

WORK LAWYERS PC
— caworklawyer.com —

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA

(Labor Code § 2699.3)

DATE May 11, 2026

DELIVERY Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

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

**SUBJECT: ISAIAH LEE WILLIAMS-DISMUK v. NEXTERA ENERGY, INC.,
NEXTERA ENERGY RESOURCES, LLC, NEXTERA ENERGY OPERATING
SERVICES, LLC, NEXTERA ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LLC, and
GOLDEN HILLS INTERCONNECTION, LLC — NOTICE OF LABOR CODE
VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3**

To LWDA and to Employer:

This office represents Isaiah Lee Williams-Dismuk (“Mr. Williams-Dismuk” or Complainant) with respect to his claims against NextEra Energy, Inc. (“NextEra Energy”), NextEra Energy Resources, LLC (“NextEra Resources”), NextEra Energy Operating Services, LLC (“NextEra Operating Services”), NextEra Energy Project Management, LLC (“NextEra Project Management”), and Golden Hills Interconnection, LLC (“Golden Hills”) (collectively, “Employer”) for violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified U.S. mail and to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via the LWDA online filing portal. 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.

NextEra Energy, Inc. is a Florida corporation, and NextEra Energy Resources, LLC, NextEra Energy Operating Services, LLC, NextEra Energy Project Management, LLC, and Golden Hills Interconnection, LLC are Delaware limited liability companies doing business in the State of California. Employer employed Mr. Williams-Dismuk from approximately December 2, 2024 to about January 8, 2026. During his employment with Employer, Mr. Williams-Dismuk was employed as a Wind Technician and, following his promotion in or about July 2025, as a Wind Technician Level II. Mr. Williams-Dismuk performed his job duties at one of Employer’s California worksites, located at 435 Mountain Vista Parkway, Livermore, California 94551. Mr. Williams-Dismuk’s wage

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

statements were issued by NextEra Energy Operating Services, LLC, with the principal employer address listed as 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, FL 33408.

Mr. Williams-Dismuk 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”). Mr. Williams-Dismuk is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt hourly employees of Employer who worked within California who experienced at least one 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, Employer has violated several of California’s wage and hour laws as a matter of policy and practice across its California operations, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 246(l), 248.5, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1174.5, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2800, and 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

Employer has 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. Employer’s wage statements include line items entitled “Retro Difference,” which document non-discretionary compensation paid to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees in pay periods later than the pay periods in which the underlying wages were earned. The presence of these retroactive pay-code line items demonstrates that wages earned in earlier pay periods were not paid in those pay periods, in violation of California Labor Code section 204. In addition, when Employer paid such retroactive wages, it failed to perform a corresponding recalculation of overtime at the recomputed regular rate of pay for the pay periods in which the underlying work was performed, resulting in systematic underpayment of overtime to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. Separately, Employer’s wage statements show non-discretionary cash-in-lieu-of-benefits compensation entitled “Medical Opt Out,” paid to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees who declined Employer-sponsored medical coverage; Employer failed to include these cash-in-lieu payments in the regular rate of pay used to calculate overtime, in violation of *Flores v. City of San Gabriel*, 824 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2016) and California regular-rate doctrine.

First, Employer regularly required 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 Employer 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. Additionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice across Employer's California operations, Employer required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to enter their time on Employer-issued spreadsheets and to round their time entries downward to the nearest five-minute increment, resulting in systematic understatement of compensable hours worked. Further, as a matter of policy and practice, Employer prohibited Complainant and Aggrieved Employees from recording overtime hours on a daily basis and instructed them to record overtime only when their recorded hours exceeded eighty (80) hours in a bi-weekly pay period, and at certain times directed that recorded daily hours not exceed eight (8) hours regardless of actual time worked. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid for this off-the-clock work.

Employer also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. Complainant is informed and believes that Employer 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, Employer 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, Employer has 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, Employer 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

Employer 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. Employer 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, cut short, or taken past his fifth (5th) hour of work because Employer failed to schedule enough employees to allow for coverage. Additionally, it was common practice and expected of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to complete their work tasks prior to taking a meal break. Although Complainant frequently took his meal break well past his fifth (5th) hour of work, Complainant completed his time sheet to reflect that a meal break was taken before his 5th hour of work, creating inaccurate time records. Additionally, on the occasions that Complainant worked more than ten (10) hours per shift, he was not allowed to take a second uninterrupted meal break.

