1875 Century Park East, Suite 1860
Los Angeles, California 90067
310.556.4811 Main | 310.943.0396 Fax

AFIFE BICAKCI
310.712.8032 Direct
Afife.Bicakci@capstonelawyers.com

March 3, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
(https://dir.govfa.net/411)

Subject: *Efrem Sargent v. Hardigg Industries, LLC, et al.*

Dear PAGA Administrator:

This office represents Efrem Sargent in connection with his claims under the California Labor Code. Mr. Sargent was an employee of HARDIGG INDUSTRIES, LLC, and/or PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC. For the purpose of this letter, Mr. Sargent collectively refers to these entities as "HARDIGG."

The employer may be contacted directly at the addresses below:

HARDIGG INDUSTRIES, LLC
147 N MAIN STREET
SOUTH DEERFIELD, MA 01373

PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC.
23215 EARLY AVENUE
TORRANCE, CA 90505

Mr. Sargent intends to seek civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and other available relief for violations of the California Labor Code, which are recoverable under sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"). Mr. Sargent seeks relief on behalf of himself, the State of California, and other persons who are or were employed by HARDIGG as a non-exempt, hourly paid employee in California and who received at least one wage statement ("aggrieved employees"). This letter is sent in compliance with the notice and reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

HARDIGG employed Mr. Sargent as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee from approximately July 7, 2025, to October 2, 2025. Mr. Sargent worked for HARDIGG as Quality Assurance Technician at its location in Ontario, California. During his employment, Mr. Sargent typically worked eight (8) hours or more per day and five (5) days per week. At the time his employment ended, Mr. Sargent was compensated approximately $26.00 per hour. His job duties include, without limitation, re-establishing the quality department, inspecting first-article and final goods, overseeing quality control across multiple departments (including shipping and assembly), and troubleshooting quality issues directly with engineers.

HARDIGG committed each of the following Labor Code violations against Mr. Sargent, the facts and theories of which follow, making him an "aggrieved employee" pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(c)(1):[1]

**HARDIGG's Company-Wide and Uniform Payroll and HR Practices**

HARDIGG SERVICES, LLC; and PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC. design and manufacture high-performance protective cases, temperature-controlled packaging solutions, portable lighting solutions, and rugged gear for commercial, industrial, and consumer use throughout the California and the United States. Upon information and belief, HARDIGG maintains a single, centralized Human Resources (HR) department at its corporate headquarters in Torrance, California, for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for HARDIGG in California, including Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees. At all relevant times, HARDIGG issued and maintained uniform, standardized scheduling and timekeeping practices and procedures for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees in California, including Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees, regardless of their location or position.

Upon information and belief, HARDIGG maintains a centralized Payroll department at its corporate headquarters Torrance, California, which processes payroll for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for HARDIGG in California, including Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees. Further, HARDIGG issues the same formatted wage statements in the same manner for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working in California, including Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees, irrespective of their location, position, or manner in which each employee's employment ended. In other words, HARDIGG utilized the same methods and formulas when calculating wages due to Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees in California.

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 – Unpaid Overtime**

California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order require employers to pay employees working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that employers are required to pay employees working more than twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay. An employee's regular rate of pay includes all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee, including nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive pay.

HARDIGG willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees. During the relevant time period, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime premiums for all of the hours they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in

[1] These facts, theories, and claims are based on Mr. Sargent's experience and counsel's review of those records currently available relating to Mr. Sargent's employment. Discovery conducted in litigation of wage and hour claims such as these often reveals additional claims that the aggrieved employee was not initially aware of (because the aggrieved employee was not aware of the law's requirements, the employer misinformed its employee of the law's requirements, or because the employer effectively hid the violations). Thus, Mr. Sargent reserves the right to supplement this letter with additional facts, theories, and claims if he becomes aware of them subsequent to the submission of this letter.

excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, because all hours that they worked were not recorded.

During the relevant time period, upon information and belief, HARDIGG had a company-wide policy and/or practice of requiring Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to perform work off-the-clock before their scheduled shifts, because HARDIGG did not provide a means to account for this time. For example, HARDIGG only provided Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees with three (3) timekeeping machines that were used by multiple employees to clock in for their shifts, thus forcing Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to arrive early in order to clock in for the start of their shifts and wait in line off-the-clock and under HARDIGG's control, time for which they were not paid. Specifically, on approximately ten (10) occasions during his employment, Mr. Sargent waited three (3) to five (5) minutes before being able to clock in for his scheduled shift. Thus, HARDIGG failed to track all of the time that employees spent working before their scheduled shifts, and Plaintiff and class members received no compensation for this time.

