

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
Allen Feghali (SBN 301080)
H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834)
Sandy Pham (SBN 352753)
MOON LAW GROUP, PC
725 S. Figueroa Street, 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125
E-mail: kmoon@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: afeghali@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: hsleviant@moonlawgroup.com
E-mail: spham@moonlawgroup.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, REYNALDO GESTRE,
ALONZO JACKSON, DAVIEN HALL, KIM BOYKIN,
LAMAR GRANT JOHNSON, AND EDWARD MATHIS

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

REYNALDO GESTRE, ALONZO JACKSON,
DAVIEN HALL, KIM BOYKIN, LAMAR
GRANT JOHNSON, and EDWARD MATHIS,
individually, and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SUTTER BAY HOSPITALS, a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: C24-03082

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
Edward G. Weil, Dept. 12]*

**SECOND AMENDED CLASS ACTION
AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT:**

1. Failure to Pay Minimum Wages [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 204, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197];
2. Failure to Pay Overtime Compensation [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194 and 1198];
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512];
4. Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Breaks [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7];
5. Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses [Cal. Lab. Code § 2802];
6. Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages at Termination [Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201-203];
7. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements [Cal. Lab. Code § 226];
8. Unfair Business Practices [Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.]; and
9. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab. Code § 2699, et seq.].

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiffs	3
B. Defendants	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	4
CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	8
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	12
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	13
THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	14
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION	15
FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION	16
SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION	17
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	18
EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION	19
NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION	22
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	24
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	28

1 Plaintiff Reynaldo Gestre (“Plaintiff”), Plaintiff Alonzo Jackson (“Plaintiff Jackson”),
2 Plaintiff Davien Hall (“Plaintiff Hall”), Plaintiff Kim Boykin (“Plaintiff Boykin”), and Plaintiff
3 Lamar Grant Johnson (“Plaintiff Johnson”), and Plaintiff Edward Mathis (“Plaintiff Mathis”),
4 collectively (“Plaintiffs”) based upon facts that either have evidentiary support or are likely to have
5 evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation and discovery, allege
6 as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

8 1. Plaintiffs bring this action against Defendants Sutter Bay Hospitals and Does 1
9 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code violations and
10 unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay
11 overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure
12 to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to
13 terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business expenses, and failure to furnish
14 accurate wage statements.

15 2. Plaintiffs bring the First through Eighth Causes of Action individually and as a class
16 action on behalf of themselves and certain current and former employees of Defendants
17 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members” and defined more fully
18 below). The Class consists of Plaintiffs and all other persons who have been employed by any
19 Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee during the statute of limitations
20 period applicable to the claims pleaded here.

21 3. Plaintiffs bring the Ninth Cause of Action as a representative action under the
22 California Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) to recover civil penalties that are owed to
23 Plaintiffs, the State of California, and all other current and former aggrieved employees who
24 worked for Defendants in California at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period
25 (hereinafter referred to as the “Aggrieved Employees”).

26 4. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and
27 establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County. As such, and based
28 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants’ business in California, Defendants are

1 subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission
2 (“IWC”), and the California Business & Professions Code.

3 5. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained
4 a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 5 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum
6 wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code
7 and IWC Wage Orders;
- 8 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in
9 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing
10 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing
11 to pay an additional hour’s pay for each workday a meal period violation
12 occurred;
- 13 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest
14 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
15 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour’s pay for each workday a rest
16 period violation occurred;
- 17 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 18 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages,
19 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the
20 time period specified by California law when employment terminates;
- 21 (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked;
22 and
- 23 (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements
24 containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and
25 IWC Wage Orders.

26 6. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and
27 constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their
28

1 unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were
2 willful and deliberate.

3 7. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the
4 unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the
5 foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.
6 Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of
7 herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

8 **THE PARTIES**

9 **A. Plaintiffs**

10 8. Plaintiffs are California residents that worked for Defendants in the County of
11 Contra Costa, State of California, in Contra Costa County during the statutory period.

