

Troy Q. Strange (State Bar No. 346637)
Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com
troy@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Sean Deeb

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
9/11/2026 10:02:13 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By J. Tinajero ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

SEAN DEEB, on behalf of others similarly
situated and the State of California under the
Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC., a
California Corporation d.b.a. GUIDE DOGS OF
AMERICA; INTERNATIONAL GUIDING
EYES, INC., a California Corporation d.b.a.
TENDER LOVING CANINES; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 26CU033648C

Hon. Carolyn M. Caietti
Dept. 70

CLASS ACTION

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages Owed
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages
3. Meal Period Violations
4. Rest Period Violations
5. Paid Sick Leave Violations
6. Untimely Payment of Wages
7. Wage Statement Violations
8. Waiting Time Penalties
9. Unfair Competition
10. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys
General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

Action Filed: June 18, 2026

1 Plaintiff , on behalf of all others similarly situated and the State of California under the Private
2 Attorneys General Act (“Plaintiff”) brings this FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
3 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants INTERNATIONAL GUIDING
4 EYES, INC., a California Corporation, d.b.a. GUIDE DOGS OF AMERICA, INTERNATIONAL
5 GUIDING EYES, INC., a California Corporation d.b.a. TENDER LOVING CANINES; and DOES 1
6 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), alleging as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. Plaintiff SEAN DEEB ("Plaintiff") brings this action on behalf of himself and all other
9 similarly situated employees of Defendants INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A.
10 GUIDE DOGS OF AMERICA and INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A. TENDER
11 LOVING CANINES ("Defendants") for a series of systemic violations of the California Labor Code
12 and IWC Wage Orders.

13 2. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the putative class members at the lawful
14 minimum wage rate for all hours worked. This was the result of a corporate culture and practice that
15 expected employees to remain available outside of their scheduled hours to respond to work
16 communications and discuss logistical issues, forcing them to perform uncompensated off-the-clock
17 labor.

18 3. Defendants further failed to provide Plaintiff and the putative class members with
19 compliant, duty-free meal and rest periods. Due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement to
20 navigate security checkpoints and exit prison facilities to reach rest areas, employees routinely
21 experienced late, short, or interrupted breaks without receiving the required premium pay.

22 4. Defendants’ employment policies and payroll administration systems further facilitated
23 company-wide violations, including a failure to accurately record all hours worked for the purposes
24 of calculating and accruing paid sick leave.

25 5. As a direct result of these practices, Defendants are further liable for derivative
26 violations, including the failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, the untimely payment
27 of wages during employment, and the failure to pay all wages and premiums owed upon separation.

28 6. Plaintiff seeks to recover unpaid wages, civil penalties, interest, and all other

1 recoverable damages, plus associated attorneys’ fees and costs.

2 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

3 1. Jurisdiction of this action is proper in this Court under Article VI, Section 10 of the
4 California Constitution as the causes of action are premised upon violations of California law.

5 2. The monetary damages and restitution sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of
6 the Superior Court.

7 3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
8 Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail
9 themselves to the California economy so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the
10 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

11 4. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure sections 393(a), 395,
12 and/or 395.5 because, upon information and belief, Defendants conducted business and committed
13 some of the alleged violations in this County.

14 **PARTIES**

15 **A. Plaintiff**

16 5. Plaintiff Deeb is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in
17 California as a non-exempt employee from about February 2024 to January 2026. Plaintiff worked as
18 a Service Dog Trainer.

19 6. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
20 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9
21 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party
22 in interest.”])). To the extent permitted by law, including pursuant *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting,*
23 *Inc.* (2024) 101 Cal. App. 5th 533 and *Rodriguez v. Packers Sanitation Services Ltd., LLC* (2025) 109
24 Cal.App.5th 69, the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include
25 arbitrable claims.

26 **B. Defendants**

27 7. Defendant International Guiding Eyes, Inc. is a California Corporation that maintains
28 operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county.