HARDIGG knew or should have known that as a result of these company-wide practices and/or policies, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees were performing assigned duties off-the-clock before their shifts, and were suffered or permitted to perform work for which they were not paid. Because Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees regularly worked shifts of eight (8) hours a day or more, or forty (40) hours a week or more, some of this off-the-clock work qualified for overtime premium pay. Therefore, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours they actually worked.

HARDIGG's failure to pay Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees the balance of overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 – Unpaid Minimum Wages**

California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 require employers to pay employees the minimum wage fixed by the IWC. The payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Compensable work time is defined in Wage Order No. 1-2001 as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 8, § 11010(2)(G) (defining "Hours Worked").

As set forth above, upon information and belief, HARDIGG had a company-wide policy and/or practice requiring Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to perform work-related tasks while off-the-clock before their shifts, including waiting in line to clock in for their shifts. HARDIGG failed to track this time Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees spent working off-the-clock, and Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees received no compensation for this time.

HARDIGG did not pay minimum wages for all hours worked by Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees. To the extent that these off-the-clock hours did not qualify for overtime premium payment, HARDIGG did not pay at least minimum wages for those hours worked off-the-clock in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Accordingly, HARDIGG regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees for all of the hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1197.1 and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198 – Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to provide meal periods and to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order, an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Under California law, first meal periods must start after no more than five hours. *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1041-1042 (2012). Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order also require employers to provide a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes if an employee works over ten (10) hours per day or to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

During the relevant period, HARDIGG had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of assigning heavy workloads, which has resulted in a lack of meal period coverage and prevented Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees from taking all timely, uninterrupted meal periods to which they were entitled. Additionally, HARDIGG had a company-wide practice of failing to adhere to a schedule for meal periods, which further caused Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to not be relieved of their duties for compliant meal periods.

As a result, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees had to work through all or part of their meal periods and/or had to wait extended periods of time before taking meal periods. For example, on approximately two (2) occasions, Mr. Sargent worked past the fifth hour of his shift before he was able to take his meal period in order to complete to work-related tasks. Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees did not sign valid meal period waivers on days that they were entitled to meal periods and were not relieved of all duties.

At all times herein mentioned, HARDIGG knew or should have known that, as a result of these policies, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees were prevented from being relieved of all duties to take timely, uninterrupted meal periods. HARDIGG further knew or should have known that HARDIGG did not pay Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees all meal period premiums when meal periods were late, interrupted, shortened, and/or missed.

Furthermore, HARDIGG engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying all meal period premiums owed when compliant meal periods are not provided. Because of this practice and/or policy, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for all missed, late, and interrupted meal periods.

Accordingly, HARDIGG failed to provide all meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198. Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198 – Non-Compliant Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records**

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires employers to make, keep and provide true, accurate, and complete employment records. HARDIGG has not provided Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees with properly itemized wage statements. Labor Code section 226(e) provides that if an employer fails to comply with providing an employee with properly itemized wage statements as set forth in 226(a), then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or $50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and $100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed $4,000. Further, Labor Code section 226.3 provides that any employer who violates section 226(a) shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of $250 per employee per violation in an initial citation and $1,000 per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage statement or fails to keep the required records pursuant to Section 226(a).

During the relevant time period, HARDIGG has knowingly and intentionally provided Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees with uniform, incomplete, and inaccurate wage statements. For example, HARDIGG issued uniform wage statements to Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees that fail to correctly list: gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, including rates of pay for overtime wages, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Specifically, HARDIGG violated sections 226(a)(1), 226(a)(2), 226(a)(5), and 226(a)(9).

Because HARDIGG did not accurately record the time Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees spent working off-the-clock, HARDIGG did not list the correct amount of gross wages and net wages earned by Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees in compliance with sections 226(a)(1) and 226(a)(5). For the same reason, HARDIGG failed to accurately list the total number of hours worked by Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees in violation of section 226(a)(2), and failed to list the applicable hourly rates of pay in effect during the pay period and corresponding accurate number of work hours worked at each hourly rate in violation of section 226(a)(9).