12 9. Plaintiffs reserve the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new
13 plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v.*
14 *American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

15 **B. Defendants**

16 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based upon that information and belief
17 allege, that Defendants are:

- 18 (a) Business entities with their principal places of business in Contra Costa,
19 California;
- 20 (b) Business entities conducting business in numerous counties throughout the
21 State of California, including in Contra Costa County; and
- 22 (c) The former employers of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employers
23 of the putative Class. Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiffs, the Class,
24 and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours,
25 or working conditions.

26 11. Plaintiffs do not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or
27 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious
28 names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages

1 suffered by Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiffs will
2 amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they
3 have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

4 12. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and
5 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or
6 injured a significant number of the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees in the State
7 of California.

8 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that at all relevant times each
9 Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiffs and the
10 other employees described in the class definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,
11 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that, at all
12 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,
13 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or
14 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all
15 of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some
16 or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged
17 below. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each Defendant acted pursuant
18 to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should
19 have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the
20 conduct of all other Defendants.

21 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

22 14. Plaintiffs are California residents who worked for Defendants in the County of
23 Contra Costa, State of California during the statutory period. During the statutory period,
24 Defendants classified Plaintiffs as a non-exempt employees, and paid Plaintiffs an hourly wage.

25 15. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs for all hours
26 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiffs with
27 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs to take uninterrupted rest
28 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiffs for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final

1 wages to Plaintiffs when Defendants terminated Plaintiffs' employment, and failed to furnish
2 accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for
3 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

4 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not
5 paying Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all
6 overtime wages. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the
7 clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
8 sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain
9 periods of time, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo
10 COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs,
11 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for
12 work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory
13 period, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and
14 other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating
15 the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to
16 underpayment to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

17 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
18 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods.
19 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
20 Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute,
21 continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without
22 compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not
23 provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not
24 adequately inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal
25 period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the
26 tenth hour of work. Defendants also failed to accurately record meal periods. Accordingly,
27 Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
28 Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

1 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
2 and permit Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest
3 periods. Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
4 Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and
5 permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours
6 of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
7 Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did
8 not adequately inform Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a
9 rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or
10 authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants
11 have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not
12 have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
13 Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate
14 records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs,
15 the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period.
16 Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiffs, the Class,
17 and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

18 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiffs, the
19 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their
20 duties for Defendants without reimbursement, such as the occasional use of personal cellular
21 telephones for work purposes.

22 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
23 pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all
24 wages for all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period
25 premium wages.

26 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiffs, the Class,
27 and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable
28 hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages

1 earned for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were
2 not provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
3 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendants' address).
4 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendants' address as required by California law. As
5 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
6 Aggrieved Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 7 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
8 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
9 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
10 entitled;
- 11 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,
12 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even
13 though they had not been;
- 14 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum,
15 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the
16 correct California rate even though they were;
- 17 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,
18 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct
19 California rate even though they had not been;
- 20 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,
21 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 22 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in
23 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have
24 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages
25 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage
26 statements contained the required accurate information;

1 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose
2 entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability,
3 unemployment, and other governmental benefits; and

4 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages
5 rates to which Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were
6 entitled, and Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were paid
7 less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

8 Thus, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in
9 California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

10 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

11 22. Plaintiffs bring certain claims individually, as well as on behalf of each and all other
12 persons similarly situated, and thus, seek class certification under California Code of Civil
13 Procedure § 382.

14 23. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiffs seek relief
15 authorized by California law.

16 24. The proposed Class consists of and is defined as:

17 All persons who worked for any Defendants in California as an hourly, non-
18 exempt employee at any time during the period beginning four years before the
19 filing of the initial complaint in this action and ending when notice to the Class
is sent.

20 25. At all material times, Plaintiffs were members of the Class.

21 26. Plaintiffs undertake this concerted activity to improve the wages and working
22 conditions of all Class Members.

23 27. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the Class is
24 readily ascertainable:

25 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class (and each subclass, if any) are so
26 numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical.
27 The membership of the entire Class is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time,
28

1 however, the Class is estimated to be greater than 100 individuals and the
2 identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of
3 Defendants' records.

