

LAW OFFICES OF ANGEL J. HORACEK, PC
Angel J. Horacek (SBN 245680)
angel@horaceklaw.com
Iryll Robbins-Umel (SBN 249562)
iryll@horaceklaw.com
5701 West Slauson Avenue, Suite 210
Culver City, CA 90230
310-774-0323
310-774-3945 fax

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lillian Sogar,
individually, and on behalf of Aggrieved
Employees pursuant to the California
Private Attorney General Act

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE – CIVIL COMPLEX CENTER

LILLIAN SOGAR, individually, and on
behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to
the California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SECURITY SCORECARD, INC., and DOES
1 to 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 30-2024-01412162-CU-OE-CXC

**COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT
ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CAL.
LABOR CODE §§ 2698 *ET SEQ.***

Assigned for All Purposes:
Judge Lon F. Hurwitz
Dept. CX103

1 Plaintiff LILLIAN SOGAR (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of all similarly
2 aggrieved employees, alleges against defendants SECURITY SCORECARD, INC. and DOES 1
3 to 20, (“Defendants”) as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is an enforcement action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys
6 General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, et seq. (“PAGA”) to recover civil
7 penalties on behalf of Plaintiff, the State of California, and all individuals who worked for
8 Defendants in the State of California as hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees at any time
9 from one year prior to Plaintiff’s submission of written notice of Defendants’ alleged violations
10 of the Labor Code to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) through final
11 judgment (“Aggrieved Employees”).

12 2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants hired Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees but
13 failed to properly pay them all wages owed for all time worked (including minimum wages,
14 straight time wages, and overtime wages), failed to provide them with all meal periods and rest
15 periods and associated premium wages to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay them all
16 wages due during their employment, failed to timely pay them all wages due upon termination of
17 their employment, failed to provide them with accurate itemized wage statements, failed to
18 maintain accurate payroll records, facilitated erroneous personnel records, and failed to
19 reimburse them for necessary business expenses.

20 3. As a result, Defendants violated *inter alia* California Labor Code sections 201,
21 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194, 1197,
22 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage
23 Order. Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to recover all available remedies under PAGA
24 including but not limited to civil penalties and attorney’s fees and costs.

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California
27 Constitution, Article VI, section 10. The statutes under which this action is brought do not
28 specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

5. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are either citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally availed themselves of the California market to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. Further, no federal question is at issue because the claims asserted herein are based solely on California law.

6. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of Orange. Moreover, many of the acts, events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiff occurred in the State of California, County of Orange.

THE PARTIES

7. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff LILLIAN SOGAR was and is a resident of Orange County in the State of California. Plaintiff was also employed by Defendants in Orange County in the State of California.

8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant SECURITY SCORECARD, INC. was and is, upon information and belief, at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer whose employees are employed throughout Orange County and the State of California.

9. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 to 20 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the complaint and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to Defendants, each acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others' behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants represent and were in accordance with Defendants' official policy.

11. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or

1 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
2 Plaintiff to make each of said Defendants employers and therefore liable under the statutory
3 provisions set forth herein.

4 12. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
5 Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing their employment, and to supervise their
6 daily employment activities.

7 13. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
8 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be their joint employers.

9 14. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the
10 Aggrieved Employees.

11 15. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within
12 the State of California.

13 16. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified the acts and
14 omissions complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and
15 abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the
16 damages herein alleged.

17 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said
18 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts,
19 omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

20 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

21 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, engaged Plaintiff from approximately
22 September 2023 to November 2023 as an "independent contractor." During Plaintiff's
23 employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was employed as a coordinator working remotely in
24 Anaheim, California 92806.

25 19. Defendants employed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees but failed to
26 properly pay them all overtime wages and minimum wages for all hours worked, failed to
27 provide all meal and rest breaks to which they were entitled, failed to timely pay all wages upon
28 termination of employment, failed to provide accurate wage statements, failed to keep accurate

1 employment records, facilitated erroneous personnel records, failed to reimburse necessary
2 business-related expenses, and failed to adhere to other related protections by the California
3 Labor Code and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order.

4 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
5 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to the
6 protections afforded by the Labor Code and the applicable Wage Order, yet as set forth in detail
7 below, engaged in a systematic pattern and practice of violating the California Labor Code and
8 the applicable Wage Order.

9 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

10 21. PAGA is and was applicable to Defendants' employment of Plaintiff and
11 Aggrieved Employees.

12 22. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that
13 provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and
14 collected by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be
15 recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
16 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California
17 Labor Code section 2699.3.

18 23. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an "aggrieved employee,"
19 who is any person employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the alleged
20 violations was committed.