8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the parties sued as DOES 1 through 50, are presently unknown, unascertainable, or uncertain, and are sued by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Upon information and belief, each of DOES 1 through 50 constitutes a legal employer or is otherwise legally responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein. This Complaint may be amended to reflect their true names and capacities once ascertained.

9. Upon information and belief, Defendants in this action are employers, co-employers, joint employers, and/or part of an integrated employer enterprise, as each of the Defendants exercised control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of the employees, suffered and permitted them to work, and otherwise engaged them as employees under California law.

10. Upon information and belief, at least some of the Defendants have common ownership, common management, interrelationship of operations, and centralized control over labor relations and are therefore part of an integrated enterprise and thus jointly and severally responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein, including pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, and 1197.1.

11. Upon information and belief, Defendants acted in all respects pertinent to this action as an alter-ego, agent, servant, joint employer, joint venturer, co-conspirator, partner, in an integrated enterprise, or in some other capacity on behalf of all other co-defendants, such that the acts and omissions of each defendant may be legally attributable to all others.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12. This action is brought individually and on behalf of the following class pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382:

a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from four years prior to the filing of this action through date of class certification.

13. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish various subclass definitions as appropriate at the class certification stage, according to proof.

14. The class is ascertainable and shares a well-defined community of interest in this litigation:

- 1 a. Numerosity: The class is estimated to exceed 50 individuals, although the
2 precise membership of the entire class is unknown at this time. The class is so
3 numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The identities of
4 class members are ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment and
5 payroll records.
- 6 b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other class
7 members. They were subject to the same policies and practices of Defendants,
8 which resulted in losses to the class. Proof of common unlawful business
9 practices, which Plaintiff experienced, will establish the right of the class to
10 recover on the causes of action alleged herein.
- 11 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate class representative; will take all necessary
12 steps to protect the class members' interests adequately and fairly; has no
13 interest antagonistic to other class members; and is represented by attorneys
14 who have substantial experience prosecuting, defending, resolving, and
15 litigating wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions in
16 California state and federal courts.
- 17 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other means for adjudicating this
18 dispute. Individual joinder is impractical. Class treatment will allow for
19 common issues to be resolved in a single forum, simultaneously, and without
20 duplication of effort and expense.
- 21 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action
22 advances the State of California's strong public interest in ensuring its
23 approximately millions of employed residents are properly paid the wages they
24 earned for the hours they worked. Class actions provide a mechanism for
25 enforcement of labor laws and allow for vindication of employee rights by
26 unnamed class members.

27 15. Common questions of law and fact as to the class members predominate over questions
28 affecting only individual members. The common questions of law and fact exist as to whether the

1 employment policies and practices formulated by Defendants and applied to the class members
2 constitute violations of California law.

3 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 16. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the putative class members at the lawful
5 minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically,
6 Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other putative class members
7 to work off-the-clock, for which they were not paid minimum wages. For example, Defendants
8 expected putative class members to be available outside of work hours to respond to work
9 communications regarding logistical issues, shift performance, and other related matters. This was a
10 common practice amongst the putative class members, which resulted in Plaintiff and the putative
11 class members working off-the-clock hours on a consistent basis.

12 17. As a result of this unpaid off-the-clock work, Plaintiff and the other putative class
13 members routinely were not compensated for all overtime hours worked at one-and-one-half times
14 their regular rate of pay. For example, where Plaintiff and the putative class members performed off-
15 the-clock work as described above in excess of eight hours each workday or forty hours in a week,
16 Defendant failed to compensate such work at the applicable overtime rate.

17 18. Separately, Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and the putative class for all
18 overtime worked by failing to pay overtime wages based on the applicable regular rate of pay for each
19 employee. Where Plaintiff and the putative class members earned wages in excess of their regular rate
20 of pay (including non-discretionary bonuses) Defendant failed to include these amounts in the
21 calculation of the regular rate of pay. For example, in Plaintiff's wage statement for the pay period
22 ending on June 23, 2024, Plaintiff earned a \$150 non-discretionary bonus. However, Plaintiff's
23 overtime worked in that same period was compensated at only one-and-one-half times Plaintiff's base
24 rate of pay.

