period in a day is over five (5) hours but no more than six (6) hours, the required meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, and (2) if an employee's total work period in a day is over ten (10) hours but no more than twelve (12) hours, the required second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if

the first meal period was not waived. *Ibid*. Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF did not sign a valid meal period waiver throughout PLAINTIFF's employment by DEFENDANTS.

Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above), *and* (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is presumed that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3) ("Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded"); *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1052-1053, citing section 7(A)(3) ("If an employer's records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was provided").

Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees' regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided"); *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of five and a one-half (5 ½) hours or more, entitling to at least one meal period.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not receive legally compliant thirty (30) minute first meal breaks. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted meal periods, often being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all their meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal breaks or skip meal breaks completely.

For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to take late meal periods in order to complete assigned job duties. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were interrupted during purported meal periods and/or had meal periods cut short and/or restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises due to the need to continue assigned job duties. For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to cut any meal periods short and/or work through his meal periods completely in order to complete assigned job duties.

For example, when the restaurant was busy, PLAINTIFF's supervisor would instruct PLAINTIFF to work through his owed meal period. Other times, PLAINTIFF had to take his meal period late (i.e. after the fifth hour of work) due to the need to complete assigned job duties. PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANTS would unlawfully edit the clock in and out times for his and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods in order to display at least a thirty minute off-duty meal period during most if not all shifts worked, notwithstanding the fact that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that DEFENDANTS had required

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' to perform work-related tasks during their meal periods.

Based on information and belief, other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently suffered and permitted to take meal periods past the fifth hour of work and/or had their meal periods interrupted, cut short, restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises and/or otherwise on duty due to commentary from supervisors, understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or the need to meet DEFENDANTS' goals and expectations.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during unpaid meal periods.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to complete off-the-clock work prior to their scheduled shift time which DEFENDANTS failed to take into account when scheduling meal periods for NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, meal periods were late, in part due to unaccounted pre-shift off-the-clock work.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their policies and practices resulted in the denial of uninterrupted meal periods which were free of DEFENDANTS' control owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

Based on information and belief, per DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked shifts of more than ten hours did not receive a second legally compliant thirty (30) minute second meal break.

Based on information and belief, despite DEFENDANTS' failure to provide lawful meal periods, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods (including meal periods restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises), despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES did not receive lawful meal periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to keep accurate records of the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods. Based on information and belief, to the extent meal period were recorded, DEFENDANTS illegally rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal periods. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to instruct PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as to the timing and duty-free nature of meal periods. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written meal

break policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant policy in practice. Liability for the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES can be established by evidence that an employer adopted a uniform corporate break policy that failed to give full effect to California law and the applicable Wage Order requirements. The fact that employees may legally waive meal breaks does not affect this result. *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004.

PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their time-rounding and/or auto-deduction policies and practices resulted in the denial of lawful meal periods owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[3] DEFENDANTS' failure to provide valid meal periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

Rest Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a paid, duty-free ten (10) minute rest period for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(A). In *Brinker v Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court,* 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012), the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services,*

[3] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Inc., (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided").

Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. Id. at 268 (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). Id.; see also, *Bufil v. Dollar Fin. Grp.*, Inc., (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

DEFENDANTS did not properly authorize and provide PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the middle of the work period, as required by law.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not adequately informed, authorized, instructed about, nor permitted an opportunity to take proper rest breaks per California law. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had no policy in place nor instruction as to the taking of duty-free rest periods. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written rest period policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant rest period policy in practice.

For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were unable to take compliant rest periods due to their need to complete assigned job duties and/or were unable to take a net ten-minute rest period in a suitable rest area and/or had purported rest periods restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises.

For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to work through his owed rest periods due to the need to complete assigned job duties.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rest periods were interrupted, cut short, on duty, restricted to premises and/or late due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or due to commentary from supervisors/ managers pressuring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to skip rest breaks completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide any form of a third rest period on shifts lasting longer than ten hours.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during rest periods.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were pressured to complete their work duties according to a designated schedule such that rest breaks were only taken once tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

Furthermore, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in which NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period in violation of California law. *Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of pay for each workday a proper rest period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each workday a lawful rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating the owed rest period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[4]

Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities: Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: "Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during work hours."

DEFENDANTS' locations/facilities are generally similar in layout and design, and there was, and continue to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a resting facility within DEFENDANTS' facilities/locations with reasonable or no modification, but instead denied and continue to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a breakroom). As a result, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEEES were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to resting, including but not limited

[4] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); and All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

to leaning up against the wall, or search for facilities outside of DEFENDANTS' premises which are not designated or reserved for rest, such as their personal vehicles.

DEFENDANTS did not provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods.

DEFENDANTS' failure to provide suitable resting facilities to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

Minimum Wage Violations: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit." Labor Code section 1194.

Labor Code section 1197 states the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the Commission, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Pursuant to section 4 of the applicable Wage Order, "Every employer shall pay to each employee …. not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period…" The applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." *See* §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. An employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324. Furthermore, "in any action under Section 98, 1193.6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon…" *Cal. Lab. Code* § 1194.2.

DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time rounding policies for shift start and shift end times and meal period start and end times, and failure to relieve employees of all duties/employer control during unpaid meal periods or otherwise unlawful practices for missed or improper meal periods as explained above.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding meal period start and end times and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for meal periods, despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were subject to DEFENDANTS' control during purported meal periods and/or were otherwise not afforded with lawful meal periods, depriving PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all wages owed.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for all hours worked due to DEFENDANTS' policy and/or practice of paying according to scheduled hours worked instead of actual time worked, and/or mandated off-the clock work policies and/or practices. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS would unlawfully edit the clock in and out times for PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods in order to display at least a thirty minute off-duty meal period during most if not all shifts worked, notwithstanding the fact that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that DEFENDANTS had required PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' to perform work-related tasks during their meal periods.

Based on information and belief, at times, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to work-related phone calls and/or messages they received to their phones/mobile devices and were required to respond to, including but not limited to, communications from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks, resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not compensate NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time spent donning and doffing personal protective equipment and/or uniforms (e.g., rubber gloves, hairnets, aprons, hats, and/or face masks) during meal periods, before the start of a scheduled shift, and/or after completing a scheduled shift, resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to perform other off-the-clock work for which they were not compensated. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS' electronic employee time-keeping system/app malfunctioned such that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to either reinitiate and/or otherwise troubleshoot the system prior to being able to clock in and/or were unable to clock in at all for the start of their shifts and/or clock back in from meal periods, resulting in off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced the same issues when clocking out for shifts and/or back in for meal periods. This time spent under DEFENDANTS' control was not recorded and not compensated and resulted in unpaid minimum wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who opened their work locations were required to first unlock the doors, turn on all the lights in the restaurant/facility and/or deactivate the alarm before clocking in for work, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on further information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in charge of closing their location(s) were required to first clock out for their shifts before enabling the alarm, turning off all the lights in the facility and/or locking the doors. This resulted in additional off-the-clock post-shift work that was not compensated and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS require/required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to travel between DEFENDANTS' restaurants, facilities and/or locations without compensating NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the travel time. For example, based on information and belief, due to scheduling issues and/or understaffing, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were at times required after working at their scheduled facility location to cover a shift at another of DEFENDANTS' restaurants/facilities/locations but were not compensated for the time spent driving to the second restaurant/facility, resulting in the underpayment of minimum and overtime wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES split shift premium wages when they worked split shifts during the relevant period. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work two separate shifts in the same day. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES split shift compensation whenever PLAINTIFF's and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work schedules were interrupted by non-paid non-working periods established by DEFENDANTS, which resulted in a violation of the applicable Wage Order (See section 4 of all applicable Wage orders, "When an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday…). See, also, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11050 (when an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday, except when the employee resides at the place of employment).

DEFENDANTS also failed to separately itemize these split shift premium wages on PLAINTIFF's and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' wage statements, in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders. See, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/split_shift.htm. (The employer must itemize the premium payment on the pay stub provided to the employee, and it should be shown as a separate category such as "Split Shift Premium" and should not be lumped into another category such as wages, bonus, etc. DEFENDANTS failed to separately account for the split shift premiums earned by PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their wage statements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time they were required to spend completing orientation, policy questionnaires, and/or time spent completing the onboarding process including but not limited to reviewing various documents and policies provided by DEFENDANTS. Based on information and belief, this work time was completed off-the-clock and was not compensated.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a time-rounding system that as applied systematically deprived PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of compensable time because the time-rounding system implemented by DEFENDANTS would almost always, if not always, result in understating actual compensable work time. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of their time-rounding practices resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-

EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of their time rounding, auto-deduction policies and practices for unlawful meal periods, failure to provide lawful meal periods, and/or other off-the-clock work practices and policies, resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their time rounding policies/practices, auto-deduction policies and practices, failure to provide lawful meal periods and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's minimum wage laws.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS, to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 1197.1 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[5]

Overtime Violations: California law requires employers to pay overtime equal to one and one-half times the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond eight (8) hours per workday and each hour worked beyond forty (40) hours per work week. Lab. Code §510; IWC Wage Order All applicable IWC Wage Orders §3. Employers must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid*.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated California's overtime laws by, among other things, failing to correctly calculate, or record, the total number of hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and not paying proper overtime rates for overtime worked by virtue of same.

Namely, DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time rounding policies and practices for meal periods and shift start times and shift end times, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual time worked, off-the-clock/unpaid work completed during meal periods and/or time spent restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises and/or subject to DEFENDANTS' control during off-the-clock meal periods (described above), and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in

---

[5] See Lab. Code §1197.1(a) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

the failure to account for all hours worked and thus the denial of minimum wages as well as overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay a premium wage rate for all hours worked beyond eight (8) hours in a day or beyond forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay twice NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, shift differential pay, bonus pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

This conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 218.5, 510, 558, 558.1, 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 218.5, and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[6]

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 245-248.5: Throughout the relevant time period, DEFENDANTS failed to provide proper paid sick leave to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. DEFENDANTS either failed to provide paid sick leave at all or improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick leave rate of pay owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to base the accrued sick leave hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-clock work including but not limited to work completed during unpaid meal periods and by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, commission and/or piece-rate compensation and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

[6] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their wage statements or other written statements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to put NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED on notice of their paid sick leave rights—or thereby putting their entitlement to sick leave in a Labor Code section 2810.5 notice. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of used sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE throughout the relevant time period.

Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant period, DEFENDANTS failed to provide notice of sick leave amount balance left for PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, thus affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation.

This illegal retention of paid sick leave is unlawful, and PLAINTIFF seeks all forms of injunctive relief, restitution, and declaratory relief as permitted by California law, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

In violation of Labor Code section 247.5, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain records documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, permitting the presumption that PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this article.

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed and continue to fail to comply with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays wages.

DEFENDANTS unlawfully retained and continue to retain paid sick leave that should have been paid but was not, as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to properly institute a paid sick leave program.

On information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that all of these practices were experienced and continue to be experienced by other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PLAINTIFF requests all appropriate relief under the PAGA and these statutes, including but not limited to the restitution of earned paid sick leave that could have been used, but was not due to DEFENDANTS' sole failure to institute such a paid sick leave entitlement or paid sick leave bank as required by California law.

Accordingly, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. PLAINTIFF requests all relief pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements.

Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave: Labor Code section 248.2 provides that all employers with 26 or more employees are required to provide up to 80 hours for covered employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 248.2 by not providing NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with required 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of Labor Code section 248.6.

Refusal to Make Payment: Labor Code section 216 declares unlawful an employer's refusal to pay wages due and payable and/or denial of the validity of any claim to wages due.

DEFENDANTS violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 216 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for each meal and/or rest period not provided or that was invalid. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.[7]

Wage Statement Violations: California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains the following: (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; (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; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Cal. Lab. Code. section 226(a).

As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed and continue to fail to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in

[7] Labor Code § 225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee") (emphasis added).

violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b) the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

DEFENDANTS' issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES (by virtue of rounded time entries, automatic deduction for meal periods/failure to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and employer control during unpaid meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual hours worked, and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.,* (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE is being paid.

DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements caused confusion to PLAINTIFF and caused and continue to cause confusion to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES over whether they received all wages owed to them. PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were injured by DEFENDANTS' failure to provide accurate wage statements.

In addition, because of the violations detailed above, including but not limited to, not paying regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, not paying all sick leave wages at the proper rates, and failing to provide meal and rest break premiums, DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate, itemized wage statements. As described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that further violate Labor Code section 226(a), by among other things, failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result, the wage statements provided to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not accurate and did not include all of the statutorily required information.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 226. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[8]

Unlawful Deductions: Labor Code section 221 prohibits an employer from "collect[ing] or receiv[ing] from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." Based on information and belief DEFENDANTS made unlawful deductions from NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYES paychecks during the relevant period including but not limited to deducting costs of uniforms and/or other business costs and/or deducting wages for purported overpayments from previous pay periods and/or unlawfully deducting wages for negligently damaged property. Such a practice is in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Sections 221-222 which subjects DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699.

Each violation results in a separate civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated. See Lab. Code §225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of Section 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee").

Semimonthly Payment Violations: Labor Code section 204 requires that all earned wages must be paid to employees twice during each calendar month. DEFENDANTS violated this section by, including but not limited to, failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for meal and rest periods not provided and/or otherwise unlawful, by failing to compensate employees for all hours worked, and by failing to pay proper premium wage rates for all hours worked. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 210. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.

Reporting Time Pay Violations:
Section 5 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, provides as follows:

(A) Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than

[8] See Lab. Code §226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is "per employee per violation").

the minimum wage. (B) If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting

NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid reporting time wages in accordance with California law, including but not limited to the applicable IWC Wage Order. For example, based on information and belief, at times, PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES reported to work for a scheduled shift but were sent home and/or were not put to work and were not paid all owed reporting time pay wages in accordance with California law.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of failing to pay all reporting time wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, the applicable IWC Wage Order, Section 5. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay all reporting time wages to PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, including but not limited to IWC Wage Order 5-2001, section 5(A)-(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

Violation of California Day of Rest Law

Under California law, every employee in California is "entitled" to "one day's rest [from labor] in seven"; and, no employer may "cause" their employees "to work more than six days in seven." *See* Labor Code Sections 551 and 552. Labor Code section 553 provides that a violation of the foregoing sections is a misdemeanor.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a uniform policy and practice of requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work at least seven days consecutively in a workweek, in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Section 551. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were suffered, permitted, or required to work at least seven (7) days consecutively in a workweek, in violation of California law, including but not limited to Labor Code Section 551.

Seating Violations: Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats and when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them to be seated.

All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

> (A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.
>
> (B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were working. Lastly, based on information and belief, there were periods of time when NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not engaged in active duties of their employment, yet there were no suitable seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and use of seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

DEFENDANTS' NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked in various positions. The nature of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However, DEFENDANTS failed to provide suitable seating in reasonable proximity to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work areas in violation of section 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199, subjecting DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.[9]

Violation of Labor Code section 351 and 353: Labor Code Section 351 prohibits employers and their agents from sharing in or keeping any portion of a gratuity left for or given to one or more employees by a patron. Furthermore, it is illegal for employers to make wage deductions from gratuities, or from using gratuities as direct or indirect credits against an employee's wages. Labor Code Section 353 mandates employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities received.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to ensure that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES fully received the gratuities left for them by patrons, in that DEFENDANTS and their agents would collect and/or take a portion of the gratuities for themselves, in violation of Labor Code Section 351. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed/fails to keep accurate records of all tips received, in violation of Labor Code Section 353. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay gratuities paid by customers using credit cards to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by the next regular payday following the credit card payment, in violation of Labor Code section 351.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS charge an additional service charge to their customers/patrons. Customers are led to believe that the service charge will be paid to

[9] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

DEFENDANTS' NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Instead, DEFENDANTS keeps a majority (if not the entirety) of the service charge, thereby depriving NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of the service charge/gratuity that is left by the patron/customer for the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. *See O'Grady v Merchant Exchanges Production, Inc.,* 41 Cal.App.5th 771, 790 (a mandatory service charge can constitute a gratuity that is intended to the employees providing the service).

Pursuant to PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for penalties of $100 per pay period payable to each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for the first violation of Labor Code Sections 351 and 353 they experienced within the statutory period, and $200 per pay period for each additional violation.

Standard Conditions of Labor Violations: Together, Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal, or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission.

Therefore, DEFENDANTS' violations, including but not limited to, with respect to meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, business expenses, seating, suitable resting, reporting time pay, and other violations described herein result in separate violations of sections 1198 and 1199, which subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1197.1 and 2699.

Statutory Wage Violations: Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for an employer to secretly pay wages lower than required by statute while purporting to pay legal wages.

As described above, DEFENDANTS willfully and systematically denied PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of minimum and overtime wage compensation for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of less than statutorily required wages owed to them. DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to deprive them of statutory wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages and minimum wages, to which they were entitled to under California law.

Thus, DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were properly paid. As such, PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f)-(g).

Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off:

California Labor Code section 227.3 provides that when an employer policy provides for paid vacations and/or paid time off, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his, her, or their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to the employee as wages at the employee's final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served and that there shall be no forfeiture of vested vacation time or paid time off upon termination. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue

to have a uniform policy and practice of failing to allow NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their earned vacation/paid time off during their employment and failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials) to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES upon separation of employment, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

Final Pay Violations: Labor Code section 201 requires employers to pay all wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." California Labor Code section 202(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous 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." Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid. This 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code Section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also, *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages that were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS untimely provide final wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES without regard to the timing requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

Upon separation of employment, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' final paychecks were not timely provided and/or were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off. Moreover, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' final paychecks, once provided, did not include all wages owed as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

For example, DEFENDANTS failed to furnish PLAINTIFF with any final paycheck until at least approximately one (1) week following PLAINTIFF's date of termination, and PLAINTIFF's late final paycheck was devoid of all wages owed, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed reporting time pay wages, all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates, (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely provide all owed wages immediately upon discharge of employment. Based in information and belief, at times, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced breaks in employment caused by DEFENDANTS whereby NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not be called in for work for longer than a single pay period due to including but not limited to DEFENDANTS' lack of work or lack of assignments. Such instances qualify as a discharge of employment. Yet, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay all owed wages at the end of such periods of employment, in violation of including but not limited to Labor Code section 201-202.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or 256. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[10]

Violation of Labor Code Section 208:

Labor Code Section 208 provides: Every employee who is discharged shall be paid at the place of discharge, and every employee who quits shall be paid at the office or agency of the employer in the county where the employee has been performing labor. All payments shall be made in the manner provided by law.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of failing to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who are terminated with their final paychecks at the place of discharge and/or of failing to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with their final paychecks at the office or agency of DEFENDANTS in the county where the work was performed, in violation of Labor Code Section 208.

Business Expense Violations: California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to the directions of the employer. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2802(a) and all applicable Wage Orders, § 9 (b). Furthermore, "for purposes of [section 2802], the term 'necessary expenditure or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section."

Among other things, under California law, when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, § 9 (b).

Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140.

---

[10] (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee").

To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use. *Id.* 1144-1145

California law also requires employers to reimburse employees for automobile expenses incurred for the business use of personal vehicles, such as for mileage, gas, and the wear and tear on the vehicle. *See Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554.

Further, "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under the laws of this State." *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2804.

Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to provide and maintain work tools that are supposed to be the responsibility of the employer.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business onto NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by requiring them to pay for their business expenses including but not limited to, uniforms/work clothing/work shoes, personal protective/safety gear and/or the use of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' personal mobile phone and data usage for work related purposes including but not limited to receiving and responding to work related messages and/or phone calls. For example, on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES received calls/messages to their personal cell phones/mobile devices from supervisors and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks but were not provided any and/or full reimbursement from DEFENDANTS for this personal cell phone use. For example, PLAINTIFF regularly received text messages and/or calls to his personal cell phone/mobile device from his supervisor throughout his shifts regarding work-related matters, however, DEFENDANTS did not provide PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for this business use of PLAINTIFF's personal cell phone/mobile device.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not reimbursed for the cost of using their personal phone for work related purposes and/or the cost of purchasing and/or maintaining work uniforms/work clothing/work shoes, personal protective/safety gear. For example, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to provide his own non-slip shoes to wear for work without providing PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for the business expenses PLAINTIFF incurred in connection therewith.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their personal vehicles for work without reimbursing them for the personal vehicle expenses they incurred in connection therewith. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to travel from one of DEFENDANTS' facilities/restaurants to a

second of DEFENDANTS' facilities/restaurants for work without reimbursing NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the expenses incurred in connection with DEFENDANTS' business use of their personal vehicles.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to pay for business expenses that are supposed to be the responsibility of DEFENDANTS.

