

**WILSHIRE LAW FIRM,
PLC**

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

June 5, 2026

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

Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6639 1404 03

The Claremont Colleges, Inc.
101 S. Mills Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6639 1403 97

Andrew R. Dorantes
Agent for Service of Process for:
Harvey Mudd College
301 Platt Boulevard
Claremont, CA 91711
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6639 1403 80

Re: Jose Francisco Perez v. Harvey Mudd College, et al.
Notice of California Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Jose Francisco Perez ("Plaintiff") to pursue a California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code, §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employers, Harvey Mudd College and The Claremont Colleges, Inc. (collectively referred to as "Defendants"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which Defendants are alleged to have engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all other persons who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employees at any time within the applicable statutory period (the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiff wishes to pursue this action as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of all other Aggrieved Employees.

Stig Lanesskog
Agent for Service of Process for:
The Claremont Colleges, Inc.
101 South Mills Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6639 1404 10

Elaine M. Vukadinovich, Esq.
Dean Takatsuki, Esq.
MUSICK, PEELER & GARRETT LLP
333 South Hope Street, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, California 90071-3048
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489 0090 0027 6639 1403 66

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered the California Labor Code violations described below.

Plaintiff's Employment with Defendants

Defendants own or owned and operate or operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business and Professions Code. Defendants' business is a college campus located in Claremont, California.

Plaintiff Jose Francisco Perez is a resident of California who worked for Defendants in Los Angeles County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 2024 to present. Plaintiff worked as a Grounds Keeper. Plaintiff's primary job functions consisted of performing landscaping and ground maintenance for the college, including trimming, planting, irrigation maintenance, trash removal, and general upkeep of campus grounds.

In performing Plaintiff's duties, Plaintiff was regularly required to perform work (off-the-clock), without compensation, including but not limited to being expected to answer work-related phone calls and always remain available by phone. Plaintiff was also frequently deprived of an opportunity to take legally compliant meal and rest breaks due to interruptions by supervisors and pressing job duties. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with the meal and rest break premiums as required by the Labor Code, and Plaintiff does not recall, but one time, ever receiving any meal and rest break premiums.

Additionally, Plaintiff necessarily incurred business-related expenses, including but not limited to the use of his personal cell phone for work related calls, but Defendants failed to reimburse such business-related expenses. These are just non-exhaustive examples of the facts and theories the Plaintiff asserts, which are described in more detail below. Defendants typically scheduled Plaintiff to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Plaintiff regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than 40 hours in a workweek.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants: (1) failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages); (2) failed to provide Plaintiff with legally compliant meal periods (and pay corresponding meal period premium wages at the correct rate of pay); (3) failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take rest periods; (4) failed to pay all earned wages two times per month; (5) failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed; (6) failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff at terminated; (7) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements; (8) failed to indemnify Plaintiff for expenditures. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

**Defendants Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked,
Including Minimum, Straight Time, 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, California Labor Code section 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or 40 hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

California Labor Code sections 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. Additionally, Labor Code section 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work “off-the-clock,” uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work prior to clocking in for the workday, during unpaid meal periods, and after clocking out for the workday. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Defendants also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked. As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (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 the 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, Defendants wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees by 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 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. Defendants also never informed Plaintiff of the right to, nor permitted Plaintiff to take, a second meal period when Plaintiff worked at least 10 hours in a workday. Accordingly, Defendants’ policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal periods. Defendants, however, regularly

failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (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 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two 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, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Defendants continued to assert control over Plaintiff and the 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 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus 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). Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 210 and 2699, subdivision (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 its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendants also violated California Labor Code section 204.

Section 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, during all such times, Defendants systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay

those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendants, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendants, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendants owe employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

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

Defendants, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the 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 attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the 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

California Labor Code sections 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 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continue to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours

of their leaving Defendants' employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Defendants' conduct violates California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. California Labor Code section 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 30 days.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) provides that every employer shall 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. (Cal. Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (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." (Cal. Lab. Code, § 226, subd. (e)(1).)

In addition, California Labor Code § 246(i) required employers to provide an employee with written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either employee's itemized wage statement described in § 226 or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with employee's payment of wages. If an employer provides unlimited paid sick leave or unlimited paid time off to an employee, the employer may satisfy this section by indicating on the notice or employee's itemized wage statement

“unlimited.”

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the 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 Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226, subdivision (a), and 246, subdivision (j), Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants’ failure to comply with California Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), and 246, subdivision (j), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 per employee.

Moreover, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code section 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

California Labor Code section 2802, subdivision (a) provides that employers shall indemnify his or her 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, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants. Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses (which is defined as including, without limitation, work attire, work equipment, personal protective equipment, use of personal cell phones, and/or use of personal vehicles). Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, but Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in California Labor Code sections 2802 and 2699, subdivisions (f)(2) for failing to indemnify Plaintiff and/or the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the following provisions of the California Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

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

3. California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. California Labor Code section 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code section 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. California Labor Code section 226 and 246 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
7. California Labor Code sections 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination; and
8. California Labor Code section 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699, subdivision (f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendants 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 "Rachel Vinson", with a stylized, flowing script.

Rachel J. Vinson, Esq.