25 19. Likewise, Defendant failed to include all remuneration when calculating the rate of pay
26 for sick leave for Plaintiff and the putative class members. Instead, Defendants paid for the paid sick
27 leave of the Plaintiff and other employees based on their base rates of pay.

28 20. In addition, Plaintiff and other putative class members routinely experienced missed,

late, short, and interrupted meal periods due to scheduling and the pressures to keep up with the high demands of the job. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other putative class members with compliant, uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods before the fifth hour of work.

21. These missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement that Plaintiff and the putative class members leave the prison facility to take a break, as Defendants provided no break rooms or designated rest facilities within the secure perimeter. This required Plaintiff to navigate security checkpoints and walk to the parking lot simply to reach a rest area, a process that consumed a significant portion of the meal period itself. Additionally, the requirement to navigate these security checkpoints on both exit and entrance resulted in many of Plaintiff's meal periods being late or cut short.

22. Between the time spent clearing security and the inability be fully free from his employer's control until reaching the parking lot, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take timely and compliant meal periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice, yet these non-compliant meal periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

23. Similarly, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other putative class members to take compliant, uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods. These violations occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement that Plaintiff leave the prison facility to take a break, which consumed a significant portion of the rest period itself. Consequently, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take rest periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice, yet these non-compliant rest periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

24. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period as a result of the policies and practices.

25. These payment failures extended to the end of the employment relationship, as

1 Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to Plaintiff and the putative
2 class members by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.
3 Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to putative class members during their
4 employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of
5 employment. Furthermore, Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for these late payments.

6 26. Compounding these issues, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
7 statements to the putative class members each pay period as a result of the aforementioned policies
8 and practices. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct
9 “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were
10 not paid, resulting in an inaccurate recording of earnings on those statements.

11 27. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state the
12 applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at those rates. The amounts stated
13 are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

14 28. Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to
15 accurately list employees’ “total hours worked,” as the wage statements did not accurately include the
16 uncompensated time Plaintiff and other putative class members worked due to Defendants’ policy and
17 practice of encouraging off-the-clock work.

18 29. Finally, because of Defendant’s policies and practices, including the failure to
19 accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records
20 in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES OWED**

23 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, 218, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197**

24 **(All Claims Alleged by Plaintiff and Class Members Against All Defendants)**

25 30. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

26 31. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
27 §§ 200, 218, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Hours
28 and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable orders), which require non-

1 exempt employees be timely paid at least the state or local minimum wage (if higher) for each hour of
2 work, and further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to pay all minimum wages
3 (plus liquidated damages). In addition to minimum wages, Labor Code § 200 states that "'wages'
4 includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is
5 fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, commission basis, or other method of
6 calculation."

7 32. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Plaintiff and class
8 members at least the lawful minimum wage for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code sections
9 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Hours and Days of
10 Work" and "Minimum Wages" sections of the applicable orders), including payment at the lawful
11 local and county minimum wage ordinances in effect. As a result, Defendants are liable for all
12 associated damages, including liquidated damages for the minimum wage violations pursuant to Labor
13 Code § 1194.2.

14 33. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of
15 minimum, regular and overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial. Plaintiff and class
16 members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages, plus liquidated damages in an
17 amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid (and interest thereon), in addition to interest, attorneys'
18 fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code sections 1194 and 1194.2,
19 218.6 and any other applicable statutes.

20 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES**

22 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194**

23 34. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

24 35. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
25 §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, which require non-exempt employees be timely paid overtime
26 wages all overtime hours worked, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's
27 failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime hours worked.

28 36. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Plaintiff and class members no

less than one and one-half times their respective “regular rate of pay” for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in one day, 40 hours in one week, or the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and no less than twice their respective “regular rate of pay” for all hours over 12 hours in one day and any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek for such hours worked, in violation of Labor Code sections 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable orders).

37. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid overtime wages, in addition to interest, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys’ fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512

38. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

39. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 558 and 512, which require non-exempt employees be provided complaint meal periods (or meal period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an employer’s failure to lawfully provide all meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums at the lawful regular rate of compensation.

40. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently provide Plaintiff and class members compliant, duty-free meal periods of not less than 30 minutes beginning before the fifth hour of hour for each work period of more than five hours per day and a second duty-free meal period of not less than 30 minutes beginning before the tenth hour of hour of work in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, 558, 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Meal Periods” sections of the applicable orders).

41. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation for each workday that a fully compliant meal period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Meal Periods” sections of the

applicable orders).

42. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the meal period premiums owed, in addition to interest, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516

43. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

44. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516, which require non-exempt employees be authorized to take complaint rest periods (or rest period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to lawfully provide all rest periods and/or pay rest period premiums at the lawful regular rate of compensation.

45. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently authorize and permit Plaintiff and class members to receive compliant, duty-free rest periods of not less than ten (10) minutes for every four hours worked (or major fraction thereof) in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Rest Periods" sections of the applicable orders).

46. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation for each workday that a fully compliant rest period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL PAID SICK LEAVE WAGES

Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, 218, 246 *et seq.*

47. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

48. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to pay sick leave wages to Plaintiff and a paid sick leave subclass in violation of Labor Code section 246

1 *et seq.* Paid sick leave earnings constitute wages for purposes of California wage and hour law.
2 (*Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1103 [“Courts have recognized
3 that ‘wages’ also include those benefits to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her
4 compensation, including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, and sick pay”].)

5 49. Labor Code section 246(l), in conjunction with Labor Code section 248 *et seq.*, 248.1,
6 248.2, and 248.6, in addition to the applicable County sick pay ordinances in locales worked by class
7 members, govern how Defendants were required to calculate paid sick leave.

8 50. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members their paid sick leave wages at one
9 of the lawful rates set forth in the statute or ordinance because Defendants failed to include in their
10 sick leave calculation the additional remuneration received by Plaintiff and class members (i.e., at the
11 regular rate of pay and/or calculated based on total wages earned).

12 51. As a result, Defendants violated the Labor Code and are liable to Plaintiff and class
13 members for underpaid sick leave wages, in addition to interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs.

14 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

15 **UNTIMELY PAYMENT OF WAGES**

16 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 218**

17 52. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

18 53. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
19 §§ 204, 204b, and 210 which require non-exempt employees be timely paid all wages owed each pay
20 period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer’s failure to comply with
21 this obligation. Labor Code § 218 authorizes individuals to sue directly for wages and penalties due
22 under these sections, including Labor Code § 210(c)’s statutory late payment penalties.

23 54. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to timely pay all wages,
24 including paid sick leave and meal and rest premiums, earned by Plaintiff and class members twice
25 during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays (for
26 employees paid on a non-weekly basis) and on the regularly-scheduled weekly payday for weekly
27 employees, if any, in violation of Labor Code sections 204 and 204b and the IWC Wage Orders (the
28 “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable orders).

55. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages, in addition to a statutory penalty in the amount of \$100 for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for all subsequent violations and for all willful or intentional violations for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld under provided in Labor Code § 210, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code § 226

56. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

57. This cause of action is brought by a wage statement subclass pursuant to Labor Code § 226(a) which requires non-exempt employees be provided accurate itemized wage statements each pay period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to comply with this obligation.

58. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and class members resulting in injury to Plaintiff and class members. Specifically, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and class members did not accurately state each pay period all of the information required by Labor Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

59. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of accurate itemized wage statements, causing confusion and concealing wage and premium underpayments.

60. As a result, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the statutory penalty of \$50 per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, up to an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 226(e).

/ / /

///

///

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

3 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 201 *et seq.***

4 61. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

5 62. This cause of action is brought by a waiting time subclass pursuant to Labor Code
6 §§ 201 through 203, which require an employer to timely pay all wages earned upon termination of
7 employment, and which further provide a private right of action to recover statutory waiting time
8 penalties each day an employer fails to comply with this obligation, up to a maximum of 30 days
9 wages.

