

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
SHELBY MINER (SBN 318338)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Sacramento

04/16/2024

By: A. Mocanu Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

ARTHUR ROPER, individually, and on
behalf of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

NORTH STATE ELECTRICAL
CONTRACTORS, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: **24CV007543**

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
§ 2698 *et seq.* (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

1 Plaintiff ARTHUR ROPER ("Plaintiff") hereby submits his Complaint against
2 Defendant NORTH STATE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS, INC., and DOES 1 through
3 100, inclusive; (collectively, "Defendants"), on behalf of himself and other current and former
4 aggrieved employees of Defendants for penalties as follows:

5
6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This representative action brought pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*
8 (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA")) for Defendants' violations of Labor
9 Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194,
10 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

11 2. This Complaint challenges Defendants' systemic illegal employment
12 practices resulting in violations of the stated provisions of the Labor Code against the identified
13 group of employees.

14 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
15 jointly and severally acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious
16 disregard to the rights of all employees in (1) failing to pay all meal period wages and rest break
17 wages, (2) failing to properly calculate and pay all minimum and overtime wages, (3) failing to
18 provide accurate wage statements, (4) failing to pay all wages due and owing during
19 employment and upon termination of employment, and (5) failing to reimburse all necessary
20 business expenses.

21 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

22 4. This action is brought pursuant to PAGA. The civil penalties sought by
23 Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established
24 according to proof at trial.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California
2 Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all
3 causes except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is
4 brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5 6. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of PAGA and Labor Code
6 §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226(b), 226(c), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558,
7 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800 and 2802.

8 7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information
9 and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally
10 avails itself of California law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California
11 courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12 8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the
13 named Defendants transact business and/or have offices in this county, and the acts and
14 omissions alleged herein took place in this county. Moreover, this action is brought on behalf
15 of the State of California as a private attorney general and has jurisdiction in this venue.

16
17 **PARTIES**

18 9. Plaintiff ARTHUR ROPER is an individual residing in the State of
19 California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants.

20 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are
21 licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California, including the
22 County of Los Angeles.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend the complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

13. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to PAGA and Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226(b), 226(c), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800 and 2802.

CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF PAGA

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF)

14. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 13 as though fully set forth herein.

/ / /

///

///

1 **15.** PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor
2 Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of
3 its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
4 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
5 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

6 **16.** On February 8, 2024, Plaintiff ARTHUR ROPER provided written notice
7 to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were
8 violated, and the theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and
9 incorporated by reference is a copy of the written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that
10 on or about April 15, 2024, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired, and the LWDA did
11 not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiff has exhausted
12 his administrative remedies.

13 **17.** Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are
14 “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all
15 current or former employees of Defendants who worked for Defendants at any time during the
16 period from February 8, 2023 to the present, and/or one or more of the alleged violations was
17 committed against them by Defendants at any time during the period from February 8, 2023 to
18 the present.

19 **Failure to Produce Personnel File and Payroll Records**

20 **18.** In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code § 1198.5, Defendants
21 were required to provide every current and former employee with a copy of their personnel file
22 maintained by Defendants within thirty (30) calendar days of a written request for a copy or
23 right of inspection of the same.

24 **19.** In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code § 226(b) and (c),
25 Defendants were required to provide every current and former employee with a copy of their
26 payroll records maintained by Defendants within twenty-one (21) calendar days of a written or
27 oral request for a copy or right of inspection of the same.

1 **20.** Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with a copy of his personnel file and
2 payroll records, or right to inspection of the same, within thirty (30) calendar days and twenty-
3 one (21) calendar days, respectively, of his December 18, 2023 written request for the same.

4 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

5 **21.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their
6 non-exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
7 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
8 mandate of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

9 **22.** As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and
10 other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay
11 all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

12 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

13 **23.** In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
14 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-
15 minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further
16 required to provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five
17 (5) hours worked.

18 **24.** As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other
19 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks
20 and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

21 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

22 **25.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their
23 employees within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code § 204.

24 **26.** As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
25 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time
26 period.

27 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

28. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

29. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate* records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174.

30. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

31. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide their employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code § 246.

32. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former employees with paid sick days pursuant to Labor Code § 246.