As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2802, PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out DEFENDANTS' orders and/or carrying out the duties assigned by DEFENDANTS.

As described herein, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their job duties. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries:

Unlawful Agreements

Labor Code section 432.5 provides that "no employer…shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer…to be prohibited by law." Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to unlawful non-solicitation/non-compete agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements, unlawful releases and/or waivers, unlawful forum selection clauses and/or choice of law provisions/agreements and/or unlawful criminal and/or financial checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

The California Labor Code places certain procedural and substantive limit on employers' ability to conduct employee background checks and on how employers can use the information they obtain through those background checks. Labor Code section 1024.5 states that employers, except for financial institutions, may order a credit check only if the individual works (or is applying to work) in certain positions (e.g., managerial positions, financially-related positions, and certain government positions). Additionally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq*.) and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA - 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.)* mandate several requirements prior to and following an employee

background check, including but not limited to identifying an appropriate reason for the background check, a separate consent form with required disclosures and certain formatting requirements, additional forms such as a summary of rights, a way by which to request a copy of the report, as well as proper notice of adverse actions taken, among other statutory requirements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful financial credit checks on NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the ICRAA and the FCRA.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a background check which failed to abide by the requirements set forth in CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq*. and 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq*., including but not limited to by failing to provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure (and/or failing to provide any disclosure at all), failing to provide disclosures free of extraneous information, failing to provide a lawful purpose for the background check, failing to provide a summary of rights under the ICRAA and/or the FRCA, failing to provide a way by which the individual could request a copy of the report, failing to disclose the name, address, and telephone number of the third party preparing the report, and failing to properly obtain authorization or consent to such a background check, and thus was an unlawful background check.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful criminal and/or financial checks not in conformance with the applicable laws, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to provide ongoing consent to DEFENDANTS to conduct background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a condition of employment, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about arrests not resulting in convictions on their employment application, in violation of California law.

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law, including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), asked NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on their employment application in violation of California law.

By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an employment offer, DEFENDANTS violated California's Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

Unlawful PAGA Waiver

Additionally, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to other unlawful agreements, including but not limited to, an unlawful waiver of PAGA and or representative actions as a condition of employment.

An action pursuant to PAGA '"…is a representative action on behalf of the state'" *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.,* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87. It is well settled that agreements purporting to waive an employee's right to a trial of PAGA claims is contrary to California law and unenforceable. *See Iskanian v CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 384 ("We conclude that where, as here, an employment agreement compels the waiver of representative claims under the PAGA, it is contrary to public policy and unenforceable as a matter of state law.")

Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that a court cannot compel arbitration of an aggrieved employee's individual PAGA claim because there is no such thing as an individual PAGA claim. *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.,* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87 ("There is no individual component to a PAGA action because 'every PAGA action … is a representative action on behalf of the state.'")

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to waive their right to a trial of PAGA claims in violation of California law. By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree, in writing, to an unlawful PAGA waiver, DEFENDANTS required written agreement to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment which is a violation of labor code section 432.5.

As such, PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES continue to be subject to various unlawful provisions as a condition of employment.

Conclusion

DEFENDANTS have violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, the applicable IWC Wage Order, including but not limited to all applicable Wage Orders, as well as other laws, and is liable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. The civil penalties PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES seek to recover include, but are not limited to, the statutory and civil penalties specified above.

Labor Code § 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter (i.e. this NOTICE) to the employer in question and file an online claim to the LWDA setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the LWDA an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this NOTICE is to satisfy the requirements created by Labor Code §§ 2699, 2699.3(a), 2699.3(b), 2699.3(c), and 2699.5, prior to seeking penalties and premium wages allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations in a civil action. We look forward to determining whether the LWDA intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly ask that you respond to this NOTICE according to the time frame contemplated by the code.

If the LWDA elects not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, PLAINTIFF will seek these penalties in a civil action, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of DEFENDANTS within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

Please advise if your office intends to investigate any of the factual and legal allegations and provide notice within sixty-five days of the date of this NOTICE to our office and to that of other charged parties. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
Crosner Legal, PC
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Main: 866.276.7637
Fax: 310.510.6429
Email: kiara@crosnerlegal.com

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,



Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
CROSNER LEGAL, PC

CROSNER LEGAL
PUBLIC INTEREST RIGHTS

Manny Martinez <manny@crosnerlegal.com>

Thank you for submission of your PAGA Case.

LWDA DO NOT REPLY <lwdadonotreply@dir.ca.gov> Thu, Jun 29, 2023 at 2:57 PM
To: "prelit@crosnerlegal.com" <prelit@crosnerlegal.com>

6/29/2023

LWDA Case No. LWDA-CM-965293-23
Law Firm : Crosner Legal, PC
Plaintiff Name : Gilbert Garcia
Employer: Kalaveras SL Inc
Filing Fee : $75.00
IFP Claimed : No

Item submitted: Initial PAGA Notice

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Please make a note of the LWDA Case No. above as you may need this number for future reference when filing any subsequent documents for this Case.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

Los Angeles Office
9440 Santa Monica Blvd.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
kiara@crosnerlegal.com
direct: (424) 335-5236
office: (866) 276-7637
fax: (310) 510-6429

October 20, 2023

VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY:
California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA U.S. CERTIFIED MAIL:

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SL Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras SL Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - COV Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - COV Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras MDR Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras MDR Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Jose I Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras NB Inc.
360 E 1st St # 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras NB Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
801 Dove St
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - CVSA Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - CVSA Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - ES Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - ES Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - MON Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - MON Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - MV Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - MV Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras OR Inc
360 E 1st St #902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras OR Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
167 S Main Street
Orange, CA 92868

Jose I Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras OR LLC
1840 Tumin Rd
La Habra Heights, CA 90631

Kalaveras OR LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
167 S Main Street
Orange, CA 92868

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras PD Inc
1211 Throughbred Ln
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras PD Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Ln
Norco, CA 92860

Jose I Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras PH Inc.
1840 Tumin Rd
La Habra Hgts, CA 90631

Kalaveras PH Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - NH Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - NH Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras - SBO Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras - SBO Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras BB Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras BB Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras CO Inc.
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras CO Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras PH Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1418 S Azusa Ave
City Of Industry, CA 91748

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras RC Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras RC Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras Real Estate Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras Real Estate Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras RS Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras RS Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SA Inc
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras CO Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1300 El Sobrante Rd
Corona, CA 92879

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras CO LLC
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras CO LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras CO LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1300 El Sobrante Rd
Corona, CA 92879

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras DTF Inc
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras DTF Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
122 E Commonwealth Ave
Fullerton, CA 92832

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras DTF LLC
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras DTF LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
122 E Commonwealth Ave
Fullerton, CA 92832

Kalaveras SA Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SM Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras SM Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SP Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras SP Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SP LLC
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras SP LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SR Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras HBC Inc
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras HBC Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Jose I Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras Inc.
360 E 1st St, 902
Orange, CA 92780

Kalaveras Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
360 E 1st St # 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
16530 Bellflower Blvd
Bellflower, CA 90706

Judith B Roemer
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras LA Inc.
30901 Dropseed Drive
Murrieta, CA 92563

Kalaveras LA Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras LB Inc.
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras SR Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras SV Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras SV Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras TM Inc
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras TM Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Jose I Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras WH Inc
13112 Philadelphia St
Whittier, CA 90601

Kalaveras WH Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
13112 Philadelphia St
Whittier, CA 90631

Jose Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras WM Inc.
360 E First Street Suite 902
Tustin, CA 92780

Kalaveras LB Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Bennett A Rheingold
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras LF Inc.
3424 Carson St Ste 500
Torrance, CA 90503

Kalaveras LF Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
21021 Figueroa St.
Carson, CA 90745-1960

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent For Service of Process for:
Kalaveras LH Inc.
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras LH Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Jeronimo Ocampo
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras MC Inc
9645 Central
Montclair, CA 91748

Kalaveras MC Inc
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Deparment
9645 Central Ave.
Montclair, CA 91748

Kalaveras WM Inc.
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
13030 Goldenwest St
Westminster, CA 92683

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras Chula Vista Property LLC
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras Chula Vista Property LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Isaias Ocampo Brito
Agent for Service of Process for:
Kalaveras Escondido Property LLC
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

Kalaveras Escondido Property LLC
Attn: Human Resources / Legal Department
1211 Thoroughbred Lane
Norco, CA 92860

///
///
///
///
///

AMENDED NOTICE OF PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM

To: California Labor and Workforce Development Agency; Kalaveras SL Inc; Kalaveras - COV Inc; Kalaveras - CVSA Inc; Kalaveras - ES Inc; Kalaveras - MON Inc; Kalaveras - MV Inc; Kalaveras - NH Inc; Kalaveras - SBO Inc; Kalaveras BB Inc; Kalaveras CO Inc.; Kalaveras CO LLC; Kalaveras DTF Inc; Kalaveras DTF LLC; Kalaveras HBC Inc; Kalaveras Inc.; Kalaveras LA Inc.; Kalaveras LB Inc.; Kalaveras LF Inc.; Kalaveras LH Inc.; Kalaveras MC Inc; Kalaveras MDR Inc; Kalaveras NB Inc.; Kalaveras OR Inc; Kalaveras OR LLC; Kalaveras PD Inc; Kalaveras PH Inc.; Kalaveras RC Inc; Kalaveras Real Estate Inc; Kalaveras RS Inc; Kalaveras SA Inc; Kalaveras SM Inc; Kalaveras SP Inc; Kalaveras SP LLC; Kalaveras SR Inc; Kalaveras SV Inc; Kalaveras TM Inc; Kalaveras WH Inc; Kalaveras WM Inc.; Kalaveras Chula Vista Property LLC; and Kalaveras Escondido Property LLC

Date: October 20, 2023

Subject: *Gilbert Garcia v. Kalaveras SL Inc, et al.*

Introduction

This office represents PLAINTIFF, Gilbert Garcia (hereinafter "PLAINTIFF") in connection with PLAINTIFF's claims under the California Labor Code. PLAINTIFF was, at all relevant times herein mentioned, an employee of the following entitities and individual managing agents of said entitities: Kalaveras SL Inc; Kalaveras - COV Inc; Kalaveras - CVSA Inc; Kalaveras - ES Inc; Kalaveras - MON Inc; Kalaveras - MV Inc; Kalaveras - NH Inc; Kalaveras - SBO Inc; Kalaveras BB Inc; Kalaveras CO Inc.; Kalaveras CO LLC; Kalaveras DTF Inc; Kalaveras DTF LLC; Kalaveras HBC Inc; Kalaveras Inc.; Kalaveras LA Inc.; Kalaveras LB Inc.; Kalaveras LF Inc.; Kalaveras LH Inc.; Kalaveras MC Inc; Kalaveras MDR Inc; Kalaveras NB Inc.; Kalaveras OR Inc; Kalaveras OR LLC; Kalaveras PD Inc; Kalaveras PH Inc.; Kalaveras RC Inc; Kalaveras Real Estate Inc; Kalaveras RS Inc; Kalaveras SA Inc; Kalaveras SM Inc; Kalaveras SP Inc; Kalaveras SP LLC; Kalaveras SR Inc; Kalaveras SV Inc; Kalaveras TM Inc; Kalaveras WH Inc; Kalaveras WM Inc.; Kalaveras Chula Vista Property LLC; and Kalaveras Escondido Property LLC; (hereinafter, these entities and their managing agents are collectively referred to as "DEFENDANTS"). DEFENDANTS may be contacted directly at the addresses listed above.