10 63. Defendants willfully failed and continue to fail in their affirmative obligation to pay all
11 wages earned and unpaid to Plaintiff and class members immediately upon termination of employment
12 or within 72 hours thereafter for employees who did not provide at least 72 hours prior notice of his
13 or her intention to quit, and further failed to pay those sums for 30 days thereafter in violation of Labor
14 Code sections 201 through 203 and the IWC Wage Orders.

15 64. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover a waiting time penalty for a period
16 of up to 30 days, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

17 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

19 **Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.***

20 65. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

21 66. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business
22 practices in the State of California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200
23 by committing the foregoing wage and hour violations alleged throughout this Complaint.

24 67. Defendants' dependence on these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
25 Plaintiff and continue to deprive other class members of compensation to which they are legally
26 entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage to
27 Defendants over competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers in compliance
28 with California's wage and hour laws. These failures constitute unlawful, deceptive, and unfair

business acts and practices in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*

68. Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged in this Complaint, and Plaintiff, as an individual and on behalf of others similarly situated, seeks full restitution of the moneys as necessary and according to proof to restore all monies withheld, acquired, and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

69. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law for past or future violations, to the extent the statute of limitations on each of the alleged causes of action do not extend to the four year limitation provided under the UCL or to the extent the underlying Labor Code and IWC Wage Order violations do not provide a private right of action.

70. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to injunctive relief against Defendants, restitution, and other equitable relief to return all funds over which Plaintiff and class members have an ownership interest and to prevent future damage and the public interest under Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Plaintiff and class members are further entitled to recover interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*

(By Plaintiff on Behalf of the State and the Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants)

71. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

72. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of the following "aggrieved employees" pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), codified as Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*:

- a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the initial PAGA notice through date of trial.

73. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the aggrieved employees, according to proof.

1 74. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
2 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action with respect to this cause of action. (*Kim v. Reins*
3 *Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff
4 files suit is always the real party in interest.”])

5 75. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,,
6 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
7 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
8 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
9 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former
10 employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures
11 specified in Section 2699.3. “

12 76. Any allegations regarding violations of the IWC Wage Orders are enforceable as
13 violations of Labor Code section 1198, which states: “[t]he employment of any employee for longer
14 hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

15 77. Labor Code section 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
16 penalties under the PAGA.

17 78. On or about **April 24, 2026**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and provided
18 written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants) of
19 Defendants’ alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
20 violations. On or about **July 7, 2026**, Plaintiff submitted an amended written notice to the LWDA and
21 Defendants supplementing the claims.

22 79. A true and correct copies of Plaintiff’s initial written PAGA notice, dated April 24,
23 2026, and Plaintiff’s Amended PAGA notice, dated July 7, 2026, are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and
24 **Exhibit 2**, respectively, and are incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein (collectively,
25 the “PAGA Notices”).

26 80. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received a response to Plaintiff’s
27 written PAGA notices from the LWDA.

28 81. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice sent by Plaintiff, neither

1 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
2 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

3 82. Now that at least 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these
4 violations, without notice of cure from Defendants or notice from the LWDA of its intent to investigate
5 the alleged allegations and issue the appropriate citations to Defendants, Plaintiff exhausted all
6 prerequisites and commenced this civil action under Labor Code section 2699 *et seq.*

7 83. As set forth in the PAGA notices attached as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 and incorporated
8 into this Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all
9 corresponding civil penalties:

- 10 a. **Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194,
11 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 12 b. **Unpaid Overtime.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage
13 Orders.
- 14 c. **Unpaid Paid Sick Leave.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7.
- 15 d. **Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
16 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 17 e. **Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516,
18 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 19 f. **Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment.** Violation of Labor Code
20 §§ 204, 204b, 210.
- 21 g. **Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment.** Violation of
22 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256.
- 23 h. **Non-Compliant Wage Statements.** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- 24 i. **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.** Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC
25 Wage Orders.

