

March 24, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION AND MAIL:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Herc Rentals, Inc.

27500 Riverview Center Blvd.
Bonita Springs, FL 34134
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 6551 9575 10

Herc Rentals, Inc.

1505 Corporation CT CORPORATION SYSTEM, Agent for Service of Process
330 N. Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 6551 9512 59

LWDA Case No.: LWDA-CM-1004498-24

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* Penalties – Second Amended PAGA Notice Letter to the
LWDA Victor Manuel Ramirez, *et al.* v. Herc Rentals, Inc., *et al.***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiffs Victor Manuel Ramirez and Norman Wishteyah (“Plaintiffs”) and other similarly situated aggrieved employees (collectively “Aggrieved Employees”) for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* (“the Act”). Unless specified below, Plaintiffs would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated, Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, Herc Rentals, Inc., and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act. We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The Second Amended Class Action Complaint, filed earlier, provides the details of Plaintiffs’ class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It,



along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as non-exempt hourly employees in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present (Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees”). However, with regard to the allegations under Labor Code § 226(a) *only*, Plaintiffs expand the scope and definition of the Aggrieved Employees to all employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants’ payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants’ control. Plaintiffs contend this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Next, Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work duties prior to clocking in, including: helping customers who were waiting at the gate upon arrival to work; unloading trucks; and booting up their work computers, as well as the ADP software, in order to clock in. Aggrieved Employees were also required to keep working after clocking out from their shifts, including having to answer phone calls and reviewing and replying to dispatches for the next work day.

Additionally, Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to work through their unpaid meal periods, including having to perform work related duties, unload trucks, as well as keep and monitor company-issued radios throughout their unpaid meal periods.

Aggrieved Employees were also required to be on call every other weekend. Defendants required that Aggrieved Employees take their work cellular phones with them at the end of the workweek and monitor them constantly throughout the weekend. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to remain within a 30-mile radius from the place of their employment during the weekends when they were on call. On multiple occasions, Aggrieved Employees received and responded to work-related telephone calls during the weekends when they were on call.

This uncompensated time caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10) and/or twelve (12) hours a day and/or forty (40) hours a week, entitling Aggrieved Employees to minimum and overtime wages, which they were systemically denied.



Defendants also failed to Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees earned commissions, and performance-based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Aggrieved Employees' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take a second timely meal period prior to the completion of their tenth hour of work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks including having to carry and monitor their radios and walkie-talkies during their meal and rest periods. This policy cause both the interruption and the shortening of the meal and rest periods that Aggrieved Employees were entitled to in accordance with California law.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights, and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take rest breaks in compliance with the California Law. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload, including monitoring their radios and walkie-talkies.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay wages at their appropriate regular rates of pay for each meal and rest period denied.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate wage statements as mandated by law pursuant to Labor Code section 226. Specifically, Defendants failed to issue wage statements as "a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing." Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees were not recorded in "ink or other indelible form."

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(1) as "gross wages earned" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(2) as "total hours worked by the employee" were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not



included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(5) as “net wages earned” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(8) as the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to state “the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.” Defendants failed to comply with Labor Code section 226(a)(9) as “all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee” were not accurately reflected in that: all hours worked, including overtime, were not included.

Furthermore, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paper pay stubs as required by Labor Code § 226, applicable Wage Orders, and DLSE Opinion Letters. Plaintiffs’ and Aggrieved Employees’ wage statement were only provided in electronic format in violation of Labor Code § 226.

Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for business expenses incurred in executing their duties under Defendant’s employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cellular phone for work-related activities prior to the issuance of work cell phones several months into their employment with Defendants. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses.

Finally, Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the Class Action Complaint, the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:¹

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states, “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.

¹ Plaintiff hereby reserves the right to seek penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, for Defendants’ violations of the applicable provisions of the Labor Code, suffered by Aggrieved Employees, but not directly suffered by Plaintiff under *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.



In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “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.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages and overtime for all hours worked, at the proper rates of pay. First, Defendants implemented an unlawful time-rounding policy and practice which rounded down and reduced the actual working hours recorded by Aggrieved Employees, and upon which their pay was based, and generally did so to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees, and these unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants’ payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created. Defendants did so with the ostensible intent of paying Aggrieved Employees only for the hours they were scheduled to work, rather than the hours they were actually under Defendants’ control. Plaintiffs contend this policy is not neutral and results, over time, to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees by systematically undercompensating them.

Next, Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to perform work, off-the-clock, for which they were not paid wages. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work duties prior to clocking in, including: helping customers who were waiting at the gate upon arrival to work; unloading trucks; and booting up their work computers, as well as the ADP software, in order to clock in. Aggrieved Employees were also required to keep working after clocking out



from their shifts, including having to answer phone calls and reviewing and replying to dispatches for the next work day.

Additionally, Defendants required Aggrieved Employees to work through their unpaid meal periods, including having to perform work related duties, unload trucks, as well as keep and monitor company-issued radios throughout their unpaid meal periods.

Aggrieved Employees were also required to be on call every other weekend. Defendants required that Aggrieved Employees take their work cellular phones with them at the end of the workweek and monitor them constantly throughout the weekend. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to remain within a 30-mile radius from the place of their employment during the weekends when they were on call. On multiple occasions, Aggrieved Employees received and responded to work-related telephone calls during the weekends when they were on call.

Defendants have the ability to pay minimum and overtime wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Aggrieved Employees.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). The other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve (12) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above caused Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of eight (8), ten (10), and twelve



(12) hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders.

Defendants also failed to Aggrieved Employees overtime wages at the proper and applicable regular rates of pay. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees earned commissions, and performance-based non-discretionary bonuses in addition to their hourly pay. However, these supplemental earnings were not accounted for when determining Aggrieved Employees' regular rates of pay, and respective and proper overtime rates of pay.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of 8, 10, and 12 hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).



Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically denying Aggrieved Employees the opportunity to take meal periods in compliance with California Law. Specifically, due to understaffing and heavy workloads, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take timely meal periods prior to the completion of their fifth hour of work. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were denied the opportunity to take a second timely meal period prior to the completion of their tenth hour of work. Furthermore, Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all work duties during unpaid meal periods and were required to keep working during meal breaks including having to carry and monitor their radios and walkie-talkies during their meal and rest periods. This policy cause both the interruption and the shortening of the meal and rest periods that Aggrieved Employees were entitled to in accordance with California law.

Aggrieved Employees were not provided with meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for each five (5) hour work period due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each meal period as part of each work shift; and (2) no formal written meal policy that encouraged employees to take their meal periods, or that advised Aggrieved Employees of their meal and rest period rights, and and (3) Defendants' practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their meal and rest periods due to the excessive workload.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were not provided with rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour work period, or major fraction thereof, due to (1) Defendants' policy of not scheduling each rest period as part of each work shift, including second rest breaks for shifts of six (6) hours or more; (2) no formal compliant written rest period policy that encouraged employees to take their rest periods, or that properly advised Aggrieved Employees of their rest period rights; (3) Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to continue working through their rest breaks due to the excessive workload, including monitoring their radios and walkie-talkies.



Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Proper Sick Time Pay in Violation of Labor Code § 246

Labor Code Section 246 affords an employee “who works in California for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment [] paid sick days . . . of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked” and “no less than 24 hours of accrued sick leave or paid time off by the 120th calendar day of employment or each calendar year, or in each 12-month period.”

Defendants had a common policy and practice of systemically failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees the requisite sick time pay in accordance with California Law. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees worked for Defendants for more than 30 days, but were not paid at least one hour of sick pay for every 30 hours of work, or at least 3 days of sick time for every 12 month period of work.

Therefore, Aggrieved Employees are owed the unpaid balance of said wages pursuant to the Wage order according to proof at trial, interest pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6 and 1194(a).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have consistently required Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cellular phone for work-related activities prior to the issuance of work cell phones several months into their employment with Defendants. Aggrieved Employees were not reimbursed for these necessary work-related expenses in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiffs seek all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and



2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks. Additionally, the wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to provide for the legal name and address of the employing entity, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(8)

Additionally, for the purposes of Subsection (a)(9), Plaintiffs seek to expand the scope of the Aggrieved Employees she seeks to represent to extend to all individuals employed by Defendants during the applicable period. The wage statements issued to Aggrieved Employees failed to state all applicable hourly rates for which Aggrieved Employees were paid as required by Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are 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) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3,



which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to “a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...”

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants’ systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work, Plaintiffs were not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours he worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that he was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants’ uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2),



and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*



Plaintiffs' PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the Class Action Complaint, Plaintiffs will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

The Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.*, and 2802, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked, failure to pay proper reporting time and sick pay under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 223, 227.3, 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit them to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";



(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5 and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter and the attached Complaint therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiffs allege have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David Keledjian', written over a horizontal line.

David Keledjian

Cc: Herc Rentals, Inc., by Certified Mail