

AARON N. COLBY (State Bar No. 247339)
aaron@colbylegal.com
ZOE YUZNA (State Bar No. 268496)
zoe@colbylegal.com
COLBY LAW FIRM, PC
13263 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 203
Studio City, California 91604
Telephone: (818) 253-1599
Fax: (818) 475-1981

Attorneys for Plaintiff
WILLIAM FENNELL

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
9/16/2024 6:06 PM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By J. Mercer, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

WILLIAM FENNELL, an individual and as a
representative of aggrieved employees pursuant to the
Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA),

Plaintiff,

vs.

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES CORPORATION, a
corporation; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,

Defendant.

Case No. 24LBCV01994

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR:

1. **REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE**
ATTORNEY'S GENERAL ACT
ACTION PER LABOR CODE
SECTION 2698, ET SEQ.

Plaintiff William Fennell as an individual and as a representative of aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) ("Plaintiff") alleges and complains against Defendants California Resources Corporation and Does 1 through 10 (collectively, "Defendant") as follows:

PARTIES | JURISDICTION | VENUE

1. Plaintiff, at all times relevant hereto, is and has been a resident of the State of California.

2. Defendant California Resources Corporation ("Defendant") operates an organization engaged in hydrocarbon exploration in California, holding the largest privately held mineral acreage position in the state. Defendant's corporate headquarters is at 1 World Trade Center, Suite 1500 Long Beach, California 90831.¹ Defendant employs thousands of employees across California.² Defendant reported annual operating revenue for 2023 of 2,801,000,000.³

3. Defendant conducts business in the State of California.

4. Under California Code of Civil Procedure section 395(a), venue is proper in this County because Defendant resides in this County and/or Plaintiff's alleged injuries herein occurred in this County.

5. The true names and capacities of the defendants named herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff believes that all of the Doe defendants are California residents. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to show such true names and capacities when they have been determined. Defendant and Doe Defendants are collectively referred to as "Defendant," "Defendants" or "Defendant Employers."

6. Plaintiff believes that, at all times relevant herein, each defendant designated, including Does 1 through 10, was the agent, managing agent, principal, owner, partner, joint venturer, representative, manager, servant, employee, and/or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, and was at all times mentioned herein acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

///

¹ <https://www.crc.com/about-crc/default.aspx>

² <https://www.linkedin.com/company/california-resources-corporation/about/>

³ <https://dl8rn0p25nwr6d.cloudfront.net/CIK-0001609253/fc3a2dbc-99ab-4c70-99dc-ae5c930d0a.pdf>

1 7. Defendant, and each of them, acted in concert with one another to commit the wrongful
2 acts alleged herein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled and/or coerced one another in the wrongful acts
3 alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so, including pursuant to Government Code section 12940(i).
4 Defendant, and each of them, formed and executed a conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they
5 would commit the unlawful acts alleged herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and
6 pursuant to said conspiracy, intended to cause and actually causing Plaintiff harm.

7 **ALTER EGO | AGENCY | JOINT EMPLOYER**

8 8. There exists such a unity of interest and ownership between Defendant Employers that the
9 individuality and separateness of Defendant Employers have ceased to exist. At all times relevant hereto,
10 Defendant Employers, and each of them, were the agents, employees, managing agents, supervisors,
11 coconspirators, parent corporation, joint employers, alter egos, successors, and/or joint ventures of the
12 other Defendant Employers, and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least
13 in part within the course and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employer, alter ego
14 status, successor status and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other
15 Defendant Employers. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this complaint to any act or failure
16 to act by a defendant or co-defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to mean
17 the acts and/or failures to act by each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

18 9. Plaintiff believes Defendant Employers were both Plaintiff's joint employer and are liable
19 under the joint employer and single enterprise theories. *See Laird v. Capital Cities* (1998) 68 Cal.App.4th
20 727, 737-38 (four factors to prove single enterprise are "interrelation of operations, common management,
21 centralized control of labor relations, and common ownership or financial control. ... Although courts
22 consider the four factors together, they often deem centralized control of labor relations the most
23 important."); *see also Vernon v. State of California* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 114, 128 (separate entities
24 can also be deemed a "joint employer" by having the right to control the employment relationship, as
25 evaluated by focusing on "an examination of defendant's role with respect to the right to hire, fire, transfer,
26 promote, discipline, set the terms, conditions and privileges of employment, train and pay the plaintiff.").