26 84. Plaintiff seeks to collect all recoverable civil penalties for the Labor Code violations
27 alleged in this Complaint and the PAGA notices (including amendments thereto) against Defendants
28 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) and (f), in addition to attorneys' fees, costs, and interest to the

1 extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 2699(k).

2 **PRAYER**

3 Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- 4 a. For certification of this action as a class action;
- 5 b. For appointment of Plaintiff as the class representative;
- 6 c. For appointment of above-captioned counsel for Plaintiff as Class Counsel;
- 7 d. For division of class members into appropriate classes and/or subclasses according to
- 8 proof;
- 9 e. For recovery of all statutory penalties and liquidated damages;
- 10 f. For disgorgement of all amounts wrongfully obtained to the extent permitted by law;
- 11 g. For restitution and injunctive relief;
- 12 h. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent permitted by
- 13 law, including (without limitation) under Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194 and Code of
- 14 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.
- 15 i. For recovery of damages in amount according to proof;
- 16 j. For all recoverable pre- and post-judgment interest;
- 17 k. For this action to be maintained as a representative action under the PAGA;
- 18 l. For Plaintiff and counsel of record to be provided with all enforcement capability as if
- 19 the action were brought by the State of California or the California Division of Labor
- 20 Enforcement;
- 21 m. For recovery of all civil penalties and other recoverable amounts under the PAGA;
- 22 n. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent
- 23 permitted by law, associated with the PAGA claims pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
- 24 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and any other applicable sections; and

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

April 24, 2026

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL

- Electronic Return Receipt -

International Guiding Eyes, Inc. d.b.a.
Guide Dogs of America
13445 Glen Oaks Blvd.
Sylmar, CA 91342

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

International Guiding Eyes, Inc. d.b.a.
Tender Loving Canines
13445 Glen Oaks Blvd.
Sylmar, CA 91342

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **SEAN DEEB** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “covered employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

**INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A. GUIDE DOGS OF AMERICA;
INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A. TENDER LOVING
CANINES**

Defendants shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code

violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff’s counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Service Dog Trainer from about February 2024 to January 2026. During their employment Plaintiff and the other covered (i.e., aggrieved) employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees, including those misclassified as non-exempt, and exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “covered employees” and the “PAGA Period”). As defined, these covered current and former employees are “aggrieved employees” under PAGA.

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “covered employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants’ violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other covered employees to work off-the-clock, and for which they were not paid minimum wages. For example, Defendants maintained a culture that expected covered employees to be available outside of work hours to respond to work communications to discuss logistical issues, shift performance, and other related matters. This was a common practice amongst the covered employees. This culture resulted in Plaintiff and the covered employees working an average of one to two hours off-the-clock per week, resulting in unpaid hours.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave
Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 40 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) “the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;” (2) “by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;” or (3) “for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time.” Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees “with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave laws with respect to the covered employees. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the covered employees with all sick leave accrued. Plaintiff and the covered employees worked off-the-clock hours that were not accounted for when calculating an employee’s accrued paid sick leave. Therefore, Plaintiff and other covered employees were not awarded the total accrued sick leave time they had earned.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). "[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage." *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is "exceedingly narrow" and applies only when (1) "the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty" and (2) *both* "the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period." *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal.5th 444, 459.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods due to the pressures to keep up with the high demands of the job and due to scheduling. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other covered employees with compliant, uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods before the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff estimates that he was deprived of compliant meal periods approximately one to two times per week. These violations occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement that Plaintiff leave the prison facility to take a break, as Defendants provided no break rooms or designated rest facilities within the secure perimeter. This required Plaintiff to navigate security checkpoints and walk to the parking lot simply to reach a rest area, a process that consumed a significant portion of the meal period itself. Furthermore, because personal cellular phones were prohibited inside the prison for security reasons, Plaintiff was forced to keep his phone in his vehicle,

meaning he could not attend to personal affairs or be truly relieved of the workplace environment until he reached his car. Consequently, between the time spent clearing security and the inability to access personal communication until reaching the parking lot, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take meal periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice yet these non-compliant meal periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the covered employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other covered employees to take compliant, uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods. Plaintiff estimates that he was deprived of compliant rest periods one to two times per month. These violations occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement that Plaintiff leave the prison facility to take a break as described above, which consumed a significant portion of the rest period itself. Consequently, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take rest periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice yet these non-compliant rest periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the covered employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of “all wages” for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid “not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides “every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty” of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the covered employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours’ notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours’ notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to covered employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the covered employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:” (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the covered employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list employees’ “total hours worked,” as the wage statements did not accurately include the uncompensated time plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants’ policy and practice of encouraging off-the-clock work.

Plaintiff and other covered employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or

information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other covered employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other covered employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “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.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys’ Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other covered employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored

information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the covered employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the covered employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronic data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elyssa Martinez".

Elyssa Martinez

LMP

Cc Plaintiff Sean Deeb
HR Representative, Mark D. Miller - mdmiller@guidedogsofamerica.org

EXHIBIT 2

Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

July 7, 2026

AMENDED NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL

- Electronic Return Receipt -

International Guiding Eyes, Inc. d.b.a.
Guide Dogs of America
13445 Glen Oaks Blvd.
Sylmar, CA 91342

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

International Guiding Eyes, Inc. d.b.a.
Tender Loving Canines
13445 Glen Oaks Blvd.
Sylmar, CA 91342

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **SEAN DEEB** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “covered employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

**INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A. GUIDE DOGS OF AMERICA;
INTERNATIONAL GUIDING EYES, INC. D.B.A. TENDER LOVING
CANINES**

Defendants shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code

violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff’s counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Service Dog Trainer from about February 2024 to January 2026. During their employment Plaintiff and the other covered (i.e., aggrieved) employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees, including those misclassified as non-exempt, and exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “covered employees” and the “PAGA Period”). As defined, these covered current and former employees are “aggrieved employees” under PAGA.

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “covered employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants’ violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage **Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other covered employees to work off-the-clock, and for which they were not paid minimum wages. For example, Defendants maintained a culture that expected covered employees to be available outside of work hours to respond to work communications to discuss logistical issues, shift performance, and other related matters. This was a common practice amongst the covered employees. This culture resulted in Plaintiff and the covered employees working an average of one to two hours off-the-clock per week, resulting in unpaid hours.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Overtime
Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the covered employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. As described above, Defendants failed to account for all hours worked by the Plaintiff and the covered employees during the PAGA Period. To the extent that these hours worked constituted overtime wages, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the covered employees for all hours worked.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave
Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 40 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method,

employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) “the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;” (2) “by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;” or (3) “for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time.” Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees “with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave laws with respect to the covered employees. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the covered employees with all sick leave accrued. Plaintiff and the covered employees worked off-the-clock hours that were not accounted for when calculating an employee’s accrued paid sick leave. Therefore, Plaintiff and other covered employees were not awarded the total accrued sick leave time they had earned.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the covered employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee’s “regular rate” of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 (“We hold that the terms are synonymous: “regular rate of compensation” under section 226.7(c), like “regular rate of pay” under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages”). “[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage.” *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58, 61. Labor

Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is “exceedingly narrow” and applies only when (1) “the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty” and (2) *both* “the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period.” *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal.5th 444, 459.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods due to the pressures to keep up with the high demands of the job and due to scheduling. Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other covered employees with compliant, uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods before the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff estimates that he was deprived of compliant meal periods approximately one to two times per week. These violations occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical requirement that Plaintiff leave the prison facility to take a break, as Defendants provided no break rooms or designated rest facilities within the secure perimeter. This required Plaintiff to navigate security checkpoints and walk to the parking lot simply to reach a rest area, a process that consumed a significant portion of the meal period itself. Furthermore, because personal cellular phones were prohibited inside the prison for security reasons, Plaintiff was forced to keep his phone in his vehicle, meaning he could not attend to personal affairs or be truly relieved of the workplace environment until he reached his car. Consequently, between the time spent clearing security and the inability to access personal communication until reaching the parking lot, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take meal periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice yet these non-compliant meal periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

A number of these violations can be seen on Plaintiff’s own timekeeping records. For example, on December 11th and 15th of 2025, Plaintiff worked for more than five hours before taking a compliant meal period. This violation can be determined from Plaintiff’s records alone.

Company Code	Employee Id	Last Name	Preferred /First Name	Work Date	Pay Type Description	Punch In Time	Punch Out Time	Punch In Type	Punch Out Type	Regular Duration (hours)	OT1 Duration (hours)	OT2 Duration (hours)	Unpaid Duration (hours)
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/08/2025	Lunch	12/8/25 12:31 PM	12/8/25 1:01 PM	Start Lunch	End Lunch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/08/2025	Work	12/8/25 1:01 PM	12/8/25 4:30 PM	End Lunch	Clock Out	3.48	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/09/2025	Work	12/9/25 8:00 AM	12/9/25 12:42 PM	Clock In	Start Lunch	4.70	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/09/2025	Lunch	12/9/25 12:42 PM	12/9/25 1:13 PM	Start Lunch	End Lunch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.52
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/09/2025	Work	12/9/25 1:13 PM	12/9/25 4:31 PM	End Lunch	Clock Out	3.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/10/2025	Work	12/10/25 8:00 AM	12/10/25 11:41 AM	Clock In	Start Lunch	3.68	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/10/2025	Lunch	12/10/25 11:41 AM	12/10/25 12:11 PM	Start Lunch	End Lunch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/10/2025	Work	12/10/25 12:11 PM	12/10/25 4:30 PM	End Lunch	Clock Out	4.32	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/11/2025	Work	12/11/25 8:00 AM	12/11/25 2:30 PM	Clock In	Start Lunch	6.56	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/11/2025	Lunch	12/11/25 2:30 PM	12/11/25 3:00 PM	Start Lunch	End Lunch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/11/2025	Work	12/11/25 3:00 PM	12/11/25 4:30 PM	End Lunch	Clock Out	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/12/2025	Work	12/12/25 8:00 AM	12/12/25 11:45 AM	Clock In	Start Lunch	3.75	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/12/2025	Lunch	12/12/25 11:45 AM	12/12/25 12:15 PM	Start Lunch	End Lunch	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.50
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/12/2025	Work	12/12/25 12:15 PM	12/12/25 4:30 PM	End Lunch	Clock Out	4.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
107981	88	Deeb	Sean	12/15/2025	Work	12/15/25 8:00 AM	12/15/25 1:20 PM	Clock In	Start Lunch	5.33	0.00	0.00	0.00

Despite these violations being clear on the face of Plaintiff's records, Plaintiff's corresponding wage statements for the same period do not indicate that he was paid for either of these violations.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the covered employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Specifically, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other covered employees to take compliant, uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods. Plaintiff estimates that he was deprived of compliant rest periods one to two times per month. These violations occurred primarily due to heavy workloads and the logistical

requirement that Plaintiff leave the prison facility to take a break as described above, which consumed a significant portion of the rest period itself. Consequently, Plaintiff was frequently unable to take rest periods fully relieved from duty. On information and belief, Defendants were aware of this practice yet these non-compliant rest periods were not compensated with the required one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the covered employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of “all wages” for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid “not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides “every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty” of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the covered employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours' notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours' notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to covered employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the covered employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, "an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:" (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the covered employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct "gross wages earned" or "net wages earned," as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of "gross wages earned" on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list employees' "total hours worked," as the wage statements did not accurately include the uncompensated time plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants' policy and practice of encouraging off-the-clock work.

Plaintiff and other covered employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other covered employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other covered employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate "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." Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other covered employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys' fees

and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the covered employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the covered employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronic data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the covered employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,



Troy Q. Strange

LMP

Cc Plaintiff Sean Deeb
HR Representative, Mark D. Miller - mdmiller@guidedogsofamerica.org