



THE SENTINEL FIRM^{APC}

707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 4700, Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel. (213) 985-1150 | Fax. (213) 985-2155

Seung L. Yang, Esq.
seung.yang@thesentinelfirm.com

July 31, 2026

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Employbridge, LLC
1845 Satellite Blvd, Suite 300
Duluth, GA 30097

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Employbridge, LLC
Agent for Service of Process
CSC- Lawyers Incorporating Service
Rebecca Vang
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr
Sacramento, CA 95833

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Real Time Staffing Services, LLC
1845 Satellite Blvd, Suite 300
Duluth, GA 30097

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Real Time Staffing Services, LLC
Agent for Service of Process
CSC- Lawyers Incorporating Service
Rebecca Vang
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr
Sacramento, CA 95833

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

U.S. Pole Company, Inc.
660 West Avenue O
Palmdale, CA 93551

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

U.S. Pole Company, Inc.
Agent for Service of Process
W. Brad Barbagallo
5900 Canoga Avenue, #450
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

U.S. Outdoor Lighting
660 West Avenue O
Palmdale, CA 93551

Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

RE: *Moise O Majuan Sosa v. Employbridge, LLC, et al.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that our office has been retained by Moise O Majuan Sosa (“Plaintiff”) to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, et seq.) against his former employers, Employbridge, LLC, Real Time Staffing

Services, LLC, U.S. Pole Company, Inc., and U.S. Outdoor Lighting (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, and employees)(“Defendants”). Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, were the joint employers of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3 and sets forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendants’ aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of Plaintiff individually as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the “Aggrieved Employees”).

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

Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff’s Employment with Defendants

Defendants own and operate an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Los Angeles County. As such, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”).

Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a Material Handler from approximately May 2025 to approximately January 2026 in the State of California. Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Plaintiff typically worked 5 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff’s employment, Defendants committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff’s experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime

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 (8) 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 (8) hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the

employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission 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 all overtime wages. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received bonuses, incentive compensation, and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all remuneration when determining the correct overtime rate of pay, meal break premium rate of pay, and sick day rate of pay, leading to underpayment of compensation. Also throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly worked off-the-clock, without compensation. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to keep their personal cell phones on at all times, including during meal periods, and were required to respond to work requests from supervisors while clocked out during purported meal periods. Despite being required to perform these work tasks, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this time worked. As a result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees performed these work tasks off-the-clock and were not compensated for this time worked. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants 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 Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Pay Meal Period Premiums

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. California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one hour of additional wages at the employee's regular rate of compensation 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 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, 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. Defendants did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to

prioritize urgent work tasks before starting their meal periods or during their meal periods, resulting in late, shortened, interrupted, or missed meal periods. These requirements also meant Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duty during their meal periods. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to keep their personal cell phones on at all times, including during meal periods, and were required to respond to work requests from supervisors while clocked out during purported meal periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to remain on premises during meal periods, and remain ready to respond to work-related requests. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not 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 at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday they were not provided with a meal period(s) in accordance with California law. Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for non-compliant meal periods.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods and Pay Rest Period Premiums

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit rest periods of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof. Each failure to authorize and permit rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendants, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four (4) consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to keep their personal cell phones on at all times, including during rest periods, and were required to respond to work requests from supervisors while on their purported rest periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to remain on premises during rest periods, and remain ready to respond to work-related

requests. As a result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were rarely provided with compliant rest periods and were regularly required to work through their rest periods. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

California Labor Code section 226.7 and the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders require employers to pay an employee one hour of additional wages at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday they were not provided with all required rest periods. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each workday they were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods. Defendants, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for non-compliant rest periods.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by 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 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 Labor Code 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' failure to comply with the 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.

As a result, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenses

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cell phones for work purposes such as communicating with co-workers and supervisors. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were also required to purchase tools such as work boots but were not reimbursed for these expenses. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not adequately compensated for these work-related expenses. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendants, and Defendants has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

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.

During the relevant time period, Defendants failed, and continues to fail to pay terminated Aggrieved Employees without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 within the time periods specified. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), non-compliant meal periods, and non-compliant rest periods.

Defendants' 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.

Accordingly, Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the 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 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).)

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees regularly were interrupted during their meal periods to answer requests from supervisors which resulted in inaccurate total hours worked on wage statements. Further, as a result of this practice, Defendants failed to pay meal premiums and overtime wages at the correct regular rate.

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

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 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 hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendants failed 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.

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

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the 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, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
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 § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.


Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff 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, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendants on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, 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 us at the above-listed contact information.

Sincerely,

THE SENTINEL FIRM, APC



Seung L. Yang, Esq.