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, and on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees employed by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of PLAINTIFF's original notice filed on June 29, 2023 (assigned LWDA case no: LWDA-CM-965293-23 ("NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") and on behalf of all current and former exempt employees employed by any one or more of the DEFENDANTS at any location in California within one year of the date of PLAINTIFF's original notice filed on June 29, 2023 ("EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES"), hereby gives written amended notice ("AMENDED NOTICE") of PLAINTIFF's claims against DEFENDANTS. This AMENDED NOTICE is being provided via online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA")

and DEFENDANTS via certified mail to their Agent(s) for Service of Process and/or entity mailing address as provided to the California Secretary of State.

This AMENDED NOTICE also serves to demonstrate PLAINTIFF's reasonable attempt at settlement with DEFENDANTS. If DEFENDANTS are interested in settling this matter before a lawsuit is filed, DEFENDANTS may contact Crosner Legal, P.C., at the address listed at the close of this AMENDED NOTICE. This settlement attempt is in compliance with relevant California law. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

This AMENDED NOTICE is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5. This AMENDED NOTICE further reserves any and all rights by PLAINTIFF to amend this notice to include, amend, or add further charges upon discovery of new violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code. In addition, to the extent that entities and/or other individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code sections including, but not limited to sections 558.1 and 1197.1—PLAINTIFF reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue. Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of PLAINTIFF's original notice filed on June 29, 2023. Consequently, DEFENDANTS are on notice that PLAINTIFF continues its investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of *any* of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein. For violations that are curable under § 2699.3(c) and that DEFENDANTS intend to cure within the statutory time period set forth in §§ 2699 and 2699.3(c), the DEFENDANTS shall provide notice including a description of the actions taken to cure. If the alleged violation is not cured within the statutory time period, PLAINTIFF will commence a civil action pursuant to section 2699. For all other violations that are not curable, an action pursuant to section 2699(a) and 2699(f) will commence after the requirements under 2699.3 are fulfilled.

Based on the following summary of facts and theories upon which PLAINTIFF will base PLAINTIFF's claims, PLAINTIFF requests that the LWDA regard this AMENDED NOTICE as written notice of PLAINTIFF's intent to seek civil penalties against DEFENDANTS. Under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, a PAGA representative has authority to seek penalties for all known violations committed by the employer – regardless of whether the representative experienced all violations personally. *Id.* at 760-761. Moreover, under *Johnson v. Maxim Healthcare Servs., Inc.,* (2021) 66 Cal. App. 5th 924, 929, an employee may pursue a claim under PAGA even when that employee's individual claim is time-barred.

PLAINTIFF, on behalf of PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, alleges that the specific provisions of California law that DEFENDANTS have violated, requiring this AMENDED NOTICE, include but are not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 208, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.7, 245-248.6, 351, 353, 432, 432.5, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and all applicable Wage Orders.

The Named Entities Are Joint Employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES

California courts have recognized that the definition of "employer" for purposes of enforcement of the California Labor Code goes beyond the concept of traditional employment to reach irregular working arrangements for the purpose of preventing evasion and subterfuge of California's labor laws. *Martinez v. Combs* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35, 65. As such, anyone who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, engages, suffers, or permits any person to work or exercises control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any person, may be liable for violations of the California Labor Code as to that person.

PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times DEFENDANTS and unknown entities operated as a single integrated enterprise with common ownership and centralized human resources as set forth herein. Under California law, in determining whether two defendant entities are liable as an integrated enterprise, courts consider four factors: (1) centralized control of labor relations; (2) interrelation of operations; (3) common management; and (4) common ownership or financial control. *Laird v. Capital Cities/Abc, Inc.* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th 727, 737 (overruled on other grounds, *Reid v. Google, Inc.* (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 512 (2010).)

PLAINTIFF believes and hereon asserts that DEFENDANTS and unknown entities must be classified as joint employers of PLAINTIFF for purposes of liability for civil penalties under PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered and permitted PLAINTIFF to perform services from which they benefited, and furthermore that the aforementioned entities had the right to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of PLAINTIFF at all relevant times herein, so as to be considered the joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, maintain the same principal business address and/or individual agent for service of process and/or utilize some of the same attorneys and/or human resources personnel to oversee employment-related matters. By reason of their status as joint employers of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, they are each liable for civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders as to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Individual Liability Under Labor Code § 558.1

Labor Code section 558.1 permits joint and several liability as to both an individual and employer for violations of Labor Code sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1194, and 2802. DEFENDANTS, at all relevant times, were an employer or person acting on behalf of employer(s) who violated PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code. The California Legislature defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as "*a natural person* who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer." The "managing agent" definition mirrors that found in California's punitive damages statute (subdivision (b) of section 3294 of the Civil Code). Under that statute and supporting case law, "managing agents" are all employees who exercise substantial independent authority and judgment in their corporate

decision-making such that their decisions ultimately determine corporate policy. *White v. Ultramar, Inc.* (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 563, 566-67. For the reasons set forth above and others, at all relevant times, any above-listed individuals meet the criteria of managing agents under California law, and therefore, may be held liable under California Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 for violations of Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, and 1194 as further described in detail below.

PLAINTIFF intends to further name any unknown individuals responsible for violations arising under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 after further discovery. PLAINTIFF will ask the Court to relate the amendment of the PAGA charge and the operative complaint to the date of filing of these charges. PLAINTIFF asks and demands that DEFENDANTS put these individuals on notice immediately to provide them as much notice possible to mount in defense. In the alternative, PLAINTIFF also offers to DEFENDANTS to place those individuals on notice if DEFENDANTS voluntarily provides their contact information.

General Information

DEFENDANTS own, operate, manage and/or staff its employees to work at the facilities, restaurants and/or other location(s) in California. DEFENDANTS own, operate and/or manage and/or staff its employees to work at including but not limited to, the facilities, locations and/or restaurants operating under the name(s) "Kalaveras" and/or "Kalaveras Cantina Urbana" located in including but not limited to the following cities and/or neighborhoods in California: Bellflower, Chino Hills, Long Beach, Marina Del Rey, Montebello, Moreno Valley, Newport Beach, North Hollywood, Orange, Pasadena, Puente Hills, Rancho Cucamonga, Redondo Beach, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Pedro, Santa Monica, Silver Lake, Simi Valley, West Los Angeles, and Whittier. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS are owned, operated and/or managed by a parent company and/or entities that operates all locations collectively. DEFENDANTS, through its various locations serve the restaurant, food, and/or food services industry.[1] Although DEFENDANTS may operate a successful company or have a noble mission, DEFENDANTS do not comply with California's labor laws.

PLAINTIFF is a former employee of DEFENDANTS. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt employee with a job title of bartender and/or a similar title(s) and/or position(s) from in or around April 2022 through in or around May 2023. PLAINTIFF worked for DEFENDANTS at DEFENDANTS' Los Angeles (Silver Lake), California location(s). PLAINTIFF regularly worked at least five (5) to seven (7) hours per day, at least two (2) to five (5) days per week. DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF an hourly rate for time counted by DEFENDANTS as hours worked. PLAINTIFF also earned tips as part of his compensation.

Among other things, DEFENDANTS (1) failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete time records for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (2) failed and continue to fail to pay PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked; (3) failed and continue to fail to pay PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at least minimum wage for all hours worked and overtime/regular rates for corresponding work; (4) failed and continue to fail to pay proper overtime wages for

[1] *See* https://kalaveras.com/. Last visited on June 29, 2023.

failure to incorporate all non-discretionary compensation into the overtime premium pay calculations; (5) failed and continue to fail to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with proper meal and/or rest breaks, and/or compensate PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of compensation for missed/improper meal and/or rest periods; (6) refused and continue to refuse to make and/or falsely denied the amount of payments due to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, including but not limited to, owed sick pay; (7) failed and continue to fail to place PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on proper notice of their workplace rights, including but not limited to owed sick pay; (8) failed and continue to fail to provide legally compliant wage statements to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES; (9) made unlawful deductions from PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' paychecks; (10) failed and continue to fail to timely pay wages to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES during employment and/or upon separation of employment; (11) failed and continue to fail to reimburse PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses incurred on behalf of DEFENDANTS; (12) conducted and continue to conduct illegal criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of PLAINTIFF's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' hire and continued employment; (13) required and continue to require PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to disclose arrests not resulting in convictions and/or to disclose convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired and continue to inquire into PLAINTIFF's, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES', and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' criminal history on their employment applications and sign off on same as a condition of employment; (14) failed and continue to fail to provide suitable seating; and (15) required and continue to require PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a term or condition that violates the law as a condition of employment. Further descriptions of the above-mentioned violations and others are explained below.

Labor Code Violations

Recordkeeping Requirement Violations: California Labor Code section 1174 requires employers to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 similarly requires employers to keep accurate time records reflecting the times during which allowed meal periods were provided each day.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage statements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by virtue of DEFENDANTS' time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices.

DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS' failure to relieve PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed, and continue to fail, to record the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed and continue to fail, to record the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work shifts.

Additionally, DEFENDANTS failed, and continue to fail to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

DEFENDANTS' failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.[2]

Violations of Labor Code Sections 226(b)-(c), 1198.5, and 432:

Time and Pay Records

Labor Code section 226 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 require that employers keep the following information on file for each employee for a minimum of three years: The employee's dates of employment; the employee's hourly rates and the corresponding number of hours worked by the employee at each hourly rate, when the employee begins and ends each work period (including meal periods) and split intervals; total hours worked by the employee; all deductions; gross wages earned; and net wages earned.

Section (b) of Labor Code section 226 further requires employers to "afford current and former employees the right to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to their employment upon reasonable request to the employer." Section (c) of Labor Code section 226 provides that, "an employer who receives a written or oral request to inspect or receive a copy of records pursuant to subdivision (b) pertaining to a current or former employee shall comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than 21 calendar days from the date of the request. A violation of this

[2] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

subdivision is an infraction." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar ($750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 226(f).

Personnel Records
In addition to their right to time and pay records, employees, and their representatives, have the right to inspect and receive a copy of their personnel files pursuant to Labor Code section 1198.5. This statute applies to both former and current employees. Labor Code section 432 further specifies that employers must furnish copies of all employment records bearing the employee's signature.

Labor Code section 1198.5 also requires that the file be made available for inspection or receipt within a "reasonable" amount of time, but "not later than 30 calendar days from the date the employer receives a written request." An employer's failure to comply within this timeframe likewise entitles a current or former employee to recover a seven hundred fifty-dollar ($750) penalty from the employer. Lab. Code section 1198.5(k).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely produce or make available a current or former employee's personnel records and/or payroll records when requested pursuant to Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, 432, and/or the applicable Wage Order. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to timely produce complete payroll and personnel records when requested by NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to penalties under Labor Code sections 226, 1198.5, and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.

Meal Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a workday, and it must be provided within the first five (5) hours the employee works. Lab. Code section 512 (and all applicable IWC Wage Orders), section 11(A) and (C); *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004. Employers must also provide employees with a second duty-free, uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal period when an employee works more than (10) hours in a workday, and it must be provided before the end of the 10th hour of work. *Ibid*. Meal periods can be waived, but only under the following circumstances: (1) if an employee's total work period in a day is over five (5) hours but no more than six (6) hours, the required meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, and (2) if an employee's total work period in a day is over ten (10) hours but no more than twelve (12) hours, the required second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived. *Ibid*. Upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF did not sign a valid meal period waiver throughout PLAINTIFF's employment by DEFENDANTS.

Employers covered by any and all applicable IWC Wage Orders have an obligation to both (1) relieve their employees for at least one meal period for shifts over five hours (see above), *and* (2) to record having done so. If the employer fails to properly record a valid meal period, it is presumed

that no meal period was provided. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7(A)(3) ("Meal periods . . . shall also be recorded"); *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1052-1053, citing section 7(A)(3) ("If an employer's records show no meal period for a given shift over five hours, a rebuttable presumption arises that the employee was not relieved of duty and no meal period was provided").

Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employees' regular rate of pay for each missed or unlawful meal period (e.g., less than 30 minutes, interrupted meal period, first meal period provided after five (5) hours, second meal period provided after 10 hours). Lab. Code § 226.7; all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §11(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provision of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided"); *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES consistently worked shifts of five and a one-half (5 ½) hours or more, entitling to at least one meal period.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not receive legally compliant thirty (30) minute first meal breaks. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently unable to take timely, off duty, thirty-minute, uninterrupted meal periods, often being forced to take late meal periods, interrupted meal periods, and/or work through part or all their meal periods due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties and/or commentary from supervisors pressuring them to take non-compliant meal breaks or skip meal breaks completely.

For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were forced to take late meal periods in order to complete assigned job duties. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were interrupted during purported meal periods and/or had meal periods cut short and/or restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises due to the need to continue assigned job duties. For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to cut any meal periods short and/or work through his meal periods completely in order to complete assigned job duties.

For example, when the restaurant was busy, PLAINTIFF's supervisor would instruct PLAINTIFF to work through his owed meal period. Other times, PLAINTIFF had to take his meal period late (i.e. after the fifth hour of work) due to the need to complete assigned job duties. PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANTS would unlawfully edit the clock in and out times for his and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods in order to display at least a thirty minute off-duty meal period during most if not all shifts worked, notwithstanding the fact that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that DEFENDANTS had required PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' to perform work-related tasks during their meal periods.

Based on information and belief, other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were consistently suffered and permitted to take meal periods past the fifth hour of work and/or had their meal periods interrupted, cut short, restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises and/or otherwise on

duty due to commentary from supervisors, understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or the need to meet DEFENDANTS' goals and expectations.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during unpaid meal periods.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to complete off-the-clock work prior to their scheduled shift time which DEFENDANTS failed to take into account when scheduling meal periods for NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, meal periods were late, in part due to unaccounted pre-shift off-the-clock work.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their policies and practices resulted in the denial of uninterrupted meal periods which were free of DEFENDANTS' control owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

Based on information and belief, per DEFENDANTS' uniform policy and practice, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked shifts of more than ten hours did not receive a second legally compliant thirty (30) minute second meal break.

Based on information and belief, despite DEFENDANTS' failure to provide lawful meal periods, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding the start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for missed and/or otherwise unlawful meal periods (including meal periods restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises), despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES did not receive lawful meal periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to keep accurate records of the true start and end times of PLAINTIFF's and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' meal periods. Based on information and belief, to the extent meal period were recorded, DEFENDANTS illegally rounded the start and end times of purported meal periods resulting in PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES not being paid for all time worked as well as late and/or shortened meal periods. *See Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to instruct PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as to the timing and duty-free nature of meal periods. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written meal break policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant policy in practice. Liability for the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES can be established by evidence that an employer adopted a uniform corporate break policy that failed to give full effect to California law and the applicable Wage Order requirements. The fact that employees may legally waive meal breaks does not affect this result. *Brinker, supra,* 53 Cal.4th 1004.

PLAINTIFF is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their time-rounding and/or auto-deduction policies and practices resulted in the denial of lawful meal periods owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's meal period laws.

DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of compensation for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a meal period premium at all for each workday a lawful meal period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper meal period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate or compensation for purposes of calculating the owed meal period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 11(A) and (C) along with all applicable IWC Wage Orders. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 558 and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[3] DEFENDANTS' failure to provide valid meal periods, and the automatic deduction for meal periods that were not provided/valid, ultimately results in further violations, such as violations of Labor Code sections 1174, 1199, 226.6, discussed above, and other violations discussed below.

Rest Period Violations: California law requires employers to provide employees a paid, duty-free ten (10) minute rest period for each four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(A). In *Brinker v Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court,* 53 Cal.4th 1004 (2012), the California Supreme Court held that employees are entitled to a 10-minute paid rest period for shifts from 3 ½ to 6 hours in length, two 10-minute rest periods for shifts more than 6 hours up to 10 hours, and three 10-minute rest periods for shifts of more than 10 hours up to 14 hours. (*Id.* at 1029). The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee

[3] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided").

Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. Id. at 268 (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). Id.; see also, *Bufil v. Dollar Fin. Grp.*, Inc., (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

DEFENDANTS did not properly authorize and provide PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with legally compliant rest periods at a rate of every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, that insofar as practicable, are provided in the middle of the work period, as required by law.

PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not adequately informed, authorized, instructed about, nor permitted an opportunity to take proper rest breaks per California law. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had no policy in place nor instruction as to the taking of duty-free rest periods. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not have a compliant written rest period policy, nor did DEFENDANTS have any sort of compliant rest period policy in practice.

For example, based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were unable to take compliant rest periods due to their need to complete assigned job duties and/or were unable to take a net ten-minute rest period in a suitable rest area and/or had purported rest periods restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises.

For example, PLAINTIFF was frequently required to work through his owed rest periods due to the need to complete assigned job duties.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' rest periods were interrupted, cut short, on duty, restricted to premises and/or late due to understaffing, the nature and constraints of their job duties, and/or due to commentary from supervisors/ managers pressuring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to skip rest breaks completely or otherwise take non-compliant rest periods.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide any form of a third rest period on shifts lasting longer than ten hours.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented policies and/or practices that failed to relieve PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and DEFENDANTS' control during rest periods.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were pressured to complete their work duties according to a designated schedule such that rest breaks were only taken once tasks were completed, and/or as time permitted.

Furthermore, DEFENDANTS failed to pay a rest period premium for each day in which NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced a missed or otherwise unlawful rest period in violation of California law. *Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.* (2013) 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872. DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, an additional hour of wages at their respective regular rates of pay for each workday a proper rest period was not provided. DEFENDANTS either failed to pay a rest period premium at all for each workday a lawful rest period was not provided and/or failed to pay the proper rest period premium for failure to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, bonuses, shift differential pay, and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate of compensation for purposes of calculating the owed rest period premium.

The aforementioned conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[4]

Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities: Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: "Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during work hours."

DEFENDANTS' locations/facilities are generally similar in layout and design, and there was, and continue to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. DEFENDANTS could have provided NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a resting facility within DEFENDANTS' facilities/locations with reasonable or no modification, but instead denied and continue to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a breakroom). As a result, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEEES were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to resting, including but not limited to leaning up against the wall, or search for facilities outside of DEFENDANTS' premises which are not designated or reserved for rest, such as their personal vehicles.

DEFENDANTS did not provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods.

---

[4] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); and All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

DEFENDANTS' failure to provide suitable resting facilities to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

Minimum Wage Violations: "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit." Labor Code section 1194.

Labor Code section 1197 states the California requirement that employees must be paid at least the minimum wage fixed by the Commission, and any payment of less than the minimum wage is unlawful. The minimum wage standard applies to each hour employees worked for which they were not paid. Pursuant to section 4 of the applicable Wage Order, "Every employer shall pay to each employee …. not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period…" The applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." *See* §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. An employer's failure to pay for any particular hour worked by an employee is unlawful even if averaging an employee's total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324. Furthermore, "in any action under Section 98, 1193.6, 1194, or 1197.1 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission or by statute, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon…" *Cal. Lab. Code* § 1194.2.

DEFENDANTS failed to compensate PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked by virtue of DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time rounding policies for shift start and shift end times and meal period start and end times, and failure to relieve employees of all duties/employer control during unpaid meal periods or otherwise unlawful practices for missed or improper meal periods as explained above.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a policy and/or practice of rounding meal period start and end times and/or automatically deducting at least thirty minutes per shift for meal periods, despite having actual and/or constructive knowledge that PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were subject to DEFENDANTS' control during purported meal periods and/or were otherwise not afforded with lawful meal periods, depriving PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all wages owed.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid for all hours worked due to DEFENDANTS' policy and/or practice of paying according to scheduled hours worked instead of actual time worked, and/or mandated off-the clock work policies and/or practices. For example, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS would unlawfully edit the clock in and out times for PLAINTIFF's and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED

EMPLOYEES' meal periods in order to display at least a thirty minute off-duty meal period during most if not all shifts worked, notwithstanding the fact that DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that DEFENDANTS had required PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' to perform work-related tasks during their meal periods.

Based on information and belief, at times, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to complete off-the-clock work outside of scheduled shifts due to work-related phone calls and/or messages they received to their phones/mobile devices and were required to respond to, including but not limited to, communications from supervisors regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks, resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS did not compensate NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time spent donning and doffing personal protective equipment and/or uniforms (e.g., rubber gloves, hairnets, aprons, hats, and/or face masks) during meal periods, before the start of a scheduled shift, and/or after completing a scheduled shift, resulting in the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Additionally, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to perform other off-the-clock work for which they were not compensated. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS' electronic employee time-keeping system/app malfunctioned such that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required to either reinitiate and/or otherwise troubleshoot the system prior to being able to clock in and/or were unable to clock in at all for the start of their shifts and/or clock back in from meal periods, resulting in off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced the same issues when clocking out for shifts and/or back in for meal periods. This time spent under DEFENDANTS' control was not recorded and not compensated and resulted in unpaid minimum wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who opened their work locations were required to first unlock the doors, turn on all the lights in the restaurant/facility and/or deactivate the alarm before clocking in for work, resulting in pre-shift off-the-clock work and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Based on further information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in charge of closing their location(s) were required to first clock out for their shifts before enabling the alarm, turning off all the lights in the facility and/or locking the doors. This resulted in additional off-the-clock post-shift work that was not compensated and the underpayment of wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS require/required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to travel between DEFENDANTS' restaurants, facilities and/or locations without compensating NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the travel time. For example, based on information and belief, due to scheduling issues and/or understaffing, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were at times required after working at their scheduled facility location to cover a shift at another of DEFENDANTS'

restaurants/facilities/locations but were not compensated for the time spent driving to the second restaurant/facility, resulting in the underpayment of minimum and overtime wages owed to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES split shift premium wages when they worked split shifts during the relevant period. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work two separate shifts in the same day. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES split shift compensation whenever PLAINTIFF's and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work schedules were interrupted by non-paid non-working periods established by DEFENDANTS, which resulted in a violation of the applicable Wage Order (See section 4 of all applicable Wage orders, "When an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday…). See, also, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11050 (when an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday, except when the employee resides at the place of employment).

DEFENDANTS also failed to separately itemize these split shift premium wages on PLAINTIFF's and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' wage statements, in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders. See, https://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/split_shift.htm. (The employer must itemize the premium payment on the pay stub provided to the employee, and it should be shown as a separate category such as "Split Shift Premium" and should not be lumped into another category such as wages, bonus, etc. DEFENDANTS failed to separately account for the split shift premiums earned by PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their wage statements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for time they were required to spend completing orientation, policy questionnaires, and/or time spent completing the onboarding process including but not limited to reviewing various documents and policies provided by DEFENDANTS. Based on information and belief, this work time was completed off-the-clock and was not compensated.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS implemented a time-rounding system that as applied systematically deprived PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of compensable time because the time-rounding system implemented by DEFENDANTS would almost always, if not always, result in understating actual compensable work time. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of their time-rounding practices resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

DEFENDANTS' failure to pay for all time worked by virtue of their time rounding, auto-deduction policies and practices for unlawful meal periods, failure to provide lawful meal periods, and/or

other off-the-clock work practices and policies, resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as well as unpaid overtime wages for those NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day and/or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had actual and/or constructive knowledge that their time rounding policies/practices, auto-deduction policies and practices, failure to provide lawful meal periods and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the underpayment of minimum wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California's minimum wage laws.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS, to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 1197.1 and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[5]

Overtime Violations: California law requires employers to pay overtime equal to one and one-half times the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond eight (8) hours per workday and each hour worked beyond forty (40) hours per work week. Lab. Code §510; IWC Wage Order All applicable IWC Wage Orders §3. Employers must pay overtime equal to double the regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week. *Ibid*.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated California's overtime laws by, among other things, failing to correctly calculate, or record, the total number of hours worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and not paying proper overtime rates for overtime worked by virtue of same.

Namely, DEFENDANTS' automatic deduction and time rounding policies and practices for meal periods and shift start times and shift end times, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual time worked, off-the-clock/unpaid work completed during meal periods and/or time spent restricted to DEFENDANTS' premises and/or subject to DEFENDANTS' control during off-the-clock meal periods (described above), and/or other off-the-clock work resulted in the failure to account for all hours worked and thus the denial of minimum wages as well as overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a week.

---

[5] See Lab. Code §1197.1(a) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay a premium wage rate for all hours worked beyond eight (8) hours in a day or beyond forty (40) hours in a week.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed and continue to fail to pay twice NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' regular rate(s) of pay for time worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for time worked beyond eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in a work week, in violation of California's overtime laws.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to incorporate all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, shift differential pay, bonus pay, multiple base rates of pay and/or other non-discretionary pay into the regular rate of pay used to calculate the owed overtime rate(s), resulting in the miscalculation and underpayment of overtime wages owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

This conduct results in violations of Labor Code sections 218.5, 510, 558, 558.1, 1198-1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §12(A). These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, 218.5, and 2699, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, §20. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the referenced statutes and Wage Order provisions were violated.[6]

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 245-248.5: Throughout the relevant time period, DEFENDANTS failed to provide proper paid sick leave to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. DEFENDANTS either failed to provide paid sick leave at all or improperly calculated the sick leave accrual and the sick leave rate of pay owed to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to base the accrued sick leave hours on the correct number of hours worked (as a result of the rounding/automatic deduction policies and practices for meal periods and/or shift start and end times/other required off-the-clock work including but not limited to work completed during unpaid meal periods and by failing to incorporate multiple rates of pay and/or all non-discretionary remuneration, including but not limited to, non-discretionary bonuses, shift differential pay, commission and/or piece-rate compensation and/or other non-discretionary compensation into the sick leave pay rate calculation.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed to provide notice of the correct sick leave amount balance available to PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES on their wage statements or other written statements.

---

[6] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period"); Lab. Code §558 (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid"); All applicable Wage Orders, §20 (establishing that "[i]n addition to any other civil penalties provided by law, any employer or any other person acting on behalf of the employer who violates, or causes to be violated, the provisions of this order, shall be subject to the civil penalty…for each underpaid employee for each pay period during which the employee was underpaid").

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to put NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED on notice of their paid sick leave rights—or thereby putting their entitlement to sick leave in a Labor Code section 2810.5 notice. In addition, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain accurate records of used sick leave and the balance of paid sick leave left to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE throughout the relevant time period.

Based on information and belief, throughout the relevant period, DEFENDANTS failed to provide notice of sick leave amount balance left for PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, thus affecting their intelligent exercise of their paid sick leave. But for this failure, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would have used their paid sick leave at least prior to their respective separations, for as on several occasions thereafter, he or she would have been entitled to use the banked sick leave and earn appropriate compensation.

This illegal retention of paid sick leave is unlawful, and PLAINTIFF seeks all forms of injunctive relief, restitution, and declaratory relief as permitted by California law, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

In violation of Labor Code section 247.5, DEFENDANTS failed to maintain records documenting the hours worked and paid sick days accrued and used by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, permitting the presumption that PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to the maximum number of hours accruable under this article.

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS further failed and continue to fail to comply with Labor Code section 246, by failing to provide PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a Labor Code section 226 wage statement, or separate writing containing the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, at the time it pays wages.

DEFENDANTS unlawfully retained and continue to retain paid sick leave that should have been paid but was not, as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to properly institute a paid sick leave program.

On information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges that all of these practices were experienced and continue to be experienced by other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PLAINTIFF requests all appropriate relief under the PAGA and these statutes, including but not limited to the restitution of earned paid sick leave that could have been used, but was not due to DEFENDANTS' sole failure to institute such a paid sick leave entitlement or paid sick leave bank as required by California law.

Accordingly, PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to injunctive relief, attorney's fees, declaratory relief, restitution, and penalties as permitted by law. PLAINTIFF requests all relief pursuant to the aforementioned code provisions, including but not limited to Labor Code sections 233 and 234, which incorporates the paid sick leave requirements.

Failure To Provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave: Labor Code section 248.2 provides that all employers with 26 or more employees are required to provide up to 80 hours for covered employees to take 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave to care for themselves, to care for a family member or if it is vaccine-related. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 248.2 by not providing NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with required 2021 COVID-19 Supplemental Paid Sick Leave. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide Supplemental Paid Sick Leave in 2022 in violation of Labor Code section 248.6.

Refusal to Make Payment: Labor Code section 216 declares unlawful an employer's refusal to pay wages due and payable and/or denial of the validity of any claim to wages due.

DEFENDANTS violated and continue to violate Labor Code section 216 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all hours worked at the proper wage rate and by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for each meal and/or rest period not provided or that was invalid. *Gould v. Maryland Sound Industries, Inc.* (1995) 31 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1154-1155.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 225.5. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.[7]

Wage Statement Violations: California law requires every employer semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that contains the following: (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; (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; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Cal. Lab. Code. section 226(a).

As DEFENDANTS failed to provide PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with meal and rest periods that complied with Labor Code section 226.7, the wage statements DEFENDANTS issued to PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed and continue to fail to correctly set forth (a) the gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(1); (b) the total hours worked by the employee in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2); (c) the net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(5); and (d) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

---

[7] Labor Code § 225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of sections 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee") (emphasis added).

DEFENDANTS' issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that also failed to indicate the earned gross and net wages earned during the pay period, the correct applicable rates of pay for all hours worked, and the "total hours worked" by PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES (by virtue of rounded time entries, automatic deduction for meal periods/failure to relieve NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of all duties and employer control during unpaid meal periods, payment according to scheduled hours worked rather than actual hours worked, and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices described above), which results in a violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Failure to list all hours worked on a wage statement, gives rise to an inference of injury under Labor Code Section 226 (*Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.,* (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 1308, 1337).

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE is being paid.

DEFENDANTS' failure to accurately list all hours worked on all wage statements caused confusion to PLAINTIFF and caused and continue to cause confusion to the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES over whether they received all wages owed to them. PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were injured by DEFENDANTS' failure to provide accurate wage statements.

In addition, because of the violations detailed above, including but not limited to, not paying regular and overtime wages for all hours worked, not paying all sick leave wages at the proper rates, and failing to provide meal and rest break premiums, DEFENDANTS have violated California Labor Code § 226 by willfully failing to furnish PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with accurate, itemized wage statements. As described herein, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed to incorporate all forms of non-discretionary compensation earned during the pay period into the overtime pay rate calculation, and as such, failed to display the proper overtime rate(s) for each hour of overtime worked by PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

Based on information and belief, wage statements issued by DEFENDANTS failed to list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9).

Moreover, based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS issued wage statements to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES that further violate Labor Code section 226(a), by among other things, failing to list the correct name and/or address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result, the wage statements provided to PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not accurate and did not include all of the statutorily required information.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 226. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[8]

Unlawful Deductions: Labor Code section 221 prohibits an employer from "collect[ing] or receiv[ing] from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." Based on information and belief DEFENDANTS made unlawful deductions from NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYES paychecks during the relevant period including but not limited to deducting costs of uniforms and/or other business costs and/or deducting wages for purported overpayments from previous pay periods and/or unlawfully deducting wages for negligently damaged property. Such a practice is in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Sections 221-222 which subjects DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code Section 2699.

Each violation results in a separate civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated. See Lab. Code §225.5 (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who unlawfully withholds wages due any employee in violation of Section 212, 216, 221, 222, or 223 shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee").

Semimonthly Payment Violations: Labor Code section 204 requires that all earned wages must be paid to employees twice during each calendar month. DEFENDANTS violated this section by, including but not limited to, failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES an additional hour of pay for meal and rest periods not provided and/or otherwise unlawful, by failing to compensate employees for all hours worked, and by failing to pay proper premium wage rates for all hours worked. These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code section 210. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute's provisions were violated.

Reporting Time Pay Violations:
Section 5 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, provides as follows:

(A) Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay, which shall not be less than the minimum wage. (B) If an employee is required to report for work a second time in any one workday and is furnished less than two (2) hours of work on the second reporting

NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not paid reporting time wages in accordance with California law, including but not limited to the applicable IWC Wage Order. For example,

[8] See Lab. Code §226.3 (establishing that the civil penalty is "per employee per violation").

based on information and belief, at times, PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES reported to work for a scheduled shift but were sent home and/or were not put to work and were not paid all owed reporting time pay wages in accordance with California law.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of failing to pay all reporting time wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, the applicable IWC Wage Order, Section 5. DEFENDANTS' failure to pay all reporting time wages to PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES violated and continue to violate the applicable Wage Order, including but not limited to IWC Wage Order 5-2001, section 5(A)-(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

Violation of California Day of Rest Law
Under California law, every employee in California is "entitled" to "one day's rest [from labor] in seven"; and, no employer may "cause" their employees "to work more than six days in seven." *See* Labor Code Sections 551 and 552. Labor Code section 553 provides that a violation of the foregoing sections is a misdemeanor.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have and continue to have a uniform policy and practice of requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work at least seven days consecutively in a workweek, in violation of including but not limited to, Labor Code Section 551. Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were suffered, permitted, or required to work at least seven (7) days consecutively in a workweek, in violation of California law, including but not limited to Labor Code Section 551.

Seating Violations: Per section 14(A-B) of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats and when they are not actively engaged in the work duties that would not permit them to be seated.

All applicable IWC Wage Orders, Section 14(A-B) provides:

> (A) All working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.
>
> (B) When employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.

Suitable seating is one of the worker protections covered by California's Wage Orders, which have the same dignity as statutes, are remedial in nature and are to be broadly construed to effectuate the goal of protecting the comfort and welfare of employees. *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1027 (2012).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with suitable seating, and when such employees were not engaged in duties which required them to stand, no seating was placed in reasonable proximity to their workstations.

Moreover, based on information and belief, the nature of the work reasonably permitted the use of seats for at least part of the time that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were working. Lastly, based on information and belief, there were periods of time when NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not engaged in active duties of their employment, yet there were no suitable seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and use of seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

DEFENDANTS' NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked in various positions. The nature of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work reasonably permitted the use of seats. However, DEFENDANTS failed to provide suitable seating in reasonable proximity to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' work areas in violation of section 14(A-B) of all applicable Wage Orders, and Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199, subjecting DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1199 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and IWC Wage Order provision, for each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE, results in a separate civil penalty.[9]

Violation of Labor Code section 351 and 353: Labor Code Section 351 prohibits employers and their agents from sharing in or keeping any portion of a gratuity left for or given to one or more employees by a patron. Furthermore, it is illegal for employers to make wage deductions from gratuities, or from using gratuities as direct or indirect credits against an employee's wages. Labor Code Section 353 mandates employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities received.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to ensure that NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES fully received the gratuities left for them by patrons, in that DEFENDANTS and their agents would collect and/or take a portion of the gratuities for themselves, in violation of Labor Code Section 351. Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS also failed/fails to keep accurate records of all tips received, in violation of Labor Code Section 353. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to pay gratuities paid by customers using credit cards to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by the next regular payday following the credit card payment, in violation of Labor Code section 351.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS charge an additional service charge to their customers/patrons. Customers are led to believe that the service charge will be paid to DEFENDANTS' NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. Instead, DEFENDANTS keeps a majority (if not the entirety) of the service charge, thereby depriving NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of the service charge/gratuity that is left by the patron/customer for the NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. *See O'Grady v Merchant Exchanges*

[9] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

Production, Inc., 41 Cal.App.5th 771, 790 (a mandatory service charge can constitute a gratuity that is intended to the employees providing the service).

Pursuant to PAGA, DEFENDANTS are liable for penalties of $100 per pay period payable to each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for the first violation of Labor Code Sections 351 and 353 they experienced within the statutory period, and $200 per pay period for each additional violation.

Standard Conditions of Labor Violations: Together, Labor Code sections 1198 and 1199 make unlawful any employment of any employee under conditions of labor prohibited by the Wage Orders, and any violation, refusal, or neglect to comply with any provision within Part 4, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code, including sections 1174, 1197, and 1198, or order or ruling of the commission.

Therefore, DEFENDANTS' violations, including but not limited to, with respect to meal periods, rest periods, recordkeeping provisions, minimum wages and overtime wages, business expenses, seating, suitable resting, reporting time pay, and other violations described herein result in separate violations of sections 1198 and 1199, which subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 1197.1 and 2699.

Statutory Wage Violations: Labor Code section 223 makes it unlawful for an employer to secretly pay wages lower than required by statute while purporting to pay legal wages.

As described above, DEFENDANTS willfully and systematically denied PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of minimum and overtime wage compensation for all hours worked which resulted in the payment of less than statutorily required wages owed to them. DEFENDANTS acted with the intent to deprive them of statutory wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages and minimum wages, to which they were entitled to under California law.

Thus, DEFENDANTS paid PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES lower wages than those they were entitled to while purporting that PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were properly paid. As such, PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f)-(g).

Failure to Pay Vested Vacation/Paid Time Off:

California Labor Code section 227.3 provides that when an employer policy provides for paid vacations and/or paid time off, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his, her, or their vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to the employee as wages at the employee's final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served and that there shall be no forfeiture of vested vacation time or paid time off upon termination. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS had and continue to have a uniform policy and practice of failing to allow NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their earned vacation/paid time off during their employment and failing to pay all vested, accrued paid time off (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary

compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials) to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES upon separation of employment, in violation of California law, including but not limited to, Labor Code section 227.3.

Final Pay Violations: Labor Code section 201 requires employers to pay all wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, immediately upon discharge. California Labor Code section 201(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately." California Labor Code section 202(a) provides, in relevant part, that "[i]f an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous 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." Pursuant to Labor Code section 203, an employer that willfully fails to pay wages due an employee who is terminated or resigns must pay (in addition to the unpaid wages) a penalty equal to the employee's daily wages for each day, not exceeding 30 days, that the wages are unpaid. This 30-day waiting time penalty is recoverable under the PAGA via Labor Code Section 256. See, *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014); see also, *Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 134 Cal. App. 4th 365 (2005).

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all wages that were due and owing upon termination or resignation. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS untimely provide final wages to NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES without regard to the timing requirements of Labor Code sections 201-202.

Upon separation of employment, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' final paychecks were not timely provided and/or were not timely provided with all owed vacation pay and/or paid time off. Moreover, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' final paychecks, once provided, did not include all wages owed as they were devoid of, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

For example, DEFENDANTS failed to furnish PLAINTIFF with any final paycheck until at least approximately one (1) week following PLAINTIFF's date of termination, and PLAINTIFF's late final paycheck was devoid of all wages owed, including but not limited to, all owed minimum wages, overtime wages, premium wages, vacation pay, all owed reporting time pay wages, all owed sick leave and/or paid time off wages at the properly accrued rates, (including but not limited to, all owed vacation pay/paid time off paid at the final rate including non-discretionary compensation, including but not limited to, shift differentials).

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS failed to timely provide all owed wages immediately upon discharge of employment. Based in information and belief, at times, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES experienced breaks in employment caused by

DEFENDANTS whereby NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would not be called in for work for longer than a single pay period due to including but not limited to DEFENDANTS' lack of work or lack of assignments. Such instances qualify as a discharge of employment. Yet, DEFENDANTS failed to timely pay all owed wages at the end of such periods of employment, in violation of including but not limited to Labor Code section 201-202.