4 (b) Typicality: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
5 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
6 defined community of interest, and Plaintiffs' claims (or defenses, if any)
7 are typical of all Class Members' claims as demonstrated herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiffs are qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
9 the interests of each Class Member with whom there is a shared, well-
10 defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated
11 herein. Plaintiffs have no conflicts with or interests antagonistic to any Class
12 Member. Plaintiffs' attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the
13 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
14 Plaintiffs have incurred, and throughout the duration of this action, will
15 continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are, and will be
16 necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial
17 benefit of each class member.

18 (d) Superiority: A Class Action is superior to other available methods for the
19 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy, including consideration of:

- 20 1) The interests of the members of the Class in individually controlling
21 the prosecution or defense of separate actions;
22 2) The extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy
23 already commenced by or against members of the Class;
24 3) The desirability or undesirability of concentrating the litigation of the
25 claims in the particular forum; and
26 4) The difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
27 action.

28 //

1 (e) Public Policy Considerations: The public policy of the State of California is
2 to resolve the California Labor Code claims of many employees through a
3 class action. Indeed, current employees are often afraid to assert their rights
4 out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are also fearful
5 of bringing actions because they believe their former employers might
6 damage their future endeavors through negative references and/or other
7 means. Class actions provide the class members who are not named in the
8 complaint with a type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their
9 rights at the same time as their privacy is protected.

10 28. There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class (and each subclass, if
11 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including without
12 limitation, whether, as alleged herein, Defendants have:

- 13 (a) Failed to pay Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum
14 wages, and overtime wages;
- 15 (b) Failed to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages to Class
16 Members;
- 17 (c) Failed to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium
18 wages to Class Members;
- 19 (d) Failed to promptly pay all wages due to Class Members upon their discharge
20 or resignation;
- 21 (e) Failed to maintain accurate records of all hours Class Members worked, and
22 all meal periods Class Members took or missed;
- 23 (f) Failed to reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; and
24 (g) Violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et. seq.* as a
25 result of their illegal conduct as described above.

26 29. This Court should permit this action to be maintained as a class action pursuant to
27 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because:

28 //

- 1 (a) The questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any
2 question affecting only individual members;
- 3 (b) A class action is superior to any other available method for the fair and
4 efficient adjudication of the claims of the members of the Class;
- 5 (c) The members of the Class are so numerous that it is impractical to bring all
6 members of the class before the Court;
- 7 (d) Plaintiffs, and the other members of the Class, will not be able to obtain
8 effective and economic legal redress unless the action is maintained as a
9 class action;
- 10 (e) There is a community of interest in obtaining appropriate legal and equitable
11 relief for the statutory violations, and in obtaining adequate compensation
12 for the damages and injuries for which Defendants are responsible in an
13 amount sufficient to adequately compensate the members of the Class for
14 the injuries sustained;
- 15 (f) Without class certification, the prosecution of separate actions by individual
16 members of the class would create a risk of:
- 17 1) Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual
18 members of the Class which would establish incompatible standards
19 of conduct for Defendants; and/or
- 20 2) Adjudications with respect to the individual members which would,
21 as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of other members
22 not parties to the adjudications, or would substantially impair or
23 impede their ability to protect their interests, including but not
24 limited to the potential for exhausting the funds available from those
25 parties who are, or may be, responsible Defendants; and,
- 26 (g) Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to
27 the Class, thereby making final injunctive relief appropriate with respect to
28 the class as a whole.

30. Plaintiffs contemplate the eventual issuance of notice to the proposed members of the Class that would set forth the subject and nature of the instant action. The Defendants' own business records may be utilized for assistance in the preparation and issuance of the contemplated notices. To the extent that any further notices may be required, Plaintiffs would contemplate the use of additional techniques and forms commonly used in class actions, such as published notice, e-mail notice, website notice, first-class mail, or combinations thereof, or by other methods suitable to the Class and deemed necessary and/or appropriate by the Court.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Minimum Wages for All Hours Worked)

31. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

32. “Hours worked” is 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.

33. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants knowingly failed to pay to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees compensation for all hours they worked. By their failure to pay compensation for each hour worked as alleged above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 1194 of the California Labor Code, and any additional applicable Wage Orders, which require such compensation to non-exempt employees.

34. Accordingly, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover minimum wages for all non-overtime hours worked for Defendants.

35. By and through the conduct described above, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have been deprived of their rights to be paid wages earned by virtue of their employment with Defendants.

