

JAMES *JH* HAWKINS
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

9880 RESEARCH DRIVE, SUITE 200, IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92618
TELEPHONE (949) 387-7200; FACSIMILE (949) 387-6676

November 8, 2023

Via Online Filing (LWDA)

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste 801
Oakland, CA 94612
<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act>

Via Certified Mail (Employers)

Healthcare Services Group, Inc.
3220 Tillman Drive, Suite 300
Bensalem, PA 19020
Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0838 3784 39

Agent for Service of Process for
Healthcare Services Group, Inc.
CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833
Receipt No.: 9589 0710 5270 0838 3784 46

HCSG West, LLC
850 Bear Tavern, Suite 306
Ewing, NJ 08628
Receipt No. 9589 0710 5270 0838 3784 53

Agent for Service of Process for
HCSG West, LLC
CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive
Sacramento, CA 95833
Receipt No.: 9589 0710 5270 0838 3784 60

RE: NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff Maria De Socorro Bazaldua, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, gives NOTICE of her intent to commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.* against her former employers, Defendants Healthcare Services Group, Inc., a Pennsylvania corporation, HCSG West, LLC, a New Jersey limited liability company; and DOES 1-50 (collectively “Healthcare Services Group” or “Defendants”). Plaintiff hereby gives written notice electronically to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and by certified mail to Defendants via their agent(s) for service of process.

NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

November 8, 2023

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as an hourly, non-exempt employee. Plaintiff began her employment with Defendants in or about February 2021 and continued such employment through November 2022. During the relevant time, she performed functions as a Housekeeper and was employed by Defendants in the State of California.

The group of aggrieved employees that Plaintiff seeks to represent is a group of non-exempt employees employed directly or indirectly for Defendants in the State of California during the relevant time period (“Aggrieved Employees”). This notice is timely as it is provided within one year of the violations. Each of the violations set forth below and in the attached complaint is asserted on behalf of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Plaintiff has attached her Complaint, and incorporates the allegations in the Complaint as though fully set forth herewith, setting out the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendant in the Complaint.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Plaintiff has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees working for Defendant at their locations in the State regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

Plaintiff claims that Defendants implemented legally non-compliant policies and practices which led to Defendants’ 1) failure to pay minimum wages; 2) failure to pay overtime owed; 3) failure to provide lawful meal periods; 4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; 5) failure to timely pay wages during employment; 6) failure to timely pay wages owed upon separation from employment; 7) failure to reimburse necessary expenses; 8) failure to pay vested vacation wages; 9) knowing and intentional failure to comply with itemized wage statement provisions; 10) violation of the Unfair Competition Law.

In addition to the violations set forth in the Complaint, Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to keep accurate records as required by Wage Order 5-2001, Labor Code 1174, and 1198. IWC Wage Order 5-2001 requires in pertinent part: every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following: (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals, and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded...(5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay...” Labor Code section 1174 also requires Defendants to maintain and preserve, in a centralized location, among other items, records showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, its employees. On information and belief and based thereon, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code section 1174, including by implementing the policies and procedures and committing the violations alleged in the complaint, including without limitation failing to keep records of meal periods and all wages earned at the proper rates. Defendants’ failure to comply with Labor Code section 1174 is unlawful pursuant to Labor Code

NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

November 8, 2023

section 1175.

All Labor Code provisions in the Complaint alleged to have been violated pertain to all entities and individuals named in the Complaint, even if not expressly specified.

Please advise by certified mail within sixty-five (65) days of the post mark on this letter if the LWDA intends to investigate these claims. Thank you, and please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Very Truly Yours,

/s/ Christina M. Lucio

Christina M. Lucio, Esq.

Enclosed: Complaint