Employer's 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) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employer 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) Employer's 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, Employer 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

Employer failed to authorize and permit Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant 10-minute periods. Employer 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 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).

Employer's 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) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employer's 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) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employer failed to

adequately inform and train Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employer 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) Employer 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) Employer's 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, Employer 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, Employer has 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, Employer 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

Employer has 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, Employer 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; waiting time penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 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

Office: (310) 248-2944

E-Mail: info@caworklawyer.com

22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 300

Torrance, California 90505

and address of the legal employing entity, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employer 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

Employer has 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, Employer violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 1174(d). Specifically, as a matter of uniform policy and practice across Employer's California operations, Employer required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to round their time entries downward to the nearest five-minute increment and to record meal periods at uniform times that did not reflect when meal breaks were actually taken. This policy and practice caused the time records of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to be systematically inaccurate.

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 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 Employer. 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. Employer's wage statements include a "Cell Phone - Per" pay-code line item paying a uniform amount of \$10 per pay period (approximately \$20 per month) to those non-exempt California employees who received any reimbursement, an amount that does not represent a reasonable percentage of the actual cost of cell phone usage as required by *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.*, 228 Cal.App.4th 1137 (2014). Many Aggrieved Employees, including Complainant for substantial portions of his employment, received no reimbursement at all for the cost of their personal cell phones or their personal cellular data plans.

Accordingly, Employer 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 his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him 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, Employer 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, Employer has 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 sections 203 and 558 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. Employer has failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees their sick pay at the correct rate of pay. Accordingly, Employer has 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 558 penalties; relief under California Labor Code 248.5, and attorneys’ fees and costs.

11. FAILURE TO PROVIDE PREVENTATIVE COOL-DOWN RECOVERY PERIODS

Employer required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to work indoors and 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. Employer regularly required Complainant and Aggrieved Employees to 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.

Employer’s 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) Employer 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) Employer’s management at various levels, affecting all non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant preventative cool-down rest periods; (3) Employer 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) Employer 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) Employer failed to provide water, shade, cool-down rest periods, and access to first aid; and (6) Employer’s 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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Justin Lo". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and a stylized "Lo".

JUSTIN LO, ESQ.

Notice to Employer via Certified Mail

NEXTERA ENERGY, INC.

Agent for Service of Process,
1505 Corporation – CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833-3505

NEXTERA ENERGY, INC.

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
435 Mountain Vista Parkway
Livermore, CA 94551

NEXTERA ENERGY, INC.

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408

NEXTERA ENERGY RESOURCES, LLC

Agent for Service of Process,
1505 Corporation – CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833-3505

NEXTERA ENERGY RESOURCES, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
435 Mountain Vista Parkway
Livermore, CA 94551

NEXTERA ENERGY RESOURCES, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
700 Universe Boulevard, Attn: Corporate Governance
Juno Beach, FL 33408

NEXT ERA ENERGY OPERATING SERVICES, LLC

Agent for Service of Process,
1505 Corporation – CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833-3505
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833-3505

NEXT ERA ENERGY OPERATING SERVICES, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
435 Mountain Vista Parkway
Livermore, CA 94551

NEXT ERA ENERGY OPERATING SERVICES, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
700 Universe Boulevard
Juno Beach, FL 33408

NEXTERA ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LLC

Agent for Service of Process,
1505 Corporation – CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833-3505

NEXTERA ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
435 Mountain Vista Parkway
Livermore, CA 94551

NEXTERA ENERGY PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
700 Universe Boulevard,
Juno Beach, FL 33408

GOLDEN HILLS INTERCONNECTION, LLC

Agent for Service of Process,
1505 Corporation – CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833

GOLDEN HILLS INTERCONNECTION, LLC

Human Resources/Legal Dept.
435 Mountain Vista Parkway
Livermore, CA 94551