36. By virtue of the Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional compensation to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their non-overtime hours worked without pay, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved

1 Employees, but which exceed the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which will be
2 ascertained according to proof at trial.

3 37. By failing to keep adequate time records required by California Labor Code §
4 1174(d), Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of minimum wage
5 compensation due Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

6 38. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
7 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover liquidated damages (double damages) for
8 Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages.

9 39. California Labor Code section 204 requires employers to provide employees with
10 all wages due and payable twice a month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable
11 to this cause of action, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be paid
12 twice a month at rates required by law, including minimum wages. However, during all such times,
13 Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
14 Employees all such wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month.

15 40. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to seek recovery
16 of all unpaid minimum wages, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to
17 California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6, and 1194(a).

18 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

20 41. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
21 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

22 42. California Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be
23 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they
24 receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

25 43. California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 provide that employees in California shall
26 not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional
27 compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, California
28 Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed

1 by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

2 44. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have
3 worked more than eight hours in a workday, as employees of Defendants.

4 45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs, the Class, and the
5 Aggrieved Employees overtime compensation for the hours they have worked in excess of the
6 maximum hours permissible by law as required by California Labor Code § 510 and 1198.
7 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are regularly required to work overtime hours.

8 46. By virtue of Defendants' unlawful failure to pay additional premium rate
9 compensation to the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their overtime hours
10 worked, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to
11 suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown to them but which exceed the
12 jurisdictional minimum of this Court and which will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

13 47. By failing to keep adequate time records required by Labor Code § 1174(d),
14 Defendants have made it difficult to calculate the full extent of overtime compensation due to
15 Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees.

16 48. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees also request recovery of
17 overtime compensation according to proof, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California
18 Labor Code § 1194(a), as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, in
19 a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

20 49. California Labor Code § 204 requires employers to provide employees with all
21 wages due and payable twice a month. The Wage Orders also provide that every employer shall
22 pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, overtime wages for all
23 overtime hours worked in the payroll period. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs, the Class,
24 and the Aggrieved Employees with all compensation due, in violation of California Labor Code §
25 204.

26 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

27 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Provide Meal Periods)**

28 50. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs

1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

51. Under California law, Defendants have an affirmative obligation to relieve the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees of all duty in order to take their first daily meal periods no later than the start of Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees' sixth hour of work in a workday, and to take their second meal periods no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Section 512 of the California Labor Code, and Section 11 of the applicable Wage Orders require that an employer provide unpaid meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each five-hour period worked. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any meal period mandated under any Wage Order.

52. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants regularly failed to provide Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees with both meal periods as required by California law. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take all meal periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted meal periods), Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage Orders.

53. Under California law, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s), plus interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against All Defendants for Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods)

54. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

55. Defendants are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Section 512 of the California Labor Code, the applicable Wage Orders require that the employer permit and authorize all employees to take paid rest periods of 10 minutes each for each 4-hour period worked. Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes,

1 the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is
2 itself a violation of California's rest break laws. It is a violation of Section 226.7 of the California
3 Labor Code for an employer to require any employee to work during any rest period mandated
4 under any Wage Order.

5 56. Despite these legal requirements, Defendants failed to authorize Plaintiffs, the
6 Class, and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks, regardless of whether employees worked
7 more than 4 hours in a workday. By their failure to permit and authorize Plaintiffs, the Class, and
8 the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods as alleged above (or due to the fact that Defendants
9 made it impossible or impracticable to take these uninterrupted rest periods), Defendants willfully
10 violated the provisions of Section 226.7 of the California Labor Code and the applicable Wage
11 Orders.

12 57. Under California law, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are
13 entitled to be paid one hour of premium wages rate for each workday he or she was not provided
14 with all required rest break(s), plus interest thereon.

15 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Against All Defendants for Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses)**

17 58. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
18 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

19 59. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, by failing
20 to pay and indemnify the Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees for their necessary
21 expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their
22 obedience to directions of Defendants.

23 60. As a result, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were damaged at
24 least in the amounts of the expenses they paid, or which were deducted by Defendants from their
25 wages.

26 61. Plaintiffs, the class they represent, and the aggrieved employees they represent are
27 entitled to attorney's fees, expenses, and costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(c) and
28 interest pursuant to Labor Code section 2802(b).

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Against all Defendants for Failure to Pay Wages of Discharged Employees – Waiting Time**
3 **Penalties)**

4 62. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
5 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

6 63. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if
7 an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due
8 and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or
9 her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless
10 the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in
11 which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

12 64. Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many
13 other members of the Class ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the
14 employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and
15 continue to fail to pay terminated Class Members, without abatement, all wages required to be paid
16 by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
17 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

18 65. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and those Class members who are no longer
19 employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within seventy-
20 two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§
21 201 and 202.

22 66. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
23 wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall
24 continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is
25 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

26 67. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from
27 Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular
28 hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

68. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5, 218.6 and 1194, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, expenses, and costs incurred in this action.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Failure to Provide and Maintain Accurate and Compliant Wage Records)

69. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

70. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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.

71. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the gross wages earned by Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees, the failure to list the true “total hours worked by the employee,” and the failure to list the true net wages earned.

72. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

//

73. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have been injured by Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under California Labor Code § 226(a).

74. Calculation of the true wage entitlement for Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees is difficult and time consuming. As a result of this unlawful burden, Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees were also injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

75. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

76. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are also entitled to injunctive relief, as well as an award of attorney's fees and costs to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h).

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.)

77. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

78. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under California Business & Professions Code § 17201.

79. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs, other Class members, and to the general public. Plaintiffs seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

80. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, are violations of California law, and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

81. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code, are unlawful and in violation of public policy; and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive, fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

82. Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages, and other benefits in violation of the California Labor Code constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

83. Defendants' failure to pay overtime compensation and other benefits in violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of All Hours Worked

84. Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records of all hours worked in accordance with California Labor Code § 1174.5 and the IWC Wage Orders constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

85. Defendants' failure to provide meal periods in accordance with California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

86. Defendants' failure to authorize and permit rest periods in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.7 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

Failure to Indemnify Necessary Business Expenses

87. Defendants' failure to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses in

1 accordance with California Labor Code § 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders, as alleged above,
2 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200,
3 *et seq.*

4 **Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

5 88. Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements in accordance
6 with California Labor Code § 226, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity
7 prohibited by California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

8 89. By and through their unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described
9 herein, the Defendants, have obtained valuable property, money and services from Plaintiffs, and
10 all persons similarly situated, and have deprived Plaintiffs, and all persons similarly situated, of
11 valuable rights and benefits guaranteed by law, all to their detriment.

12 90. Plaintiffs, the Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees suffered monetary
13 injury as a direct result of Defendants' wrongful conduct.

14 91. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, is entitled
15 to, and do, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge money and/or property which the
16 Defendants have wrongfully acquired, or of which Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved
17 Employees have been deprived, by means of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or
18 fraudulent business practices. Plaintiffs, the Class, and the Aggrieved Employees are not obligated
19 to establish individual knowledge of the wrongful practices of Defendants in order to recover
20 restitution.

21 92. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, are further
22 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair, unlawful
23 and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining the Defendants, and each of them, from
24 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the
25 future.

26 93. Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of members of the putative class, have no
27 plain, speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which the Class Members
28 suffered as a consequence of the Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

1 As a result of the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiffs,
2 individually, and on behalf of members of the putative Class, has suffered and will continue to
3 suffer irreparable harm unless the Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to
4 engage in said unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

5 94. Plaintiffs also allege that if Defendants are not enjoined from the conduct set forth
6 herein above, they will continue to avoid paying the appropriate taxes, insurance and other
7 withholdings.

8 95. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiffs and
9 putative Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
10 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
11 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiffs and Class
12 Members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
13 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

14 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act** 16 **of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

17 96. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference and re-allege as if fully stated herein paragraphs
18 1 through 21 in this Second Amended Complaint.

