OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION
5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Tel.: 818-293-5623
Fax: 888-850-1310

January 9, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING
Labor & Workforce Development Agency

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
GenMark Diagnostics, Inc.
5964 La Place Court
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7850

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Roche Carlsbad
5964 La Place Court
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7850

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Roche
5964 La Place Court
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7850

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Agent for Service of Process
Amanda Garcia
330 N Brand Blvd
Glendale, CA 91203
Agent certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7867

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
Roche Holdings, Inc.
1 DNA Way
South San Francisco, CA 94080
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7874

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL
GenMark Diagnostics, Inc.
2210 Faraday Ave
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 7881

Re: ***Isagani Laygo v. GenMark Diagnostics, Inc., Roche Holdings, Inc., Roche Carlsbad, Roche – Compliance Letter of California Labor Code § 2698 – Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear Sir or Madam:

This office represents Isagani Laygo ("Plaintiff"), a former California employee of Genmark Diagnostics, Inc., Roche Holdings, Inc., Roche Carlsbad, Roche ("Defendants"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client works for Defendant in Southern California. Herein we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to our client and other of its California non-exempt employees.

Plaintiff began working for Defendants in or around November of 2016. While working for Defendant as a Team Lead, Plaintiff was earning ($28.09) dollars per hour.

Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant's needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. Defendant routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees undergo a COVID-19 screening process prior to the start of their scheduled shifts. When Plaintiff would arrive, he was not allowed to clock-in for the day until he passed a medical examination to screen Plaintiff for symptoms of COVID-19. The time spent undergoing the COVID-19 temperature checks and the time between completing the COVID-19 screening took Plaintiff on the average of 1-2 minutes to complete. Moreover, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to go through off the clock COVID-19 related checks consisting of nasal swab test. It took Plaintiff on the average of 20 minutes to complete these tasks. Defendants routinely made Plaintiff and its California employees wait in line for the ADP time clocks to become available to clock in or out.

The time spent waiting in line took Plaintiff on the average of 1 minute to complete. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees if these tasks were completed outside of his regular work hours. These excess hours were not recorded on our client's and Defendant's California employees wage statements. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees should have been compensated for that time, but he was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other California employees of Defendant claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. Defendant pays their employees bonuses and commissions which are not included in the employees regular rate of pay for the purposes of computing the proper overtime rate. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1194.2.

Additionally, Labor Code Section 1194(a) states: "[n]otwithstanding 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 attorney's fees, and costs of suit. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees claim that Defendant engaged in "time clock rounding." This essentially means that the Defendant underpaid Plaintiff by rounding the time Plaintiff worked in violation of Labor Code Section 1194(a).

Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(3), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5). Plaintiff and the California employees wage statements' failed to accurately state the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(8), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's worked hours, due to the time clock rounding. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records and required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

Our client further alleges that Defendants paid him and Defendant's California employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b) and 201.3.

Defendant violated Labor Code § 246 by failing to provide paid sick leave to the aggrieved employees, failing to comply with the accrual and carryover requirements for paid sick leave, failing to provide an employee with written notice each pay period stating the amount of paid sick leave available each pay period and otherwise wholly failing to participate in the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014. (Labor Code § 245, *et seq.*).

Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

We invite Defendants or its attorney(s) to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM

ROMAN OTKUPMAN