These violations subject DEFENDANTS to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 203, 210, and/or 256. Each violation results in a *separate* civil penalty, for each EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE and each NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE for each pay period during which the statute provisions were violated.[10]

Violation of Labor Code Section 208:

Labor Code Section 208 provides: Every employee who is discharged shall be paid at the place of discharge, and every employee who quits shall be paid at the office or agency of the employer in the county where the employee has been performing labor. All payments shall be made in the manner provided by law.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS have a policy and practice of failing to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who are terminated with their final paychecks at the place of discharge and/or of failing to provide NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with their final paychecks at the office or agency of DEFENDANTS in the county where the work was performed, in violation of Labor Code Section 208.

Business Expense Violations: California law requires employers to indemnify their employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to the directions of the employer. *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2802(a) and all applicable Wage Orders, § 9 (b). Furthermore, "for purposes of [section 2802], the term 'necessary expenditure or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted by this section."

Among other things, under California law, when tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft. *See* applicable IWC Wage Order, § 9 (b).
Among other things, under California law, when employees must use their personal cellphones for work-related purposes, the employer must reimburse them for a reasonable percentage of their cell phone bills. *See Cochran v. Schwan's Home Services, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1140. To show liability, an employee will only need to show that he or she was required to use their personal cellphone for work-related purposes and not reimbursed for the use. *Id.* 1144-1145

California law also requires employers to reimburse employees for automobile expenses incurred

[10] (establishing that "[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty…for each failure to pay each employee").

for the business use of personal vehicles, such as for mileage, gas, and the wear and tear on the vehicle. *See Gattuso v. Harte-Hanks Shoppers, Inc.* (2007) 42 Cal.4th 554.

Further, "any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled to under the laws of this State." *See* Cal. Lab. Code § 2804.

Based on information and belief, PLAINTIFF and NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to provide and maintain work tools that are supposed to be the responsibility of the employer.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS shifted the costs of doing business onto NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by requiring them to pay for their business expenses including but not limited to, uniforms/work clothing/work shoes, personal protective/safety gear and/or the use of NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' personal mobile phone and data usage for work related purposes including but not limited to receiving and responding to work related messages and/or phone calls. For example, on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES received calls/messages to their personal cell phones/mobile devices from supervisors and/or other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES regarding scheduling and/or other work tasks but were not provided any and/or full reimbursement from DEFENDANTS for this personal cell phone use. For example, PLAINTIFF regularly received text messages and/or calls to his personal cell phone/mobile device from his supervisor throughout his shifts regarding work-related matters, however, DEFENDANTS did not provide PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for this business use of PLAINTIFF's personal cell phone/mobile device.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were not reimbursed for the cost of using their personal phone for work related purposes and/or the cost of purchasing and/or maintaining work uniforms/work clothing/work shoes, personal protective/safety gear. For example, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF to provide his own non-slip shoes to wear for work without providing PLAINTIFF with any reimbursement for the business expenses PLAINTIFF incurred in connection therewith.

Based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to use their personal vehicles for work without reimbursing them for the personal vehicle expenses they incurred in connection therewith. For example, based on information and belief, at times, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to travel from one of DEFENDANTS' facilities/restaurants to a second of DEFENDANTS' facilities/restaurants for work without reimbursing NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and/or EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the expenses incurred in connection with DEFENDANTS' business use of their personal vehicles.

Based on information and belief, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were improperly required to pay for business expenses that are supposed to be the responsibility of DEFENDANTS.

As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business expenses. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2802, PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to be reimbursed for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out DEFENDANTS' orders and/or carrying out the duties assigned by DEFENDANTS.

As described herein, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their job duties. DEFENDANTS' failure to provide PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with full reimbursement for all reasonable expenses associated with carrying out their duties required that PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES subsidize and/or carry the burden of business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

Unlawful Agreements/ Unlawful Criminal History Inquiries:

Unlawful Agreements

Labor Code section 432.5 provides that "no employer…shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer…to be prohibited by law." Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful conditions of employment including but not limited to unlawful non-solicitation/non-compete agreements, unlawful confidentiality and/or nondisclosure agreements, unlawful releases and/or waivers, unlawful forum selection clauses and/or choice of law provisions/agreements and/or unlawful criminal and/or financial checks as a condition of obtaining and/or continuing employment in violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

The California Labor Code places certain procedural and substantive limit on employers' ability to conduct employee background checks and on how employers can use the information they obtain through those background checks. Labor Code section 1024.5 states that employers, except for financial institutions, may order a credit check only if the individual works (or is applying to work) in certain positions (e.g., managerial positions, financially-related positions, and certain government positions). Additionally, the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act (ICRAA- CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq*.) and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA - 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq.)* mandate several requirements prior to and following an employee background check, including but not limited to identifying an appropriate reason for the background check, a separate consent form with required disclosures and certain formatting requirements, additional forms such as a summary of rights, a way by which to request a copy of the report, as well as proper notice of adverse actions taken, among other statutory requirements.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS ordered unlawful financial credit checks on NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, in violation of Labor Code section 1024.5, and required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to provide ongoing written consent to the unlawful credit checks as a condition of employment, in violation of California and Federal law, which results in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to submit and/or agree to submit in writing to unlawful criminal background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment in violation of the ICRAA and the FCRA.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to a background check which failed to abide by the requirements set forth in CA Civil Code section 1786, *et seq*. and 15 U.S.C. section 1681, *et seq*., including but not limited to by failing to provide a clear and conspicuous disclosure (and/or failing to provide any disclosure at all), failing to provide disclosures free of extraneous information, failing to provide a lawful purpose for the background check, failing to provide a summary of rights under the ICRAA and/or the FRCA, failing to provide a way by which the individual could request a copy of the report, failing to disclose the name, address, and telephone number of the third party preparing the report, and failing to properly obtain authorization or consent to such a background check, and thus was an unlawful background check.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to unlawful criminal and/or financial checks not in conformance with the applicable laws, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS also required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to provide ongoing consent to DEFENDANTS to conduct background checks throughout the duration of employment, in violation of the ICRAA and/or FCRA and/or other applicable laws, resulting in a further violation of Labor Code section 432.5, by requiring applicants and employees to agree to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment.

Based on further information and belief, DEFENDANTS knew that requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree to unlawful criminal and/or financial background checks as a condition of obtaining and/or holding employment was unlawful.

By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES agree in writing to unlawful provisions as a condition of employment, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5.

Unlawful Inquires into Criminal History

Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits an employer from asking applicants about past arrest(s) unless they resulted in conviction(s) and even then, certain limitations apply. Based on information and belief, DEFENDANTS asked NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about arrests not resulting in convictions on their employment application, in violation of California law.

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS, in violation of California law, including but not limited to the Fair Chance Act/the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), asked NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES about convictions prior to extending an offer of employment and/or otherwise impermissibly inquired into criminal history on their employment application in violation of California law.

By asking about arrests not resulting in convictions, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.7. By asking about convictions at the application phase or prior to extending an employment offer, DEFENDANTS violated California's Fair Chance Act, and thereby violated Labor Code section 432.5 by unlawfully requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to disclose arrests and/or convictions as a condition of employment.

Unlawful PAGA Waiver

Additionally, DEFENDANTS violated Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to other unlawful agreements, including but not limited to, an unlawful waiver of PAGA and or representative actions as a condition of employment.

An action pursuant to PAGA '"…is a representative action on behalf of the state'" *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.,* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87. It is well settled that agreements purporting to waive an employee's right to a trial of PAGA claims is contrary to California law and unenforceable. *See Iskanian v CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC* (2014) 59 Cal. 4th 348, 384 ("We conclude that where, as here, an employment agreement compels the waiver of representative claims under the PAGA, it is contrary to public policy and unenforceable as a matter of state law.")

Moreover, the California Supreme Court has ruled that a court cannot compel arbitration of an aggrieved employee's individual PAGA claim because there is no such thing as an individual PAGA claim. *Kim v Reins Int'l California, Inc.,* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 86-87 ("There is no individual component to a PAGA action because 'every PAGA action … is a representative action on behalf of the state.'")

Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS required NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree in writing to waive their right to a trial of PAGA claims in violation of California law. By requiring NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to agree, in writing, to an unlawful PAGA waiver, DEFENDANTS required written agreement to an unlawful provision as a condition of employment which is a violation of labor code section 432.5.

As such, PLAINTIFF, NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES continue to be subject to various unlawful provisions as a condition of employment.

Conclusion

DEFENDANTS have violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, the applicable IWC Wage Order, including but not limited to all applicable Wage Orders, as well as other laws, and is liable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. The civil penalties PLAINTIFF and other NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES seek to recover include, but are not limited to, the statutory and civil penalties specified above.

Labor Code § 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter (i.e. this AMENDED NOTICE) to the employer in question and file an online claim to the LWDA setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the LWDA an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this AMENDED NOTICE is to satisfy the requirements created by Labor Code §§ 2699, 2699.3(a), 2699.3(b), 2699.3(c), and 2699.5, prior to seeking penalties and premium wages allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations in a civil action. We look forward to determining whether the LWDA intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly ask that you respond to this AMENDED NOTICE according to the time frame contemplated by the code.

If the LWDA elects not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, PLAINTIFF will seek these penalties in a civil action, on behalf of PLAINTIFF and all NON-EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES and EXEMPT AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES of DEFENDANTS within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

Please advise if your office intends to investigate any of the factual and legal allegations and provide notice within sixty-five days of the date of this AMENDED NOTICE to our office and to that of other charged parties. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
Crosner Legal, PC
9440 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 301
Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Main: 866.276.7637
Fax: 310.510.6429
Email: kiara@crosnerlegal.com

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Best Regards,

Kiara Bramasco, Esq.
CROSNER LEGAL, PC

** Courtesy copy sent to counsel for DEFENDANTS*

CROSNER LEGAL
PUBLIC INTEREST RIGHTS

Manny Martinez <manny@crosnerlegal.com>

Thank you for your Amended PAGA Claim Notice Submission.

1 message

DIR PAGA Unit <lwdadonotreply@dir.ca.gov> Fri, Oct 20, 2023 at 11:33 AM
To: prelit@crosnerlegal.com

10/20/2023 11:30:58 AM

Thank you for your submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

Item submitted: Amended PAGA Claim Notice

If you have questions or concerns regarding this submission or your case, please send an email to pagainfo@dir.ca.gov.

DIR PAGA Unit on behalf of
Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Website: http://labor.ca.gov/Private_Attorneys_General_Act.htm

EXHIBIT 4