///

/ / /

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2
3
4
5

6
7
8

9

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3

4
5
6
7

8
9
0
1

2
3
4
5
6

7

39. Penalties under Labor Code § 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

40. Penalties under California Labor Code §§ 1198.5(k) and 226(f) in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code, in the amount of a seven hundred and fifty dollars (\$750) for each aggrieved employee per violation;

41. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes; and

42. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on his own behalf as an individual and as representative of other current and former aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, prays for judgment as follows:

1. Upon the Cause of Action, for civil penalties pursuant to statute as set forth in Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226(b), 226(c), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800 and 2802.

///


///

///

- 1 2. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code
2 §§ 210, 218.5, 226(h), 1194, 1198.5(l), and 2699, and any other applicable statute;
3 and
4 3. For such other and further relief the court may deem just and proper.

5
6 Dated: April 16, 2024

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

7
8 By:  _____

9 Douglas Han
10 Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
11 Shelby Miner
12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

February 8, 2024

BY U.S. MAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: NORTH STATE ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Arthur Roper against North State Electrical Contractors, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer or managing agent acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "NSEC").

Mr. Roper is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Roper may seek penalties for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

North State Electrical Contractors, Inc. is a California corporation located at 11101 White Rock Road, Rancho Cordova, California 95670.

NSEC employed Mr. Roper as an hourly-paid non-exempt Electrical Apprentice during the relevant time period in the State of California. NSEC directly controlled the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Mr. Roper's and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Roper may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency) of NSEC within the State of California.

¹ Mr. Roper does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Roper will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Roper is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Roper and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

NSEC failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly compensate minimum and overtime wages, failed to properly provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks or pay premium wages in lieu thereof, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in Labor Code violations as stated below.

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

NSEC has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a)-(c), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay time-and-a-half or double-time overtime wages and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. NSEC failed to compensate aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. NSEC also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses into aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code section 246 requires that employers provide employees with paid sick leave of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked. California Labor Code section 246(l) also requires that paid sick leave be paid at a non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment. During the relevant time period, NSEC failed to pay aggrieved employees paid sick leave that complied with California Labor Code section 246, by, for example, failing to pay paid sick leave at non-exempt employee's regular rate of pay or at a rate calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, NSEC routinely required aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with NSEC's policies and expectations and repair and install electrical systems. NSEC failed to provide coverage to aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally mandated meal and rest breaks. Lastly, NSEC failed to authorize and permit aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, NSEC failed to compensate aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed, including failing to pay premium wages at aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay.

California Labor Code section 551 states "[e]very person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest therefrom in seven." Section 552 further states "[n]o employer of labor shall cause his employees to work more than six days in seven." NSEC required aggrieved employees to work seven days in a row or more without one day's rest.

California Labor Code section 432.5 states "[n]o employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof, shall require any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by such employer, or agent, manager, superintendent, or officer thereof to be prohibited by law." NSEC required aggrieved employees to execute arbitration agreements as a condition of employment despite knowing that such agreements are prohibited under Labor Code section 432.6.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits their employment, their wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours' previous notice of their intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to their wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, NSEC failed to pay aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code sections 203 and 210.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, NSEC failed to pay aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, and is therefore liable under California Labor Code section 210.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, NSEC did not provide aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from NSEC were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by aggrieved employees, (4) all deductions for aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of their 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 aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 226(b) and 226(c) require an employer to produce an employee's payroll records upon request within 21 calendar days. California Labor Code section 1198.5 requires an employer to produce an employee's personnel file upon request within 30 calendar days. On December 18, 2023, Mr. Roper requested his payroll records and personnel file from NSEC. NSEC's deadlines to produce the requested documents were January 8, 2024, and January 17, 2024, respectively. To date, NSEC has yet to produce Mr. Roper's requested payroll records or personnel file.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. Pursuant to the code, (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, NSEC failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, NSEC did not provide aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of their job duties or in direct consequence of their obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by NSEC, including for purchasing equipment they were required to use and wear while working and using their personal cell phones and vehicles for work-related purposes.

We believe that Mr. Roper and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 221, 226(a)-(c), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 432.5, 510, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 2800, 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in question and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor Code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Roper will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of NSEC within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Legal Department
c/o North State Electrical Contractors, Inc.
4470 Duckhorn Drive
Sacramento, California 95834

Legal Department
c/o North State Electrical Contractors, Inc.
11101 White Rock Road
Rancho Cordova, California 95670

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

PROOF OF SERVICE