21 24. Plaintiff and the other employees are "Aggrieved Employees" as defined by
22 California Labor Code section 2699(c) because they are current or former employees of
23 Defendants against whom one of more of the alleged violations were committed.

24 25. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved
25 employee, including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following
26 requirements have been met:

- 27 a) The Aggrieved Employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
28 "Employee's Notice") to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of

1 the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
2 support the alleged violations.

- 3 b) The LWDA shall provide notice ("LWDA Response") to the employer and the
4 aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the
5 alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of the postmark date of the
6 Employee's Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA Response, or if the LWDA
7 Response is not provided within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date
8 of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action
9 pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in
10 addition to any other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

11 26. On April 30, 2024, Plaintiff provided notice by electronic submission to the
12 LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the Labor Code
13 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
14 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3. A true and correct copy of the Employee's Notice is
15 attached hereto as Exhibit A.

16 27. Plaintiff did not receive a LWDA Response within sixty-five calendar days of
17 providing the Employee's Notice.

18 28. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
19 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for
20 violations of *inter alia* California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.3,
21 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802 have
22 been satisfied.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2699, ET SEQ.

25 (Against All Defendants)

26 29. Plaintiff incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
27 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

28 30. Plaintiff brings this action on an individual basis and on a representative basis on

1 behalf of other Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, in Plaintiff's capacity as a
2 private attorney general pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor
3 Code § 2698, *et seq.*

4 31. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties
5 for violations of the Labor Code as follows: "*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any*
6 *provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor*
7 *and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,*
8 *agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through*
9 *a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current*
10 *or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.*" Cal. Lab. Code §
11 2699(a).

12 32. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
13 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is
14 authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to
15 assess a civil penalty.

16 33. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are "Aggrieved
17 Employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or
18 former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed
19 against them.

20 34. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the
21 California Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 22 a) Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay
23 overtime wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 24 b) Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to
25 pay minimum wages, as set forth more fully below;
- 26 c) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
27 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 28 d) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay

- 1 required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully below;
- 2 e) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally
- 3 required rest periods, as set forth more fully below;
- 4 f) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest
- 5 period premiums, as set forth more fully below;
- 6 g) Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to
- 7 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during employment, as set forth more fully
- 8 below;
- 9 h) Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all
- 10 wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully below;
- 11 i) Violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate
- 12 wage statements to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully
- 13 below;
- 14 j) Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete and
- 15 accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth
- 16 more fully below; and
- 17 k) Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
- 18 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses, as set
- 19 forth more fully below.

20 35. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3, and

21 2699.5, Plaintiff, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seek assessment and

22 collection of civil penalties for Plaintiff, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California

23 against Defendants for violations of Labor Code sections set forth herein, including penalties

24 under California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 1174.5, and 1197.1,

25 penalties under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and

26 remedies as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

27 36. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by

28 Aggrieved Employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the LWDA

1 for the enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights
2 and responsibilities and twenty-five (25%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

3 37. Plaintiff retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the
4 civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff therefore seeks an award of reasonable attorney's
5 fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable
6 statute.

7 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

8 38. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide that the minimum
9 wage for employees fixed by the IWC is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the
10 payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

11 39. The IWC set the minimum wage for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the
12 applicable IWC Wage Order.

13 40. Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
14 Employees for a wide range of off-the-clock work performed, including, *inter alia*: (1) accepting
15 work, addressing work-related issues, and handling scheduling and appointments prior to
16 clocking in; (2) working through required meal periods while clocked out to provide customer
17 service and to perform typical job duties; (3) assisting individuals after clocking out; and (4)
18 responding to text messages and emails in between shifts.

19 41. Moreover, Defendants had a policy, practice, and procedure of rounding
20 employee time such that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were systematically unpaid and/or
21 underpaid for time worked over the course of their employment.

22 42. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to
23 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor
24 Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

25 **Failure to Pay Straight Time**

26 43. California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 provide that employees be paid for
27 the hours worked.

28 44. Defendants failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Plaintiff and

1 Aggrieved Employees. Defendants also had a policy, practice, and procedure of rounding
2 employee time such that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were systematically unpaid and/or
3 underpaid for time worked over the course of their employment.

4 45. Accordingly, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees
5 for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Defendants violated the applicable
6 IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510. As to misclassified employees,
7 Defendants further violated California Labor Code section 226.8.

8 **Failure to Pay Proper Overtime Wages**

9 46. Labor Code section 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require Defendants
10 to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who worked more than eight (8) hours in a day; more
11 than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and/or seven (7) consecutive days, at the rate of one-and-a-
12 half times their regular rate for all such hours worked.

13 47. Labor Code section 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further requires
14 Defendants to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who worked more than twelve (12) hours
15 in a day or more than eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day, overtime compensation at a
16 rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay for all such hours worked.

17 48. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees regularly
18 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of
19 forty (40) hours in a workweek and/or for seven (7) or more consecutive days, but Defendants
20 routinely failed to properly account for all such overtime hours and further failed to compensate
21 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the correct overtime rates.

22 49. Defendants' failure to pay correct overtime wages included, *inter alia*: (a) when
23 the combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed *supra* and the on-the-clock work exceed
24 the number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime wages under Labor Code sections 510
25 and/or the applicable Wage Order; (b) when Defendants intentionally, willfully, and/or
26 negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight time, or double time as time-and-a-half; (c)
27 when Defendants assigned more work than could reasonably be completed in a workday or
28 workweek to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, but refused to authorize the overtime necessary

1 for them to complete the assigned work; and (d) when Defendants failed to include all required
2 wages and renumeration when calculating the overtime rate.

3 50. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper overtime
4 compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor Code
5 section 510, and is therefore unlawful.

6 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

7 51. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an
8 employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable IWC Order.

9 52. California Labor Code section 512(a) provides that an employer may not require,
10 cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without
11 providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the
12 total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be
13 waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

14 53. California Labor Code section 512(a) further provides that an employer may not
15 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the
16 employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours
17 worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of
18 the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

19 54. The applicable IWC Wage Order sets forth the same requirements for meal
20 breaks.

21 55. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were scheduled to work for no longer
22 than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual
23 consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without a meal period of
24 not less than thirty (30) minutes.

25 56. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees who were scheduled to work for more
26 than six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an
27 uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

28 57. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for more

1 than ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally
2 mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours
3 without receiving a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

4 58. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, who were scheduled to work for more
5 than twelve (12) hours, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without a
6 second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

7 59. Moreover, when meal breaks were provided, they were often interrupted, cut
8 short, and/or Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not relieved of all duties as required by
9 law.

10 60. Such conduct violates California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the
11 applicable IWC Wage Order.

12 **Failure to Pay Compliant Meal Break Premiums**

13 61. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides: “[i]f an employer fails to provide
14 an employee a [meal] period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an
15 applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
16 Commission... the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's
17 regular rate of compensation for each workday that the [meal] period is not provided.

18 62. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides: “[i]f an employer fails to provide an
19 employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer
20 shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for
21 each workday that the meal period is not provided.”

22 63. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees meal period
23 premiums due in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 on each day when a
24 complete, timely, and uninterrupted meal period of at least thirty (30) minutes was not provided.

25 64. Moreover, if and when meal break premiums were provided, Defendants failed to
26 incorporate all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
27 Employees in the regular rate of compensation for purposes of such premiums.

28 65. Defendants’ conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California

1 Labor Code section 226.7.

2 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods**

3 66. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an
4 employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

5 67. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize
6 and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle
7 of each work period” and that the “rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily
8 at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless
9 the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

10 68. Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work four (4) or
11 more hours without authorizing or permitting a timely ten (10) minute uninterrupted rest period
12 during which time they were relieved of their duties per each four (4) hour period, or major
13 fraction thereof worked.

14 69. Defendants’ conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and
15 California Labor Code section 226.7.

16 **Failure to Pay Rest Break Premiums**

17 70. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides: “[i]f an employer fails to provide
18 an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not
19 limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial
20 Welfare Commission, ... the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the
21 employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the [rest] period is not provided.

22 71. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides: “[i]f an employer fails to provide an
23 employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer
24 shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for
25 each workday that the rest period is not provided.

26 72. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees required rest break
27 premiums due when compliant rest periods were not provided.

28 73. Such conduct is in direct violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

2 74. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person
3 in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than
4 those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the
5 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed. It further provides all wages
6 earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any
7 calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and
8 payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

9 75. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in
10 excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular
11 payroll period.

12 76. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to
13 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due to them, within any time period
14 permissible under California Labor Code section 204, including wages for overtime
15 compensation, minimum wage compensation, meal period premiums, and rest period premiums.

16 77. Such conduct violates Labor Code section 204.

17 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

18 78. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are
19 required to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged.

20 79. California Labor Code section 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an
21 employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and
22 payable immediately.

23 80. California Labor Code section 202 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her
24 wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the
25 employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case
26 the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

27 81. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to
28 pay, in accordance with California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, any wages of an employee

1 who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the
2 due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced; but the
3 wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

4 82. At the time that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' employment with
5 Defendants ended, Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees all wages owed to them pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201 and 202,
7 including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period
8 premium wages.

9 83. Such conduct violates Labor Code sections 201, 202 and 203.

10 **Failure to Provide Compliant Wage Statements**

11 84. California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish
12 each of its employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned,
13 (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
14 applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided
15 that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one
16 item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid,
17 (7) the name of the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of
18 the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
19 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

20 85. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete
21 and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state
22 all correct rates of pay, all hours worked, all meal period premium wages earned, and all rest
23 period premium wages earned.

24 86. Such conduct violates Labor Code section 226.

25 **Failure to Keep Requisite Payroll Records**

26 87. California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep at a central
27 location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll
28 records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate

1 units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective
2 plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this
3 purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years.

4 88. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to keep accurate and complete
5 payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid to Plaintiff and the
6 Aggrieved Employees.

7 89. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d),
8 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily
9 protected rights.

10 90. More specifically, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been injured by
11 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) because
12 they were denied both their legal right and protected interest, in having available, accurate and
13 complete payroll records pursuant to California Labor Code section 1174(d).

14 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses**

15 91. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
16 reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
17 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her job
18 duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

19 92. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related
20 expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including, but not limited to
21 the usage of personal cell phones/internet usage for work-related purposes as well as laptops and
22 vehicles for work related purposes.

23 93. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the
24 Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business-related expenses and costs.

25 94. Such conduct violates Labor Code sections 2802.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **Misclassification Of Non-Exempt Employees As Independent Contractors**

2 95. California Labor Code section 226.8 makes it unlawful for an employer to
3 willfully misclassify an individual as an independent contractor.

4 96. Defendants misclassified Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees as independent
5 contractors in violation of Labor Code 226.8, paying them without payroll, and thereby depriving
6 them of wage statements and other protections afforded to non-exempt employees under
7 California law, including, *inter alia*, the allegations described herein.

8 97. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not free from Defendants' control or
9 direction in connection with the performance of their work, the work they performed was not
10 outside the usual course of Defendants' business, and Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
11 Employees were not customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or
12 business of the same nature as the work performed for Employers. See *Dynamex Operations*
13 *West, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903 (adopting the "ABC" test for determining
14 whether a worker is an independent contractor rather than an employee and placing the burden of
15 proof on an employer to prove each factor); California Labor Code §2775 (codifying the "ABC"
16 test into law).

17 98. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees qualify as employees pursuant to the holding
18 in *S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Dept. of Industrial Relations* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 341 and California
19 Labor Code section 2775(b)(3).

20 99. Therefore, Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.8 and 2775 et
21 seq by willfully misclassifying Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees as independent
22 contractors.

23 **Unlawful Employment Condition**

24 100. California Labor Code Section 432.5 prohibits any employer from requiring any
25 employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is
26 known by the employer to be prohibited by law.

27 101. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved
28 Employees, whether then considered current employees or not, and applicants to sign agreements

1 which, among other terms prohibited by law, unlawfully misclassified them as independent
2 contractors.

3 102. Therefore, Defendants violated California Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring
4 that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees sign independent contractor agreements prohibited by
5 California law.

6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

7 Plaintiff prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
8 follows:

- 9 1. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699,
10 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 226.8, 1174.5, 1197.1 and all other penalties allowed by the
11 California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes;
12 2. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to sections 210, 218.5 and
13 2699(g)(1) of California Labor Code; and
14 3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

15
16 DATED: July 8, 2024

LAW OFFICES OF ANGEL J. HORACEK, PC

17
18 

19 _____
20 Angel J. Horacek
Iryll Robbins-Umel

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Lillian Sogar, individually,
22 and on behalf of Aggrieved Employees pursuant to
23 the California Private Attorney General Act
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

April 30, 2024

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: *Lillian Sogar v. SecurityScorecard, Inc.*

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Lillian Sogar (“Claimant”) with respect to her claims under the California Labor Code against SecurityScorecard, Inc. (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employer employed Claimant from approximately September through November 2023. Claimant was misclassified as an independent contractor and should have been classified as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. During Claimant’s employment with Employer, Claimant was employed as a coordinator, working remotely in Anaheim, California. Claimant performed various duties for Employer including coordinating applicant and employee communications, scheduling interviews, and related administrative tasks. Employer provides IT Security services and maintains employees throughout California, including in Orange County.

Employers misclassified Claimant and the other Aggrieved Employees as independent contractors, whom should have been classified as employees because, *inter alia*, they were not free from Employers’ control or direction in connection with the performance of their work, the work they performed was not outside the usual course of Employers’ business, and Claimant and the other Aggrieved Employees were not customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed for Employers. *See Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903 (adopting the “ABC” test for determining whether a worker is an independent contractor rather than an employee and placing the burden of proof on an employer to prove each factor); California Labor Code §2775 (codifying the “ABC” test into law).

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of Claimant and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees misclassified as independent contractors who worked for Employers in the

State of California during the relevant statutory period (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 558, 558.1, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”).

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee’s regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee’s regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock including, among other things, prior to clocking-in and/or after clocking-out for their shifts. In particular, Employers failed to properly record the hours worked by the aggrieved employees. On information and belief, Employers have adopted uniform policy and practices that violate the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders by not properly tracking Aggrieved Employees time, thus intentionally depriving Aggrieved Employees of proper pay. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, regular rate/straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198. As to misclassified employees, Employers further violated California Labor Code section 226.8.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id.*

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete, and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and

refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code §226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code §226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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, Employers failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, regular rate/straight time wages, minimum wages, overtime compensation, meal and rest period premiums, and any other remuneration, wages, pay, or monies as they became due (*e.g.*, accrued gratuities, bonuses, commissions, etc.). Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock and any other time not recorded in the first place), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and for any other time not recorded in the first place, as well as meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

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, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period, in addition to any number of other records not maintained relating to Aggrieved Employees who were misclassified. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the usage of personal cell phones and wireless internet related thereto, as well as the purchase of computers and internet or related applications and related internet – all for necessary, work-related purposes.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all regular rate/straight time wages, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other remuneration, wages, pay, and monies (*e.g.*, accrued gratuities, bonuses, commissions, etc.) due. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. MISCLASSIFICATION OF NON-EXEMPT EMPLOYEES AS INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

California Labor Code section 226.8 makes it unlawful for an employer to willfully misclassify an individual as an independent contractor. California Labor Code section 226.8 permits Claimant to recover civil penalties on behalf of the Labor Commissioner for each violation, in addition to any other penalties or fines permitted by law.

During the relevant time period, Employers misclassified Claimant and Aggrieved Employees as independent contractors in violation of Labor Code 226.8, paying them without payroll, and thereby depriving them of wage statements and other protections afforded to non-exempt employees under California law, including, *inter alia*, the allegations described herein. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not free from Employers' control or direction in connection with the performance of their work, the work they performed was not outside the usual course of Employers' business, and Claimant and the other Aggrieved Employees were not customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed for Employers. *See Dynamex Operations West, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2018) 4 Cal.5th 903 (adopting the "ABC" test for determining whether a worker is an independent contractor rather than an employee and placing the burden of proof on an employer to prove each factor); California Labor Code §2775 (codifying the "ABC" test into law). Alternatively, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees qualify as employees pursuant to the holding in *S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Dept. of Industrial Relations* (1989) 48 Cal.3d 341 and California Labor Code section 2775(b)(3). Therefore, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 226.8 and 2775 *et seq* by willfully misclassifying Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees as independent contractors.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant California Labor Code section 2699 *et seq*; penalties under Labor Code Section 226.8; and attorneys' fees and costs.

10. UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT CONDITION

California Labor Code section 432.5 prohibits any employer from requiring any employee or applicant for employment to agree, in writing, to any term or condition which is known by the employer to be prohibited by law.

During the relevant time period, Employers required Claimant and Aggrieved Employees, whether then considered current employees or not, and applicants to sign agreements which, among other terms prohibited by law, unlawfully misclassified them as independent contractors. Therefore, Employers violated California Labor Code section 432.5 by requiring that Claimant and Aggrieved Employees sign independent contractor agreements prohibited by California law.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant California Labor Code section 2699 *et seq* and attorneys' fees and costs.

11. EMPLOYER'S OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 (“*Huff*”), as an Aggrieved Employee, Claimant has standing, and intends to pursue civil penalties on behalf of the LWDA against Employers for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employers. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against Employer for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Claimant, as an “aggrieved” employee affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby does, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for all Labor Code violations by Employer.

Employers are in direct violation of numerous California wage and hour laws including but not limited to said sections stated above. Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code §2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code §2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code §2699. Cal. Lab. Code §2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant’s intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code §2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers’ alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours truly,
LAW OFFICES OF ANGEL J. HORACEK, PC


Angel J. Horacek
Iryll Robbins-Umel

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
Ben Yeamans, Associate General Counsel
SecurityScorecard, Inc.
1140 Avenue of the Americas, Floor 19
New York, NY 10036