The wage statement deficiencies also include, without limitation, failing to list the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; failing to list all deductions; failing to list the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; failing to list the inclusive dates of the period for which employees were paid; failing to list the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and/or failing to state all hours worked as a result of not recording or stating hours worked off-the-clock.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) provides that "[e]very person employing labor in this state shall . . . [k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors" and "[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments . . . ." At all relevant times, and in violation of Labor Code section 1174(d), HARDIGG willfully failed to maintain accurate payroll records for Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees showing the daily hours they worked and the wages paid thereto as a result of failing to record the off-the-clock hours that they worked.

California Labor Code section 1198 provides that the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor shall be those fixed by the Labor Commissioner and as set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Order. Section 1198 further provides that "[t]he employment of any employees for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, employers are required to keep accurate time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period and meal period. During the relevant time period, HARDIGG engaged in company-wide practices and/or policies of failing to record actual hours worked, and thereby failed to keep accurate records of work period and meal period start and end times for Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees, in violation of section 1198.

Because HARDIGG failed to provide the correct net and gross wages earned, applicable rates of pay, and number of total hours worked on wage statements, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees have been prevented from verifying, solely from information on the wage statements themselves, that they were paid correctly and in full. Instead, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees have had to look to sources outside of the wage statements themselves and reconstruct time records to determine whether in fact they were paid correctly and the extent of underpayment, thereby causing them injury.

Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code sections 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198, pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code § 204 – Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. Alternatively, California Labor Code section 204 provides that the requirements of this section are deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

During the relevant time period, HARDIGG willfully failed to pay Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees all wages due including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal period premiums, within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with Labor Code section 204, pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 – Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages Upon Termination**

California Labor Code sections 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.

HARDIGG willfully failed to pay Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees who are no longer employed by HARDIGG all their earned wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal period premiums, either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving HARDIGG's employ.

Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202, pursuant to Labor Code sections 256 and/or 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code § 2802 – Unreimbursed Business Expenses**

California Labor Code section 2802 requires employers to pay for all necessary expenditures and losses incurred by the employee in the performance of his or her job. The purpose of Labor Code section 2802 is to prevent employers from passing off their cost of doing business and operating expenses on to their employees. *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc*., 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144 (2014). The applicable wage order, IWC Wage Order No. 1-2001, provides that: "[w]hen tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft."

During the relevant time period, HARDIGG had a company-wide policy of requiring Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to utilize their own personal mobile devices, including, but not limited to, cellular phones, and/or mobile data for work-related purposes, but failed to reimburse them for the costs of their work-related mobile device expenses. For example, Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees were required to use their personal mobile devices for work-related tasks, including researching quality control procedures, reviewing ISO 9100 standards, developing quality-related documents, and responding to work-related communications. Mr. Sargent used his personal cellular phone for work-related purposes almost every day, and at least half of his personal cellular phone usage was for work. Although HARDIGG required Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees to utilize their personal mobile devices and/or mobile data to carry out their work-related responsibilities, HARDIGG failed to reimburse them for these costs.

HARDIGG could have provided Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees with actual equipment for use on the job, such as company mobile devices; or, HARDIGG could have reimbursed employees for the costs of their mobile device usage. Instead, HARDIGG passed these operating costs onto Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees.

Thus, HARDIGG had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of not reimbursing employees for expenses necessarily incurred in violation of California Labor Code section 2802. Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with the applicable IWC Wage Order and Labor Code section 2802, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**Violation of California Labor Code § 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C) – Failure to Provide Notice of Material Terms of Employment**

California's Wage Theft Prevention Act was enacted to ensure that employers provide employees with basic information material to their employment relationship at the time of hiring, and to ensure that employees are given written and timely notice of any changes to basic information material to their employment. Codified at California Labor Code section 2810.5, the Wage Theft Prevention Act provides that at the time of hiring, an employer must provide written notice to employees of the rate(s) of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or otherwise, including any rates for overtime, the regular payday designated by the employer, and any allowances claims as part of the minimum wage, including meal or lodging allowances. Effective January 1, 2015, an employer's written notice pursuant to section 2810.5 must also include a statement that the employee may accrue and use sick leave; has a right to request and use accrued paid sick leave; may not be terminated or retaliated against for using or requesting the use of accrued paid sick leave; and has the right to file a complaint against an employer who retaliates.