27 10. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special
28 employers within the meaning of Government Code sections 12926 (d), 12940 (a),(h),(1), (h)(3)(A), (i),

1 and, 12950, and regularly employ five (5) or more persons and are therefore subject to the jurisdiction of
2 this Court. Defendant Employers were Plaintiff's employers, joint employers and/or special employers
3 within the meaning of the Labor Code and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Order, and are
4 each an "employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer" as such term is used in Labor Code
5 sections 558 and/or 558.1, and liable to Plaintiff on that basis. Defendant Employers are Plaintiff's joint
6 employers by virtue of a joint enterprise, and that Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant Employers.
7 Plaintiff performed services for each and every one of Defendant Employers, and to the mutual benefit
8 of all Defendant Employers, and all Defendant Employers shared control of Plaintiff as an employee,
9 either directly or indirectly, and the manner in which Defendant Employers' business was and is
10 conducted.

11 11. Labor Code section 558.1 provides that an employer or "other person acting on behalf of
12 an employer" who violates certain California wage and hour laws "may be held liable as the employer for
13 such violation." Labor Code section 558.1 defines "other person acting on behalf of an employer" as a
14 "natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent" of the employer. Labor Code
15 section 558.1(b). *See* Labor Code section 558(a) (authorizing civil penalties against "any employer or
16 other person acting on behalf of an employer" who causes overtime pay violations to occur."); *see Atempa*
17 *v. Pedrazzani*, 27 Cal.App.5th 809, 823-824 (2018); Labor Code section 1197.1 ("Any employer or other
18 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person" for failure to pay
19 minimum wages."); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089 (2005) ("aggrieved employees may
20 ... maintain civil actions to recover such penalties"); *see Reynolds v. Bement*, 36 Cal.4th 1075, 1089, fn.
21 10 (2005) (alter ego doctrine may be used in wage claim actions to impose liability on controlling directors
22 and shareholders); *see* Government Code section 12925(d) (defining "Person" as one *or more* individuals,
23 partnerships, associations, corporations, limited liability companies, legal representatives, trustees,
24 trustees in bankruptcy, and receivers or other fiduciaries).

25 12. Despite the formation of purported corporate existence, Defendant Employers are, in
26 reality, one and the same, including, but not limited to because: (a) Defendant Employers are completely
27 dominated and controlled by one another, who personally committed the frauds and violated the laws as
28 set forth in this complaint, and who have hidden and currently hide behind Defendant Employers to

1 perpetrate frauds, circumvent statutes, or accomplish some other wrongful or inequitable purpose; (b)
2 Defendant Employers derive actual and significant monetary benefits by and through one another's
3 unlawful conduct, and by using one another as the funding source for their own personal expenditures;
4 (c) Defendant Employers, while really one and the same, were segregated to appear as though separate
5 and distinct for purposes of perpetrating a fraud, circumventing a statute, or accomplishing some other
6 wrongful or inequitable purpose; (d) Defendant Employers does not comply with all requisite corporate
7 formalities to maintain a legal and separate corporate existence; (e) the business affairs of Defendant
8 Employers are, and at all times relevant were, so mixed and intermingled that the same cannot
9 reasonably be segregated, and the same are in inextricable confusion. Defendant Employers are, and at
10 all times relevant hereto were, used by one another as a mere shell and conduit for the conduct of certain
11 of Defendant Employers' affairs, and are, and were, the alter ego of one another. The recognition of
12 the separate existence of each of the Defendant Employers would not promote justice, in that it would
13 permit Defendant Employers to insulate themselves from liability to Plaintiff for violations of the law.
14 The corporate existence of Defendant Employers should each be disregarded in equity and for the ends of
15 justice because such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud and injustice to Plaintiff herein. Accordingly,
16 Defendant Employers constitute the alter ego of one another, and the fiction of their separate corporate
17 existence must be disregarded.

18 **ADMINISTRATIVE EXHAUSTION**

19 13. Plaintiff exhausted administrative requirements for Plaintiff's claims.

20 14. On July 12, 2024, Plaintiff's counsel gave written notice by online filing with the California
21 Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by sending via certified mail to Defendants a
22 letter specifying the California Labor Code provisions Defendants violated, including the facts and
23 theories supporting the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have passed since Plaintiff's
24 counsel submitted the letter to the LWDA and certified-mailed the letter to Defendants, and the LWDA
25 has not provided notice of intent to investigate the alleged violations, nor have Defendants provided notice
26 of intent or any efforts to cure. Accordingly, the statutory period for any investigation or response has
27 concluded and Plaintiff may commence this lawsuit pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as provided by
28 subsection 2699.3.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

15. **Plaintiff's Hire & Job Details.** From May 7, 2008 to January 25, 2024, Plaintiff William Fennell worked for Defendant as an employee in various non-exempt job positions, starting with Utility Worker paid \$17 per hour, and ending with Production Technician III paid \$43.17 per hour.

16. **Defendant's "On-Call" Policy.** Plaintiff's work schedule was typically Monday through Friday and sometimes weekends. Plaintiff was also "on-call." This meant Plaintiff would get phone calls from contractors and supervisors at all hours of the night, had to be within 50 miles of a specific location, and was not permitted to drink any alcohol when he was on-call. However, this on-call time was not paid. In or around January 2023, Defendant began paying one hour of overtime to hourly employees who were "on-call" regardless of the actual amount of time spent "on-call."

17. **Plaintiff Blows The Whistle On Defendant's Violation The Labor Code.** In mid-January 2024, Plaintiff questioned Defendant's overly-restrictive "on-call" policy. Plaintiff utilized Defendant's "Ask PRC" feature that encouraged employees to ask questions about problems. Plaintiff used this feature to voice concerns to Ask PRC Human Resources Member *Shawwna Edmond*.

18. Plaintiff complained to Shawwna Edmond that supervisor *Justin Narup* would unilaterally change the on-call schedule and often put Plaintiff "on-call" for seven consecutive days or more. Plaintiff complained that the "on-call" schedule was restrictive, for instance not allowing most non-work activities, events or any alcohol consumption, but without compensating employees for the "on-call" time.

19. The day after Plaintiff's complaint, Justin Narup again changed the "on-call" schedule to overload Plaintiff with over seven consecutive days every three weeks for the rest of the year. Justin Narup also conducted a PowerPoint presentation of schedule changes, meetings, GPS tracking, and reducing overtime work as a non-compliance penalty. Plaintiff questioned the legality of the policies and practices during the presentation.

20. **Rounding Time.** Defendant did not pay Plaintiff for the actual time worked based on Plaintiff's actual clock in/out times, but instead paid Plaintiff based on "rounded" clock in/out times.

21. Defendant's rounding of clock in/out times led to an underpayment of wages to Plaintiff.

22. **Off-The-Clock Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for all time worked. The off-the-clock work included, among other things according to proof: working during breaks, such as carrying on

with work during a meal or rest break; reviewing or responding to emails or texts from a mobile device or after hours; illegally “rounding” employee time at the beginning and/or end of the shift and/or the beginning and/or end of meal breaks; having to be available to report to work (“on-call” time).

23. **Overtime Work.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1.5) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, and for work in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times the regular rate of pay.

24. **Regular Rate of Pay.** Defendant failed to calculate Plaintiff’s “regular rate” for overtime purposes in the proper manner by failing to include bonus and other non-discretionary remuneration paid to Plaintiff outside of the hourly rate, leading to an underpayment of wages owed.

25. **Combining Meal And Rest Breaks.** Defendant required Plaintiff to take statutory rest breaks with Plaintiff’s statutory meal break, effectively combining the three breaks into a single break.

26. **Meal Break Violations.** Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with first or second timely, uninterrupted 30-minute meal break as required by law, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get meal breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff’s meal breaks; Plaintiff was “on-call” during meal breaks; Defendant automatically deducted unpaid meal break time from Plaintiff’s time worked even though Plaintiff performed work during such time; Defendant rounded Plaintiff’s clock in and out times for the start and end of meal breaks; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were not timely; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff’s meal breaks were less than the full 30 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during meal breaks.

27. Defendant never paid Plaintiff a meal period premium. Exhibit 1.

28. **Rest Break Violations.** Defendant failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take a 10-minute rest break per each four (4) hour period worked or a major fraction thereof, according to proof. For instance, among other things according to proof: Plaintiff did not get rest breaks at all; Plaintiff was forced to work throughout Plaintiff’s rest breaks; Plaintiff was “on-call” during rest breaks; Plaintiff’s rest breaks were not timely; Plaintiff’s rest breaks were interrupted; Plaintiff’s rest breaks were less than the

1 full 10 minutes; and/or Defendant required Plaintiff to remain on premises at the worksite during rest
2 breaks.

3 29. Defendant never paid Plaintiff a rest period premium. Exhibit 1.

4 30. **Wage Statements.** Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff with
5 uniform, complete, and accurate wage statements because the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed
6 to list the: accurate totals of the hours worked; number of hours worked at each hourly rate; net wages
7 earned; and/or gross wages earned.

