Electronically Filed by Superior Court of California, County of Orange, 10/19/2026 09:09:58 AM.
30-2026-01606369-CU-OE-CXC - ROA # 2 - DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court By B. Sanchez, Deputy Clerk.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
Christine T. LeVu (State Bar #288271)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)
christine@bamlawca.com; deblouw@bamlawca.com
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

Assigned for All Purposes:
Judge Layne H. Melzer
Dept. CX102

CARLY MEDINA, on behalf of the State of California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

COLLECTORS UNIVERSE, INC., a Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2026-01606369-CU-OE-CXC

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 for violations of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

Plaintiff Carly Medina ("PLAINTIFF"), on behalf of the people of the State of California and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, ("PAGA") only, alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendant Collectors Universe, Inc. (referred to as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANT's violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA-only action.

4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in her individual capacity; she is proceeding herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing in her individual capacity.

THE PARTIES

5. Collectors Universe, Inc. ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

6. DEFENDANT provides authentication and grading services for collectibles in

California.

7. PLAINTIFF is currently employed by DEFENDANT in California. PLAINTIFF's employment with DEFENDANT started in March of 2022. PLAINTIFF has been at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

8. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of April 30, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

9. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's violation of California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through

50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

11. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and all the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

THE CONDUCT

12. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal

breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

13. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

14. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that

the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

15. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under compensated for all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT failed to pay minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

16. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate

itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

17. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be 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. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

> [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars ($200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

18. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to the "Hourly" regular wage payments.

19. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

20. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

21. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10.

22. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and

facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii) committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]

(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)

23. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

24. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

25. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of April 30, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

26. On April 30, 2026, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the

Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. *See* **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

27. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed to pay overtime wages, and (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.[1] PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:

A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private

[1]Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor Code §558(a)(3).

Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

Dated: October 19, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Nicholas J. De Blouw

CENTURION TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APC
Ryan Stygar (State Bar #332764)
8880 Rio San Diego Dr., Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92108

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:
nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1004

April 30, 2026
CA3863

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

COLLECTORS UNIVERSE, INC.
Certified Mail #9589071052704045662428
CT Corporation System
AMANDA GARCIA
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Carly Medina ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Collectors Universe, Inc.. "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Collectors Universe, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Collectors Universe, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of April 30, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Plaintiff is currently employed by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and is entitled to minimum wages, overtime compensation, compliant meal and rest periods, and reimbursement of necessary business expenses. Plaintiff's job duties include reviewing and processing collectible items, verifying information, entering data into Defendant's systems, and meeting productivity expectations tied to daily quotas.

During the PAGA Period, Defendant sometimes fails to provide compliant meal periods and rest breaks in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Due to the nature of Plaintiff's duties and workload expectations, Plaintiff is sometimes unable to take a timely meal period before the end of the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff's job requires the continuous

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

processing of orders, including reviewing collectible items, verifying serial numbers, entering data into Defendant's systems, and labeling items, all while meeting daily productivity quotas of approximately 500–600 items. As a result, Plaintiff sometimes delays meal periods because she is in the middle of completing an order or attempting to meet required production levels. On some occasions, Plaintiff takes meal periods late or skips them in order to complete assignments, and sometimes works shifts exceeding ten hours without being provided a second compliant meal period. Similarly, Plaintiff sometimes does not take all required rest periods and, from time to time, continues working during rest periods or skips them altogether in order to meet productivity expectations. Defendant does not always provide premium pay for non-compliant meal and rest periods.

Further, during the PAGA Period, Defendant sometimes fails to pay all wages owed in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Plaintiff sometimes works overtime hours, including shifts exceeding eight hours in a day and forty hours in a week. In addition, Plaintiff occasionally performs work during periods that should be duty-free, including during meal periods when work obligations continue. Plaintiff also completed a multi-day training process required by Defendant, during which Plaintiff spent substantial time completing required job duties and was not paid for all hours worked. Additionally, from time to time, Plaintiff receives and responds to work-related communications, including Slack messages, while clocked out. These practices result in unpaid wages, including wages that should be compensated at minimum and overtime rates where applicable.

Plaintiff also incurs necessary business expenses in furtherance of Defendant's operations, including the use of a personal cell phone for work-related communications. Defendant provides a cell phone stipend from time to time, however, such reimbursement is not sufficient to cover the reasonable costs associated with Plaintiff's required use of her personal cell phone for work purposes. As a result, Defendant fails to fully reimburse business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

During the PAGA Period, Defendant occasionally fails to provide accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226(a). As a result of the wage and hour violations described herein, Plaintiff's wage statements sometimes do not accurately reflect all hours worked and wages earned.

Further, Defendant sometimes fails to timely pay all wages due, including wages associated with the violations described above, in violation of Labor Code sections 204 and 210.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees are, on some occasions, not provided with all wages and premiums owed under California law.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Nicholas De Blouw*
Nicholas De Blouw, Esq.