

January 15, 2026

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter on Behalf of ANGELICA SERMENO and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employer:

Quik Pick Express, LLC
1035 E. Watson Center Road
Carson, CA 90745

Quik Pick Express LLC's
Agent for Service of Process
Amanda Garcia
330 N Brand Blvd,
Glendale CA 91203

To Whom It May Concern:

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

This PAGA Notice concerns ANGELICA SERMENO's ("Employee") employment with Employee's former employer QUIK PICK EXPRESS, LLC ("Employer"). Employee was a non-exempt hourly employee and worked for Employer as a Truck Driver at, without limitation, 1021 233rd St., Carson, CA 90745. Employee worked for Employer from approximately August of 2018 until current time. Employee's duties included, but were not limited to, driving and making on duty reports.

Employee seeks to represent all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants during the PAGA Period. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 223, 226, 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 232, 232.5, 432, 432.5, 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198, 1198.5, 206.5, 2800, 2802, 2699, among others, Business and Professions Code section 17200, as well as applicable Wage Orders, Plaintiff seeks to represent all current and former employees of Defendants working during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Plaintiff seeks to represent only non-exempt current and former employees of Defendants that worked during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are referred to herein as "Aggrieved

Employees.” The “PAGA Period” covers the three years preceding the date this letter was submitted to the LWDA and continues past that date into perpetuity.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum and overtime wages for all minutes worked, at the proper rates of pay. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552).

Employer failed to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked by Employee and Aggrieved Employees. Employer also engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to suffer under Employer’s control by waiting in long lines to clock in, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff required uniforms and/or safety gear prior to starting their shift, to attend company meetings and/or trainings off the clock, to make phone calls off the clock, to drive to jobsites while off the clock, and/or go through security screenings and/or temperature checks off the clock. By way of example, Employee and, upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees worked through their lunch breaks when they were unable to take them on time.

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

Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the overtime laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the minimum wage and overtime laws. These practices were all to the detriment of Employee and other Aggrieved Employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked. Thus, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer’s conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Moreover, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer further violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime

compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to work every day in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Employer regularly denied Employee and Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by failing to provide timely meal breaks and by not relieving employees of all duty, thereby forcing employees to take meal breaks whenever a free moment was available. This practice regularly resulted in late and missed meal periods. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the meal period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the meal period laws, including potential violations for unprovided meals, late meals, short meals, interrupted meals, auto-deducted meals, meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties, and meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at his or her regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the Aggrieved Employees are completely relieved of all of their duties. For example, Employee did not take rest breaks due to workload demands and because Employer did not enforce rest breaks or inform Employee of her right to take them. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the rest period laws, Employee

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

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continues to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employer also failed to provide these documents to Employee and other Aggrieved Employees upon request on September 25, 2025 in violation of these Labor Code sections. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn entitles Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Employee and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those

penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully and/or intentionally failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned Aggrieved Employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed, all minimum wages owed, which Employee states under information and belief because Employer failed to provide the requested records under Labor Code section 226; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Because Employer refused to provide Employee's personnel file on **September 25, 2025**, Employee is unable to provide specifics regarding the exact documents, and language therein, that Employee was required to sign. Nevertheless, Employee recalls, and thus Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employer knew to be false. As such, Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above that gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for use of personal cell phone for work related

communications and to clock-in and out because the company's device was not working, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer is liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for the costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Once again, Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and other Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employer for purposes of competing with Employer, including, without limitation, preventing Employee and Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Employer and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, 1197.5, subdivision (k), and 1198, and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and

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

Employer did not provide Employee with the documents Employee signed to obtain or maintain employment in violation of Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 432. However, based on memory, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, non-compete agreements, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, purported confidentiality agreements, purported severance agreements, or purported release agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Employer also required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations and was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Pavel Rukavishnikov

Pavel Rukavishnikov

cc: