



NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA

(Labor Code § 2699.3)

DATE April 8, 2026

DELIVERY Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

RECIPIENTS California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

SUBJECT: DYAMOND MONIQUE BOLDEN v. PARK MANAGEMENT CORP. DBA SIX FLAGS DISCOVERY KINGDOM, SIX FLAGS ENTERTAINMENT CORPORATION, and MAGIC MOUNTAIN LLC — NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3

To LWDA and to Employer:

This office represents Dyamond Monique Bolden (“Ms. Bolden” or Complainant) with respect to her claims against Park Management Corp. DBA Six Flags Discovery Kingdom (“Park Management”), Six Flags Entertainment Corporation (“Six Flags”) and Magic Mountain LLC (“Magic Mountain”) (collectively referred to as “Employers”) for violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail. Employers individually or jointly exercised control over the wages, hours, or working conditions, either directly or indirectly, of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees, and are thus, “employers” or joint employers under California law, and are jointly and severally liable for the violations set forth herein.

Park Management Corp. DBA Six Flags Discovery Kingdom is a California corporation doing business in the State of California. Six Flags Entertainment Corporation is a Delaware corporation doing business in the State of California. Magic Mountain LLC is a California limited liability company doing business in the State of California. Employers employed Ms. Bolden from approximately 2022 to about July 9, 2025. During her employment with Employers, Ms. Bolden was employed as an “entertainment character”. Ms. Bolden performed her job duties at Employers’ principal place of business, located at 1001 Fairgrounds Drive, Vallejo, California 94589.

Ms. Bolden intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, et seq., the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”). Ms. Bolden is seeking penalties on behalf of herself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt hourly employees of any of the Employers working within California holding various positions who experienced at least one

Office: (310) 248-2944
E-Mail: info@caworklawyer.com
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300
Torrance, California 90505

or more of the same violations as Complainant as set forth in this notice. (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Complainant’s employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 3395, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC Wage Order”) and 13(b) of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. The claims made on behalf of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers have engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. This deprived Complainant and Aggrieved Employees of all compensable wages they were owed. Employers paid reporting time pay and coded it as “Show Up” that did not fully compensate Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all owed wages.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were also not provided with reporting time pay at the correct amounts. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees have been contacted to not report to work for a scheduled shift have not received the statutorily required amount of reporting time pay. Specifically, on multiple occasions, Complainant arrived at work to begin her shift but was told that her shift was cancelled. Complainant did not receive the legally required amount of reporting time pay.

First, Employers regularly require Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employers and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Specifically, before Complainant was allowed to clock-in, she was required to wash and prepare the costume that she or her colleagues were required to wear as part of the entertainment. Additionally, if Complainant was the one that was assigned to wear the costume on a particular day, she was required to get into the costume and be ready before clocking in. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid for this off-the-clock work.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. Complainant is informed and believes that Employers unlawfully adjusted Complainant and Aggrieved Employees’ time records such that the time records do not accurately reflect the start and end times of their shifts. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employers failed to

pay overtime to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration and all compensable work time.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers have failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees all owed wages for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Order; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employers required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. On the occasions that Complainant and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short because Complainant was not permitted to leave her workstation unless a supervisor had another employee relieve her for her meal break. This caused Complainant to take her meal break well past her fifth (5th) hour of work.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Complainant and Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; and (6) Employers' policy and culture prevented Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), 512(a) and 1198.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties of the applicable IWC Wage Order; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employers failed to authorize and permit Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant 10-minute periods. Employers required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Specifically, Employer's failed to schedule enough employees to permit Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to take their uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods. Moreover, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were never completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to in person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), and 1198.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the correct rate of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO DISCHARGED AND QUITTING EMPLOYEES/WAITING TIME PENALTIES

Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned either at the time Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were terminated or resigned because Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums at the correct rate of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 201(a), 202(a) and 203(a).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees did not include the actual hours worked and the correct amount of wages owed, as the time worked was either not recorded, detrimentally rounded, did not include the correct name and address of the legal employing entity, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant the applicable IWC Wage Order; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

///

///

8. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employers. IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the use of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees' use of their personal cell phones to communicate supervisors and colleagues regarding job duties and for other work-related purposes. Additionally, Complainant received emails from Employers when a shift needed to be cancelled. Complainant did not receive reimbursement for use of her personal cell phone device and personal data usage.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO PAY VACATION TIME

Pursuant to California Labor Code section 227.3, ". . . whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off her vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to her as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served." During the relevant time period, Employers failed to pay Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees for all earned and unused and accrued vacation time at their final rate of pay at the time of termination of their employment. Accordingly, Employers have violated California Labor Code section 227.3.

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; California Labor Code section 227 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. FAILURE TO PAY SICK TIME

Pursuant to California Labor Code section 246(l), all sick pay must be paid at the regular rate of pay. Employers have failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees their sick pay at the correct rate of pay. Accordingly, Employers have violated California Labor Code section 246(l).

Complainant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; California Labor Code section 227 penalties; relief under California Labor Code 248.5, and attorneys' fees and costs.

11. FAILURE TO PROVIDE PREVENTATIVE COOL-DOWN RECOVERY PERIODS

Employers required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work outdoors in extreme weather conditions and were not provided with preventative cool-down rest periods to prevent overheating and heat illness. Further, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with water, shade, or access to first aid. Employers regularly required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to

Office: (310) 248-2944

E-Mail: info@caworklawyer.com

22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300

Torrance, California 90505

work through extreme heat without allowing at least a 5-minute cool-down period every two hours as needed, or a minimum of 10-minute preventative rest period when the temperatures reach 95 degrees or above. When a compliant cool down recovery period was not provided, a wage premium was not paid to Aggrieved Employees.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Complainant and Aggrieved Employees from taking cool-down rest periods to prevent overheating because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of preventative cool-down rest period of no less than five (5) minutes at a time when needed; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant preventative cool-down rest periods; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free preventative cool-down rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant preventative cool-down rest periods; (5) Employers failed to provide water, shade, cool-down rest periods, and access to first aid; and (6) Employers' policy and culture prevented Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking preventative cool-down rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive access to water, shade, cool-down rest periods, and access to first aid.

12. FAILURE TO PROVIDE POTABLE DRINKING WATER

California Labor Code §2441 requires employers to provide fresh, free, and pure drinking water for employees, at reasonable and convenient times and places. 8 CCR §3395 requires the provision of "potable drinking water meeting the requirements of §§ 1524, 3363, and 3457, as applicable, including but not limited to the requirements that it be fresh, pure, suitably cool, and provided to employees free of charge." 8 CCR § 3457(c) further requires the provision of potable drinking water and single-use cups.

Employers did not provide employees with sufficient water and single use cups at worksites. For example, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees consistently purchased and brought their own water to work and were not provided with single use containers within a reasonable distance.

13. FAILURE TO PROVIDE SUITABLE RESTING FACILITIES

Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: "Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employee during work hours."

Employers did not provide resting facilities or bathrooms. Employers could have provided employees with a resting facility, or at minimum a portable toilet, but instead denied and continue to deny employees with suitable areas to rest. As a result, employees were forced to adjust to areas not conducive to resting. Employers did not provide employees with suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods. Employers' failure to provide suitable resting facilities to aggrieved employees violated and continues to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(8) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Justin Lo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Justin" and the last name "Lo" clearly distinguishable.

JUSTIN LO, ESQ.

Notice to Employer via Certified Mail

Park Management Corp. dba Six Flags Discovery Kingdom

Agent for Service of Process

1505 Corporation CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive

Sacramento, CA 95833

Park Management Corp. dba Six Flags Discovery Kingdom

Human Resources/Legal Dept.

1001 Fairgrounds Dr.

Vallejo, CA 94589 Human Resources/Legal Dept.

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation

Agent for Service of Process

1505 Corporation dba CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive

Sacramento, CA 95833

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation

Human Resources/Legal Dept.

1001 Fairgrounds Dr.

Vallejo, CA 94589

Magic Mountain LLC

Agent for Service of Process

1505 Corporation CSC – Lawyers Incorporating service

2710 Gateway Oaks Drive

Sacramento, CA 95833

Magic Mountain LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.

1001 Fairgrounds Dr.

Vallejo, CA 94589