

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**

660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel: (213) 381-9988  
Fax: (213) 381-9989  
wilshirelawfirm.com



Sean Paisan, Esq.  
John Yslas, Esq.  
John Lucas, Esq.  
Tyler Woods, Esq.  
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.  
Thiago Coelho, Esq.  
Benjamin Haber, Esq.  
Arrash Fattahi, Esq.

April 2, 2026

LWDA  
Attn. PAGA Administrator  
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801  
Oakland, California 94612  
*(Via Online Submission)*

Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC  
555 E. Hardy Street  
Inglewood, California 90301  
*(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)*  
**#9489-0090-0027-6639-1534-27**

Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC  
3480 E. Guasti Road  
Ontario, California 91761  
*(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)*  
**#9489-0090-0027-6639-1534-10**

Cogency Global Inc.  
Agent for Service of Process for:  
Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC  
1325 J Street, Suite 1550  
Sacramento, California 95814  
*(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)*  
**#9489-0090-0027-6639-1534-34**

Re: ***Sky Nataly Andrade v. Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC dba Centinela Hospital Medical Center***  
**Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties**

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Sky Nataly Andrade (“Ms. Andrade”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC dba Centinela Hospital Medical Center (“Centinela”). Ms. Andrade wishes to pursue this action on behalf of herself, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of potentially all other persons who worked for Centinela in California as non-exempt or hourly-paid employees at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, “Aggrieved Employees”).

The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Centinela engaged in with respect to Ms. Andrade and all Aggrieved Employees. Ms. Andrade alleges that she and other Aggrieved Employees suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

**Ms. Andrade’s Employment with Centinela**

Prime Healthcare Centinela, LLC operates Centinela Hospital Medical Center as part of the Prime Healthcare system. Ms. Andrade worked for Centinela as a licensed vocational nurse. Her primary job functions involved providing direct and indirect patient care services. In performing her duties,

Ms. Andrade was regularly required to perform work (off-the-clock), without compensation. Due to high workloads, Ms. Andrade was also frequently deprived of an opportunity to take legally compliant meal and rest breaks, and Centinela failed to provide Ms. Andrade with meal and rest break premiums as required by the Labor Code. Additionally, Ms. Andrade necessarily incurred business-related expenses, but Centinela failed to reimburse such expenses. These are just non-exhaustive examples of the facts and theories Ms. Andrade asserts, which are described in more detail below.

Centinela owns/owned and operates/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Centinela's business in California, Centinela is subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Ms. Andrade is a California resident who worked for Centinela in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately May 2025 to approximately February 2026. During Ms. Andrade's employment for Centinela, Centinela paid Ms. Andrade an hourly wage and classified her as non-exempt from overtime. Centinela typically scheduled Ms. Andrade to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Ms. Andrade also worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

Throughout Ms. Andrade's employment, Centinela failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Ms. Andrade with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Ms. Andrade to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Ms. Andrade when her employment terminated, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Ms. Andrade, and failed to indemnify Ms. Andrade for business expenditures. As discussed below, Ms. Andrade's experience working for Centinela was typical and illustrative.

### **Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight, and Overtime Wages**

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so. In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Furthermore, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Centinela failed to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Centinela required Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by requiring Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work prior

to clocking in for the workday and during uncompensated meal periods. For example, Ms. Andrade was expected to arrive at her job site before the start of her scheduled shifts to attend staff meetings on a weekly basis. Supervisors also required Ms. Andrade to carry a company phone at all times during her shifts, including during uncompensated meal periods, so that they could call and text her with work-related questions, instructions, and requests for updates. When Ms. Andrade tried to fully relieve herself of her duties during meal periods, she would be reprimanded and told that she always had to be available. Finally, Ms. Andrade was frequently required to fill out paperwork and update patient logs after clocking out for the workday. As a result, Ms. Andrade regularly performed work for which she was not compensated.

Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. California Labor Code § 510 requires that employers compensate employees 1.5 times their regular rate of pay when employees work over eight hours per day, 40 hours per week, or when employees work up to eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek. Centinela failed to properly calculate Ms. Andrade's and other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when paying overtime by failing to include all compensation in overtime calculations. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Centinela also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Centinela is liable to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

### **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

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

Despite these legal requirements, Centinela wrongfully failed to provide Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees with legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period in a manner required by law. Centinela also continued to assert control over Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly compensating Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided as required by law. For example, as discussed, Ms. Andrade was required to carry a company phone during unpaid meal periods to respond to work-related questions, instructions, and requests for updates. Additionally, supervisors frequently instructed Ms. Andrade to respond to inquiries from patient families during her meal periods and told her that she needed to be available at all times. Accordingly, Centinela failed to provide meal periods to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s). Centinela, however, failed to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided.

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

### **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

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

Throughout the statutory period, Centinela has wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods in a manner required by law. Centinela required Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of three and a half consecutive hours a day without authorizing and permitting Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period, or without compensating Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Centinela continued to assert control over Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. For example, as discussed, Ms. Andrade was required to carry a company phone during rest periods to respond to work-related questions, instructions, and requests for updates. Additionally, supervisors frequently instructed Ms. Andrade to respond to inquiries from patient families during her meal periods and told her that she needed to be available at all times.

Centinela thus failed to authorize and permit Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law, and Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Centinela, however, failed to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees all of the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

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

**Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month**

Based on Centinela's failure to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Centinela also violated Labor Code § 204. Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked.

However, Centinela failed and refused to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Centinela, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Centinela, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Centinela owes Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts. Accordingly, Centinela is liable to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

**Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

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

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

**Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination**

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. Direct deposits of wages to an employee's bank, saving and loan, or credit union account that were previously authorized by the employee are immediately terminated when an employee quits or is discharged, and the payment of wages upon termination of employment in the manner described above shall apply unless the employee has voluntarily authorized that deposit and provided that the employer complies with the provisions of Labor Code § 213(d) relating to the payment of wages upon termination or quitting of employment.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees was terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Centinela failed to pay Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Centinela's employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Centinela's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days. Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to recover from Centinela their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203. As such, Centinela is liable to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

**Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer

an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).) The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Centinela failed to timely furnish Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law). Because Centinela violated Labor Code § 226, Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Centinela the greater of their actual damages caused by Centinela’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000) per employee. Therefore, Centinela is liable to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to timely furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

#### **Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures**

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify their employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Centinela wrongfully required Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Centinela. Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses including, without limitation, work clothing. Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Centinela, but Centinela failed to indemnify Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses. As a result, Centinela is liable to Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify Ms. Andrade and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

#### **Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA**

In light of the light of the above, Ms. Andrade alleges that Centinela violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;

LWDA

*Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties*

April 2, 2026

Page 8 of 8

3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Therefore, on behalf of the Aggrieved Employees, Ms. Andrade seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

Ms. Andrade has placed Centinela on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Bishay", written in a cursive style.

John O. Bishay, Esq.