On information and belief, HARDIGG failed to provide Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees written notice that lists the requisite information set forth in Labor Code section 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C). HARDIGG's failure to provide Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees with written notice of basic information regarding their employment with HARDIGG is in violation of Labor Code section 2810.5.

Mr. Sargent and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring HARDIGG into compliance with Labor Code section 2810.5, pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f), and (k).

**California Labor Code § 558(a)**

California Labor Code section 558(a) provides "[a]ny employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars ($50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid . . . . (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid . . . ." Labor Code section 558(c) provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty provided by law." HARDIGG, at all relevant times, was an employer or person acting on behalf of an employer(s) who violated Mr. Sargent's and other aggrieved employees' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code.

Accordingly, Mr. Sargent seeks the remedies set forth in Labor Code section 558 for himself, the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees. Specifically, pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 1194.5, 2699(a), 2699(k), 2699.3(a) and 2699.3(c), 2699.5, and 558, Mr. Sargent, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties and injunctive relief for himself, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California against HARDIGG for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 516, 1174(d), 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, and 2810.5.

Therefore, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, Mr. Sargent seeks all applicable civil penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Afife Bicakci
Capstone Law APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1860
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 556-4811

Best Regards,

Afife Bicakci

Copy: HARDIGG SERVICES, LLC (via U.S. Certified Mail); PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC. (via U.S. Certified Mail)

SENDER: *COMPLETE THIS SECTION*

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.

**HARDIGG INDUSTRIES, LLC**
147 N. Main Street
South Deerfield, MA 01373

9590 9402 9637 5199 8651 18

2. Article Number *(Transfer from service label)*
9589 0710 5270 0211 5994 44

*COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY*

A. Signature
X
☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by *(Printed Name)*

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type
☐ Adult Signature
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
☑ Certified Mail®
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
Restricted Delivery
☐ Priority Mail Express®
☐ Registered Mail™
☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Signature Confirmation™
☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053 Domestic Return Receipt

**CAPSTONE LAW, APC**
1875 Century Park East
Suite #1860
Los Angeles, CA 90067

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

**CERTIFIED MAIL®**

9589 0710 5270 0211 5994 44

9589 0710 5270 0211 5994 44

**HARDIGG INDUSTRIES, LLC**
147 N. Main Street
South Deerfield, MA 01373

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
*Domestic Mail Only*
For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee
$
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)
☑ Return Receipt (hardcopy) $
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) $
☐ Certified ...
☐ Adult Si...
☐ Adult Si...
Postage
$
Total Post...
$
Sent To
Street and
City, State,

Postmark

Sargent v. Hardigg

**HARDIGG INDUSTRIES, LLC**
147 N. Main Street
South Deerfield, MA 01373

PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions

SENDER: *COMPLETE THIS SECTION*

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.

**PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC.**
23215 Early Avenue
Torrance, CA 90505

9590 9402 9637 5199 8651 25

2. Article Number *(Transfer from service label)*
9589 0710 5270 0211 5995 12

*COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY*

A. Signature
X
☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by *(Printed Name)*
C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type
☐ Adult Signature
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
☑ Certified Mail®
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
☐ Insured Mail
☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Priority Mail Express®
☐ Registered Mail™
☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Signature Confirmation™
☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053 Domestic Return Receipt

**CAPSTONE LAW, APC**
1875 Century Park East
Suite #1860
Los Angeles, CA 90067

**PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC.**
23215 Early Avenue
Torrance, CA 90505

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

**CERTIFIED MAIL®**

9589 0710 5270 0211 5995 12

9589 0710 5270 0211 5995 12

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
*Domestic Mail Only*

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee
$
Extra Services & Fees *(check box, add fee as appropriate)*
☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) $
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) $
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery $
☐ Adult Signature Required $
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery $
Postage
$
Total Postage and Fees
$
Sent To
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.
City, State, ZIP+4®

Postmark Here

Sargent, V.
Hand, a.G.

**PELICAN PRODUCTS, INC.**
23215 Early Avenue
Torrance, CA 90505

PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions