BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
Victoria B. Rivapalacio (State Bar #275115)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)
victoria@bamlawca.com; deblouw@bamlawca.com
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT
10/19/2026 3:25 PM
By: Aryanna Sheehe, DEPUTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

DAVID SZEP, on behalf of the State of California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELECTRICAL CONSULTANTS, INC., a Corporation; HILINE NATION, LLC, a Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CIVSB2630429

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

Plaintiff David Szep ("PLAINTIFF"), on behalf of the people of the State of California and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, ("PAGA") only, alleges on information and belief, except for his own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendants Electrical Consultants, Inc. and HiLine Nation, LLC (referred to as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANT's violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA-only action.

4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in his individual capacity; he is proceeding herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing in his individual capacity.

THE PARTIES

5. Electrical Consultants, Inc. ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

6. HiLine Nation, LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

7. The entities named in paragraphs 5-6 above (and any DOE entities later named) are the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck, standardized company employment handbooks, by standardized policies and procedures, by the company PLAINTIFF performs work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

8. DEFENDANT provides electric power and utility services in California.

9. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from March of 2021 to May of 2026. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

10. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of July 9, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

11. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT’s violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the

foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

13. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and all the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

THE CONDUCT

14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to

be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

15. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

16. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied

their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

17. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under compensated for all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED

EMPLOYEES forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT failed to pay minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

18. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

19. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

> [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars ($200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

20. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to the "Hourly" regular wage payments.

21. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203.

22. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

23. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their

employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

24. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10.

26. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395.5 and 393, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES across California, including in this County, and committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act

[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]

(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)

27. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

28. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the

Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

29. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of July 9, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

30. On July 9, 2026, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. *See* **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

31. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed to pay overtime wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, and (f) failed to provide wages when due, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8,

Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.[1] PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:

A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

Dated: October 19, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Nicholas J. De Blouw

Attorneys for Plaintiff

[1]Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor Code §558(a)(3).

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **novel@bamlawca.com**
WRITERS EXT: (858)-336-6865

July 9, 2026
CA3952

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Electrical Consultants, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052704052147635
Jelena Radibratovic
5030 CAMINO DE LA SIESTA
SUITE #407
SAN DIEGO, CA 92108

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of David Szep ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC. Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 9, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from approximately March of 2021 through May of 2026. Plaintiff was employed as a non-exempt employee in the construction industry and was paid on an hourly basis. Plaintiff's job duties included driving throughout San Diego County and other California locations in a company truck,

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

locating assigned pole numbers and coordinates, hiking to power line locations, inspecting power poles, taking photographs, organizing job packets, and uploading inspection information and files from home at the end of the day. Plaintiff was assigned job packets and was required to complete the inspection work connected to those assignments.

During the PAGA Period, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone for work-related communications with coworkers and/or supervisors. Plaintiff also used his personal home internet to complete required computer work, including uploading work-related files and inspection information after returning home. Even though some wage statements reflect a "Phone Reim" line, Plaintiff was not fully reimbursed for the reasonable expenses he incurred for required personal cell phone and home internet use.

Defendant also occasionally failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with compliant meal periods and rest periods in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Plaintiff did not have a traditional clock-in or clock-out system. Instead, Plaintiff entered his time digitally, generally after returning home. Plaintiff was required to drive directly to job sites, hike in the field to locate power poles, inspect the poles, take photographs, travel to the next location, and then return home to upload his work. Due to the field-based nature of Plaintiff's work, Plaintiff was sometimes unable to take compliant, duty-free meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff sometimes ate while driving between job locations or while continuing to perform work-related duties. Plaintiff also sometimes worked shifts exceeding ten hours and was not provided compliant second meal periods. Plaintiff was also sometimes unable to take compliant rest periods because he continued driving, hiking, locating power poles, inspecting power lines, and completing assigned job duties. After a review of Plaintiff's paystubs, Defendant never paid Plaintiff a single meal or rest break premium.

Further, Defendant sometimes failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Plaintiff was a non-exempt hourly employee and sometimes worked more than eight hours in a day, more than forty hours in a workweek, and, on some occasions, worked shifts lasting up to approximately sixteen hours. Plaintiff was not paid the legally required overtime and double time wages. Plaintiff's wage statements reflect regular hourly pay and, in some pay periods, drive time paid at Plaintiff's hourly rate, but do not reflect overtime wages despite Plaintiff working overtime hours. Defendant also paid Plaintiff a non-discretionary bonus incentive wage

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

during the PAGA Period, including a $5,000.00 incentive payment reflected on Plaintiff's wage statements. To the extent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked overtime during pay periods in which the non-discretionary bonus incentive wage was earned, Defendant failed to pay overtime at the correct regular rate of pay because the non-discretionary bonus incentive wage should have been included in the regular rate calculation.

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed during employment, including unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premium wages. Because Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages and premiums when due, Defendant failed to timely pay all compensation required under California law.

Defendant failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were paid on an hourly basis, and their wage statements should have accurately reflected all applicable hourly rates, all hours worked, gross wages earned, net wages earned, and all minimum, overtime, and premium wages owed. However, because Defendant failed to pay overtime wages and meal and rest period premiums, Plaintiff's wage statements did not accurately identify all wages earned or all applicable rates of pay.

Additionally, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other formerly employed Aggrieved Employees all wages owed upon separation, including unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. As a result, Plaintiff and other formerly employed Aggrieved Employees are entitled to waiting time penalties.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Elizabeth Novel Cefalu*
Elizabeth Novel Cefalu, Esq.

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **novel@bamlawca.com**
WRITERS EXT: (858)-336-6865

July 9, 2026
CA3952

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Hiline Nation, LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052704052147628
1505 Corporation
Sandra Menjivar
500 N BRAND BLVD,
SUITE #890
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of David Szep ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC. Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC in California, including any employees staffed with Electrical Consultants, Inc. and/or HiLine Nation, LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 9, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from approximately March of 2021 through May of 2026. Plaintiff was employed as a non-exempt employee in the construction industry and was paid on an hourly basis. Plaintiff's job duties included

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

driving throughout San Diego County and other California locations in a company truck, locating assigned pole numbers and coordinates, hiking to power line locations, inspecting power poles, taking photographs, organizing job packets, and uploading inspection information and files from home at the end of the day. Plaintiff was assigned job packets and was required to complete the inspection work connected to those assignments.

During the PAGA Period, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone for work-related communications with coworkers and/or supervisors. Plaintiff also used his personal home internet to complete required computer work, including uploading work-related files and inspection information after returning home. Even though some wage statements reflect a "Phone Reim" line, Plaintiff was not fully reimbursed for the reasonable expenses he incurred for required personal cell phone and home internet use.

Defendant also occasionally failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with compliant meal periods and rest periods in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Plaintiff did not have a traditional clock-in or clock-out system. Instead, Plaintiff entered his time digitally, generally after returning home. Plaintiff was required to drive directly to job sites, hike in the field to locate power poles, inspect the poles, take photographs, travel to the next location, and then return home to upload his work. Due to the field-based nature of Plaintiff's work, Plaintiff was sometimes unable to take compliant, duty-free meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work. Plaintiff sometimes ate while driving between job locations or while continuing to perform work-related duties. Plaintiff also sometimes worked shifts exceeding ten hours and was not provided compliant second meal periods. Plaintiff was also sometimes unable to take compliant rest periods because he continued driving, hiking, locating power poles, inspecting power lines, and completing assigned job duties. After a review of Plaintiff's paystubs, Defendant never paid Plaintiff a single meal or rest break premium.

Further, Defendant sometimes failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Plaintiff was a non-exempt hourly employee and sometimes worked more than eight hours in a day, more than forty hours in a workweek, and, on some occasions, worked shifts lasting up to approximately sixteen hours. Plaintiff was not paid the legally required overtime and double time wages. Plaintiff's wage statements reflect regular hourly pay and, in some pay periods, drive time paid at Plaintiff's hourly rate, but do not reflect overtime wages despite Plaintiff working

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

overtime hours. Defendant also paid Plaintiff a non-discretionary bonus incentive wage during the PAGA Period, including a $5,000.00 incentive payment reflected on Plaintiff's wage statements. To the extent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees worked overtime during pay periods in which the non-discretionary bonus incentive wage was earned, Defendant failed to pay overtime at the correct regular rate of pay because the non-discretionary bonus incentive wage should have been included in the regular rate calculation.

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages owed during employment, including unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premium wages. Because Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages and premiums when due, Defendant failed to timely pay all compensation required under California law.

Defendant failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were paid on an hourly basis, and their wage statements should have accurately reflected all applicable hourly rates, all hours worked, gross wages earned, net wages earned, and all minimum, overtime, and premium wages owed. However, because Defendant failed to pay overtime wages and meal and rest period premiums, Plaintiff's wage statements did not accurately identify all wages earned or all applicable rates of pay.

Additionally, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other formerly employed Aggrieved Employees all wages owed upon separation, including unpaid overtime wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. As a result, Plaintiff and other formerly employed Aggrieved Employees are entitled to waiting time penalties.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037
Web Site: www.bamlawca.com
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Elizabeth Novel Cefalu*
Elizabeth Novel Cefalu, Esq.