19 97. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
20 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

21 98. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
22 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
23 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
24 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
25 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a
26 civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or
27 former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

28 //

1 99. Plaintiff Gestre, Plaintiff Jackson, and Plaintiff Hall have exhausted their
2 administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On or around November 9,
3 2024, February 20, 2026, February 25, 2026, and March 16, 2026, May 6, 2026, and May 7, 2026,
4 respectively, they gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development
5 Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that
6 Defendants have violated against Plaintiffs and certain current and former aggrieved employees,
7 including the facts and theories to support the violations. Plaintiffs also paid the filing fee. Plaintiff
8 Gestre, Plaintiff Jackson, Plaintiff Hall, Plaintiff Johnson, and Plaintiff Mathis' PAGA case
9 number is LWDA-CM-1061427-24. Plaintiff Boykin's PAGA case number is LWDA-CM-
10 1164816-26. A true and correct copy of the original and amended PAGA letters are attached hereto
11 as **Exhibits A-F**.

12 100. More than 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiffs Gestre, Plaintiff Jackson, Plaintiff
13 Hall, and Plaintiff Boykin provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has
14 not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants' Labor Code violations discussed in the
15 notice. The 65-day notice period for Plaintiff Johnson and Plaintiff Mathis has not yet expired as
16 of the filing of this Second Amended Complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff Gestre, Plaintiff Jackson,
17 Plaintiff Hall, and Plaintiff Boykin may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor
18 Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code described in this Second
19 Amended Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California
20 Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, and 2699(f)(2).

21 101. In addition, Plaintiffs seek penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor
22 Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity,
23 employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
24 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
25 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins
26 and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.
27 Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total
28 hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

102. During the time period of employment for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

103. Based on the conduct described in this Complaint, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other remedies permitted by law.

104. In addition, Plaintiffs seek an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated only with respect to the class claims, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action with respect to the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Causes of Action;
2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class; and

1 18. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
2 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

3 19. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

4 As to the Fourth Cause of Action

5 20. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
6 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and the IWC Wage Orders;

7 21. For unpaid rest period premium wages as may be appropriate;

8 22. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
9 such amounts were due;

10 23. For reasonable attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5,
11 and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

12 24. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

13 As to the Fifth Cause of Action

14 25. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated Labor Code §
15 2802 and the IWC Wage Orders;

16 26. For general unpaid wages and reimbursement of business expenses as may be
17 appropriate;

18 27. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation commencing from the date
19 such amounts were due;

20 28. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

21 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

22 As to the Sixth Cause of Action

23 30. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
24 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of
25 termination of the employment;

26 31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 for former
27 employees who have left Defendants' employ;

28 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

36. For penalties and actual damages pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e);

37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(h);

38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein; and

39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, and failing to maintain accurate records of all hours worked and meal periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to indemnify necessary business expenses;

41. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all Class Members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

42. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5;

44. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and,

45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

1 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

2 46. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California
3 Labor Code by failing to pay all wages owed, including overtime, failure to provide meal periods,
4 failing to maintain accurate records of meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods,
5 failing to pay final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

6 47. For all actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

7 48. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, et seq., and all
8 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

9 49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
10 California Labor Code § 2699; and,


11 50. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

12 As to all Causes of Action

13 51. For any additional relief that the Court deems just and proper.

14 Dated: June 4, 2026

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

15
16 By: 


Kane Moon
Allen Feghali
H. Scott Leviant
Sandy Pham
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

19 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

20 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

21 Dated: June 4, 2026

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

22
23 By: 

Kane Moon
Allen Feghali
H. Scott Leviant
Sandy Pham
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT A

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

November 9, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals (“Defendant”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant’s aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiff as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff’s Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a nurse from approximately 2011 to August 2024, primarily in Contra Costa County. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours).

Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of

employment. For instance, when Plaintiff's employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT B

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

February 20, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre et al. v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre and Alonzo Jackson (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiffs as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiffs worked for Defendant during the statutory period, primarily in Contra Costa and Alameda County. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendant failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiffs seek penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the

termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.


Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT C

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

February 25, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Second Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, and Davien Hall v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, and Davien Hall (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiffs as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiffs worked for Defendant during the statutory period, primarily in Contra Costa and Alameda County. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendant failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiffs seek penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records

showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT D

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

March 19, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Second Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, and Kim Boykin v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, and Kim Boykin (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiffs as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiffs worked for Defendant during the statutory period, primarily in Contra Costa and Alameda County. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs' employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs' experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendant failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiffs seek penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records

showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT E

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

May 6, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Fourth Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, Kim Boykin, and Lamar Grant
Johnson v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, Kim Boykin, and Lamar Grant Johnson (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiffs as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County and Alameda County. As such, Defendant is subject

to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiffs worked for Defendant during the statutory period, primarily in Contra Costa and Alameda County. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs’ employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs’ experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “Hours worked” is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other remuneration. However, Defendant failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of

pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiffs seek penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records

showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and

9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.


Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kane Moon', is written over the printed name.

Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

EXHIBIT F

MOON LAW GROUP, PC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

725 S. FIGUEROA STREET, SUITE 3100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.
Kmoon@moonlawgroup.com

May 7, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Sutter Bay Hospitals
2000 Powell Street, 10th Floor
Emeryville, CA 94608

Fifth Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

Re: ***Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, Kim Boykin, Lamar Grant Johnson, and Edward Mathis v. Sutter Bay Hospitals***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Reynaldo Gestre, Alonzo Jackson, Davien Hall, Kim Boykin, Lamar Grant Johnson, and Edward Mathis (collectively, "Plaintiffs") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employer, Sutter Bay Hospitals ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiffs wish to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiffs as aggrieved employees, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiffs' Employment with Defendant

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Contra Costa County and Alameda County. As such, Defendant is subject

to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiffs worked for Defendant during the statutory period, primarily in Contra Costa and Alameda County. Defendant classified Plaintiffs as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs typically worked 5 to 6 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiffs’ employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiffs’ experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. “Hours worked” is 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.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime wages. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to work off the clock, and uncompensated. For example, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes required to wait in line in order to clock into work, uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo COVID screening prior to clocking into work, off the clock and uncompensated. Also, during certain periods of time, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were required to bag checks, consisting of walking through a metal detector and having a security guard conduct a visual bag check. Also, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were sometimes interrupted during their meal breaks for work purposes, but they were not compensated for this work time. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses and other

remuneration. However, Defendant failed to incorporate all remuneration when calculating the correct overtime rate of pay, break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Lastly, Defendant routinely deduced approximately 15 minutes of pay from Plaintiffs' and Aggrieved Employees' paychecks when they were even one minute late from returning from any rest breaks taken. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiffs seek penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the purchase of specific types of scrubs and the occasional use of personal cellular telephones for work purposes. Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for

Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

Failure to Pay All Accrued Vacation Wages at Termination

Labor Code § 227.3 requires employers to pay employees for all unused vested vacation time at their final rate of pay upon termination of their employment.

During the statutory period, Defendant maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees the correct amount of vacation pay owed at the termination of employment. For instance, when Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant terminated, he was owed vacation wages at his true final wage rate on his final pay check from Defendant even though he had accrued unused vacation time. On information and belief, Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs the correct amount of vacation pay was not a single, isolated incident, but was instead part of Defendant's policy and practice that applied to the Aggrieved Employees.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay all accrued vacation wages at termination.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiffs and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiffs and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate

until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant's failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiffs allege that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;

5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vacation wages at termination;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
9. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiffs seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiffs have placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON LAW GROUP, PC



Kane Moon, Esq.
Attorney at Law

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party
4 to the within suit; my business address is 725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

5 On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **SECOND AMENDED CLASS**
6 **ACTION AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT** on the interested parties in this action by sending
[] the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached
service list:

7 Thomas E. Geidt, Esq. (SBN 080955)

8 Teresa W. Ghali, Esq. (SBN 252961)

9 Tuyet T. Lu, Esq. (SBN 256431)

10 Emilie Ho, Esq. (SBN 355694)

11 **GBG LLP**

12 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 840

13 San Francisco, CA 94111

14 Telephone: (415) 603-5000

15 Facsimile: (415) 840-7210

16 E-mail: tomgeidt@gbgllp.com

17 E-mail: teresaghali@gbgllp.com

18 E-mail: tuyetlu@gbgllp.com

19 E-mail: emilieho@gbgllp.com

20 E-mail: service@gbgllp.com

21 *Counsel for Defendant*

22 [✓] **BY E-MAIL:** I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail
23 delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-mail of record in
24 this action.

25 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States that the
26 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **June 16, 2026** at Los Angeles, California.

27 _____
28 Helena Maa

Type or Print Name

Signature