8 31. **Final Pay.** Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all wages owed to Plaintiff immediately upon
9 Plaintiff's termination of employment, including earned and unpaid wages, such as: minimum wages;
10 overtime wages; meal and rest period premium wages; and/or all wages owed for the final day of work

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 ***REPRESENTATIVE PAGA ACTION FOR CIVIL PENALTIES PURSUANT TO***

13 **LABOR CODE SECTION 2698**

14 32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding and subsequent paragraphs.

15 33. Under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Labor Code
16 sections 2698-2699.5, private parties may recover civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code. These
17 penalties are in addition to any other relief available under the Labor Code. As set forth above, Defendant
18 has committed numerous violations of the Labor Code against Plaintiff, including but not limited to:

19 ○ **Labor Code §§ 201, 201.5, 202, 203.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon
20 termination or within 72 hours after notice of separation.

21 ○ **Labor Code § 204.** Failure to pay all earned wages within the time prescribed in Labor
22 Code §§ 204(a) and 204(b).

23 ○ **Labor Code § 206.** Failure to pay all undisputedly owed wages.

24 ○ **Labor Code § 210.** Failure to pay wages as required by Labor Code §§ 201.3, 204, 204b,
25 204.1, 204.2, 205, 205.5, 227.3, and/or 1197.5.

26 ○ **Labor Code § 212.** Failure to include the name and address of established place of
27 business in the state on pay checks to cash or deposit pay checks.

28 ○ **Labor Code § 213.** Unauthorized payment of final wages via direct deposit.

- **Labor Code § 221.** Failure to not collect and receive owed wages.
- **Labor Code § 226.** Failure to provide timely and accurate wage statements.
- **Labor Code § 226.3.** Failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).
- **Labor Code § 226.7.** Failure to provide rest periods and failure to provide an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- **Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512.** Failure to provide meal periods and failure to provide an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the meal periods.
- **Labor Code § 256.** Failure to pay all wages immediately upon termination or within 72 hours after notice of separation.
- **Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.** Failure to pay overtime and double time compensation.
- **Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197.** Failure to pay minimum wages, including overtime and double time compensation at the minimum wage rate.
- **Labor Code § 554.** Failure to provide day of rest.
- **Labor Code § 558.** Violation of a section of the chapter of the Labor Code starting with Labor Code § 500, *et seq.*, or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.
- **Labor Code § 558.1.** Violation any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and violating Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.1, and/or 1194.
- **Labor Code § 1174.** Failure to maintain compliant employee and payroll records.
- **Labor Code § 1197.1.** Failure to pay minimum wage.
- **Labor Code § 1199.** Violation of an order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.
- **Labor Code § 1198.** Violation of the following sections of orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission for conditions of labor prohibited by such:
 - **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 2,** requiring payment of “on-call” time.
 - **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 3,** requiring an employer to pay overtime and double time compensation.

- 1 ▪ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 4**, requiring an
- 2 employer to pay minimum wages, including overtime and double time
- 3 compensation at the minimum wage rate.
- 4 ▪ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 7**, requiring an
- 5 employer to maintain accurate information with respect to each employee; provide
- 6 employees with thorough and accurate itemized wage statements; and, provide
- 7 clocks within a reasonable distance from employees' work areas.
- 8 ▪ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 11**, requiring an
- 9 employer to provide its employees with adequate meal periods and an additional
- 10 hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.
- 11 ▪ **Wage Order 1-2001 (or other applicable Wage Order), Section 12**, requiring an
- 12 employer to provide its employees with adequate rest periods and an additional
- 13 hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation in lieu of the rest periods.

14 34. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of California Labor Code section
15 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of Plaintiff and other current and
16 former employees of Defendant pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code section
17 2699.3, because Plaintiff is employed by Defendant and the alleged violations of the California Labor
18 Code were committed against Plaintiff.

19 35. This claim is a *representative* PAGA action.

20 36. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff gave written notice on July 12,
21 2024, by online filing to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by
22 certified mail to Defendant of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders
23 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than
24 65 days have passed since Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA. The LWDA has not provided
25 notice that it intends to investigate PLAINTIFF’S claims.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

37. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff served Defendant with the aforementioned LWDA notice via certified mail on July 12, 2024. More than 33 days have passed since that date. Defendant has not provided Plaintiff with notice that it cured any of the violations alleged therein.

38. Per the tolling provision in Labor Code section 2699.3(g), the period of liability under Plaintiff's PAGA claim extends one year and sixty-five days before the filing of this complaint (the "PAGA Liability Period").

39. Accordingly, Plaintiff has complied with all of the requirements set forth in California Labor Code section 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

40. Pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof, pursuant to the California Labor Code, including California Labor Code sections 2699(a) and 2699(f), which provides for \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee pay period. In addition, pursuant to PAGA, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, including but not limited to penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 225.5, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 1199 from Defendant in a representative action for the violations set forth above. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. For penalties provided by law;
- b. For punitive damages where allowed by law;
- c. For civil penalties where provided by law;
- d. For prejudgment interest pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.6, California Civil Code section 3287 and/or California Civil Code section 3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest;
- e. For attorneys' fees where allowed by law;
- f. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

///

g. For such other and further relief as deemed just and proper.

DATED: September 16, 2024

COLBY LAW FIRM, PC



By: _____

AARON N. COLBY

ZOE YUZNA

Attorneys for Plaintiff

WILLIAM FENNELL

EXHIBIT 1

California Resources Corp
Payroll Services, 27200 Tourney Rd
Santa Clarita, CA 91355

Pay Group: BNE-CRC BW
Pay Begin Date: 12/18/2023
Pay End Date: 12/31/2023

Business Unit: CALCO
Advice #: 000000020394134
Advice Date: 01/05/2024

William Michael Fennell 3060 Eaton Road Chico, CA 95973	Employee ID:	0072167	TAX DATA: Tax Status: HOH Allowances: 0 Addl. Percent: Addl. Amount:	Federal S or M - 2 inco 1	CA State
	Department:	8262-Prod Op - SJV SB - Sac Vly G W			
	Location:	Willows			
	Job Title:	Production Tech III			
	Pay Rate:	\$43.173000 Hourly			

HOURS AND EARNINGS								TAXES		
Pay Period		Current		YTD						
Description	Begin Date	End Date	Rate	Hours	Earnings	Hours	Earnings	Description	Current	YTD
Overtime @ 1.5	12/18/2023	12/24/2023	64.759500	2.00	129.52	2.00	129.52	Fed Withholding	535.01	535.01
Company Vehicle	12/18/2023	12/24/2023			12.98		25.96	Fed MED/EE	68.74	68.74
Regular Pay	12/18/2023	12/24/2023	43.173000	32.00	1,381.54	56.00	2,417.69	Fed OASDI/EE	293.91	293.91
Vacation	12/18/2023	12/24/2023	43.173000	8.00	345.38	8.00	345.38	CA Withholding	289.34	289.34
Hol Overtime@ 1.5	12/25/2023	12/31/2023	64.759500	12.00	777.11	12.00	777.11	CA OASDI/EE	51.86	51.86
Company Vehicle	12/25/2023	12/31/2023			12.98		0.00			
Gym Subsidy	12/25/2023	12/31/2023			400.00		400.00			
Holiday Pay	12/25/2023	12/31/2023	43.173000	16.00	690.77	16.00	690.77			
Regular Pay	12/25/2023	12/31/2023	43.173000	24.00	1,036.15		0.00			
TOTAL HOURS WORKED:				70.00	4,760.47	94.00	4,760.47	TOTAL:	1,238.86	1,238.86

BEFORE-TAX DEDUCTIONS			AFTER-TAX DEDUCTIONS			EMPLOYER PAID BENEFITS		
Description	Current	YTD	Description	Current	YTD	Description	Current	YTD
Medical	65.54	65.54	VAD&D	3.95	3.95	Medical	308.77	308.77
Dental	6.00	6.00	Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	87.21	87.21	Dental	12.00	12.00
Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	305.23	305.23	Savings Loan 1	187.99	187.99	Vision	1.67	1.67
			Savings Loan 2	132.90	132.90	Life Insurance	8.72	8.72
						Life Insurance*	13.80	13.80
						Co Paid LTD*	11.74	11.74
						Savings Plan (ER Contrib)	87.21	87.21
						Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	261.63	261.63
TOTAL:			376.77	376.77	TOTAL:	412.05	412.05	*TAXABLE

TOTAL GROSS	FED TAXABLE GROSS	TOTAL TAXES	TOTAL DEDUCTIONS	NET PAY
Current	4,760.47	4,435.20	788.82	2,732.79
YTD	4,760.47	4,435.20	788.82	2,732.79

YEAR-TO-DATE	PAID TIME OFF	SICK LEAVE
Start Balance	111.78	0.0
+ Earned	160.08	40.0
+ Bought	0.00	0.0
- Taken	190.00	40.0
- Sold	0.00	0.0
+ Adjustments	0.00	0.0
End Balance	81.86	0.0

NET PAY DISTRIBUTION		
Account Type	Account Number	Deposit Amount
Advice #000000020394134	Checking	153455542032
		2,732.79
TOTAL:		2,732.79

MESSAGE:

California Resources Corp Payroll Services, 27200 Tourney Rd Santa Clarita, CA 91355		Pay Group: BNE-CRC BW Pay Begin Date: 01/01/2024 Pay End Date: 01/14/2024	Business Unit: CALCO Advice #: 000000020395185 Advice Date: 01/19/2024
William Michael Fennell 3060 Eaton Road Chico, CA 95973		Employee ID: 0072167 Department: 8262-Prod Op - SJV SB - Sac Vly G W Location: Willows Job Title: Production Tech III Pay Rate: \$43.173000 Hourly	TAX DATA: Federal CA State Tax Status: HOH S or M - 2 inco Allowances: 0 1 Addl. Percent: Addl. Amount:

HOURS AND EARNINGS								TAXES		
Description	Pay Period		Rate	Current		YTD		Description	Current	YTD
	Begin Date	End Date		Hours	Earnings	Hours	Earnings			
Company Vehicle	01/01/2024	01/07/2024			12.98		51.92	Fed Withholdng	433.72	968.73
Holiday Pay	01/01/2024	01/07/2024	43.173000	8.00	345.38	24.00	1,036.15	Fed MED/EE	61.99	130.73
Regular Pay	01/01/2024	01/07/2024	43.173000	32.00	1,381.54	128.00	5,526.15	Fed OASDI/EE	265.08	558.99
Overtime @ 1.5	01/08/2024	01/14/2024	64.759500	9.00	582.84	11.00	712.36	CA Withholding	242.24	531.58
Call In Overtime@1.5	01/08/2024	01/14/2024	64.759500	1.33	86.13	1.33	86.13	CA OASDI/EE	46.75	98.61
Call In Allowance	01/08/2024	01/14/2024	43.173000	4.00	172.69	4.00	172.69			
Company Vehicle	01/08/2024	01/14/2024			12.98		0.00			
Regular Pay	01/08/2024	01/14/2024	43.173000	40.00	1,726.92		0.00			
Hol Overtime@1.5					0.00	12.00	777.11			
Gym Subsidy					0.00		400.00			
Vacation					0.00	8.00	345.38			
TOTAL HOURS WORKED:				86.33	4,295.50	188.33	9,055.97	TOTAL:	1,049.78	2,288.64
BEFORE-TAX DEDUCTIONS				AFTER-TAX DEDUCTIONS				EMPLOYER PAID BENEFITS		
Description	Current	YTD	Description	Current	YTD	Description	Current	YTD		
Medical	65.54	131.08	VAD&D	3.95	7.90	Medical	308.77	617.54		
Dental	6.00	12.00	Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	85.91	173.12	Dental	12.00	24.00		
Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	300.69	605.92	Savings Loan 1	187.99	375.98	Vision	1.67	3.34		
			Savings Loan 2	132.90	265.80	Life Insurance	8.72	17.44		
						Life Insurance*	13.80	27.60		
						OAD&D	5.00	5.00		
						Co Paid LTD*	11.74	23.48		
						Savings Plan (ER Contrib)	85.91	173.12		
						Savings Plan 401(k)/Roth	257.73	519.36		
TOTAL:			372.23	749.00	TOTAL:		410.75	822.80	*TAXABLE	

TOTAL GROSS	FED TAXABLE GROSS	TOTAL TAXES	TOTAL DEDUCTIONS	NET PAY
Current 4,295.50	3,974.77	1,049.78	782.98	2,462.74
YTD 9,055.97	8,409.97	2,288.64	1,571.80	5,195.53

YEAR-TO-DATE	PAID TIME OFF	SICK LEAVE	NET PAY DISTRIBUTION		
Start Balance	81.86	0.0	Account Type	Account Number	Deposit Amount
+ Earned	13.34	60.0	Advice #000000020395185	Checking	153455542032
+ Bought	0.00	0.0			2,462.74
- Taken	0.00	0.0			
- Sold	0.00	0.0			
+ Adjustments	0.00	0.0			
End Balance	95.20	60.0	TOTAL:		2,462.74

MESSAGE: