



AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: 949.379.6250
Facsimile: 949.379.6251
www.aegislawfirm.com

July 19, 2024

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL (RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED)

Agent for Service of Process for ABC Village, Inc.:
Angeline Anton
40045 Village Rd
Temecula, CA 92591

Agent for Service of Process for ABC Child Care, Inc.:
Malinda Margiotto
42605 Musilek Pl
Temecula, CA 92592

Re: Brittany Maldonado Aldana v. ABC Village, Inc.; ABC Child Care, Inc.

Dear Labor and Workforce Development Agency; ABC Village, Inc.; ABC Child Care, Inc.:

Please allow this correspondence to serve as written notice required by California Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(1) of the specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by ABC Village, Inc.; ABC Child Care, Inc. and any other employers or person(s) acting on behalf of the employer as such phrase is used under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1 ("Respondent"), and the facts and theories in support of said allegations. This firm represents Brittany Maldonado Aldana ("Claimant"); we hereby notify you that Claimant intends to seek penalties against Respondent under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*, on Claimant's own behalf and all other aggrieved employees.

Specific Provisions of the Labor Code Allegedly Violated by Respondent

The specific provisions of the Labor Code allegedly violated by Respondent and the provisions under which Claimant submits this correspondence include the following: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Facts and Theories Supporting the Allegations Against Respondent

Claimant and other aggrieved employees worked for Respondent in California as non-exempt employees. Claimant was employed by Respondent in California within the past year.

During the past year, Respondent failed to provide 30-minute uninterrupted meal periods within the appropriate time intervals to Claimant and other aggrieved employees as required by Labor Code section 512 and section 11 of the applicable Wage Order. Claimant and other aggrieved employees frequently worked shifts over five hours and did not receive lawful meal periods because they were discouraged from taking meal periods, were interrupted during their meal periods, were required to remain on call during meal periods, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all lawful meal periods, among other reasons. As a result, their meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted.

When Claimant and other aggrieved employees missed meal periods or if the meal periods were late, short, and/or interrupted, Respondent violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, as well as section 11 of the applicable Wage Order, by failing to pay an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay to Claimant and other aggrieved employees for every day in which they suffered a meal period violation.

Respondent failed to authorize or permit paid 10-minute rest periods for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked because Claimant and other aggrieved employees were required or incentivized to work through their rest periods, discouraged from taking their rest periods, required to remain on call during rest periods, and/or were not scheduled to be relieved at the appropriate intervals to receive all rest periods.

When Claimant and other aggrieved employees did not receive rest periods, Respondent violated Labor Code section 226.7 and section 12 of the applicable Wage Order by failing to pay an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay to Claimant and other aggrieved employees.

Respondent failed to pay Claimant and other aggrieved employees at least the legal minimum wage, straight time wage, sick pay, and overtime wage at the correct rate of pay (in violation of Labor Code sections 246, 510, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198) due to Respondent's policy and practice of requiring Claimant and aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock, failing to pay wages using the appropriate regular rate of pay or the required minimum wage, and/or failing to pay for all recorded time, among other reasons. Respondent failed to pay Claimant and other aggrieved all minimum, regular, and overtime wages for these hours.

As a result of, and in addition to, these actions, Respondent violated Labor Code sections 226, and 226.3 by failing to provide itemized wage statements that accurately reported the following: (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Specifically, the wage statements failed to list the correct hours, rates, and pay due to the above unpaid wage violations, among other violations.

Respondent violated Labor Code sections 1174 and 1174.5 by failing to maintain accurate and complete records showing the hours worked daily by the aggrieved employees and the wages paid to aggrieved employees (due to the same underpayment of wages referenced above).

Furthermore, Respondent violated the Labor Code by failing to properly pay all these wages owed throughout aggrieved employees' employment and following the end of these workers' employment with Respondent due to the above violations (in violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204).

Based on these violations, Claimant seeks attorneys' fees, interest, and penalties under the Labor Code. Enclosed and incorporated by reference is the class action complaint Claimant intends to file on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees against Respondent. Claimant intends to amend the complaint to include a cause of action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, after the minimum required review period elapses and will file a conformed copy of the complaint after it has been filed with the court.

Thank you for your assistance on this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,
AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC



Jessica L. Campbell

Enclosure: Class Action Complaint