Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
Kristen M. Agnew (State Bar No. 247656)
Max W. Gavron (State Bar No. 291697)
DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.
515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile
lwlee@diversitylaw.com
kagnew@diversitylaw.com
mgavron@diversitylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Semaj Graham

D.LAW, INC.
Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363)
emil@d.law
David Yeremian (SBN 226337)
d.yeremian@d.law
Roman Shkodnik (SBN 285152)
r.shkodnik@d.law
Mason Doidge (SBN 352604)
m.doidge@d.law
450 N Brand Blvd, Suite 840
Glendale, CA 91203
Telephone: (818) 962-6465
Facsimile: (818) 962-6469

Attorneys for Plaintiff Darren Reveles

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SEMAJ GRAHAM as individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

4283929 DELAWARE LLC; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24STCV19351
Judge: Hon. Samantha Jessner

DECLARATION OF ROMAN SHKODNIK IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT

[filed concurrently with Plaintiff's Notice of Motion and Motion; Declaration of Sean Hartranft; Declaration of Larry W. Lee; Declaration of Kristen M. Agnew; Declaration of Max W. Gavron; Declaration of Semaj Graham; Declaration of Darren Reveles; Memorandum of Points and Authorities; and [Proposed] Order]

Date: November 3, 2025
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Dept.: 7

DECLARATION OF ROMAN SHKODNIK

I, Roman Shkodnik, declare:

1. I am an attorney licensed and admitted to practice before all courts of the State of California, the United States District Court for the Central, Southern, Eastern, and Northern Districts of California, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. I am a senior attorney of D.Law, Inc., counsel for Plaintiff Darren Reveles ("Plaintiff") on behalf of himself and similarly situated employees of Defendants 4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services' and Gateway Services Inc. ("Defendants"). I and my firm are referred to herein as Class Counsel. I have personal knowledge of the facts herein and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify.

2. On or about June 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a written notice with the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") alleging that Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245, *et seq*., 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2 1197, 1198.5, 1199, and 2802, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of the written notice to the LWDA.

3. On July 12, 2024, Plaintiff filed a class action complaint against Defendants in the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside, entitled *Darren Reveles v. 4283929 Delaware LLC*, Case No. CVRI2404173.

4. On August 26, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint, adding a cause of action for Penalties Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*.

5. Plaintiff authorized a split of attorneys' fees, providing that any attorneys' fees recovered in this action will be split between Plaintiff's counsel and counsel for Plaintiff Semaj Graham.

QUALIFICATIONS AND ADEQUACY OF CLASS COUNSEL

6. My firm is well qualified because of our experience, knowledge, and resources to act as counsel and represent Plaintiffs and the putative class in this action. My practice is exclusively focused on employment matters, with a substantial percentage devoted to litigating wage, hour,

and working-conditions violations on a class-wide basis.

7. I received my Bachelor of Arts in history and political science from the University of California, Los Angeles, in 2007. I then earned my Juris Doctorate from Loyola Law School in May of 2011. Upon graduating from law school, I have exclusively focused my practice on representing employees including in wage-and-hour class actions.

8. I have been practicing law since 2012. Since 2013, I have focused almost exclusively on representing employees, including in wage-and-hour class actions. During my career I have represented employees in over 100 wage-and-hour class action lawsuits as lead or co-lead counsel (including in the Central, Southern, Eastern and Northern Districts of California), and I have obtained six and seven figure settlements against a range of defendants, including Fortune 500 companies. These cases have involved the gamut of wage-and-hour claims, including claims for failure to pay minimum wages, unpaid wages and overtime, inaccurate pay statements, and failure to pay timely wages - similar to claims at issue in the present matter.

9. I am experienced in prosecuting employment matters, particularly class actions. In addition to the present case, I am also class counsel for dozens of other putative wage-and-hour class-action lawsuits pending in various state and federal jurisdictions throughout California.

10. My extensive experience in litigating employment wage and hour matters has been integral in identifying legal issues, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of a case, and generally negotiating fair and reasonable class action settlements. Practice in the narrow field of wage and hour litigation requires skill and knowledge concerning the constantly evolving substantive law (state and federal), as well as the procedural law of class action litigation. In this action, I am fully equipped to use the skills and knowledge I have developed through more than a decade of prosecuting and defending wage and hour class actions to fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class. Therefore, on the account of my resources, experience, and knowledge, I am well qualified to act as Class Counsel and represent Plaintiffs and the putative Class Members in this action.

11. Owing to my experience, I am well qualified to evaluate the class claims in this action, to evaluate settlement v. trial and defenses raised. The following are examples of some of my

cases that have resulted in favorable settlements for the employee Class Members and Aggrieved Employees I have represented: (a) *Bogues v. Ikes place #6*, San Diego Superior Court, Case No. 37-2020-00023727-CU-OE-CTL (Hon. Robert Longstreth); (b) *Garcia v. Statewide Traffic Safety And Signs, Inc.*, Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2018-01011814-CU-OE-CXC (Hon. Lon F. Hurwitz); (c) *Brito v. Brothers International Desserts dba Brothers International Desserts Inc*., Orange County Superior Court, Case No. 30-2022-01242515-CU-OE-CXC (Hon. William D. Claster); (d) *Valenzuela v. Best Express Foods, Inc.*, San Joaquin County Superior Court, Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2021-4131 (Hon. Robert T. Waters); (e) *Ruem v. EMTS, Inc. et al.*, Fresno County Superior Court, Case No. 18CECG04441 (Hon. Kimberly Gaab); (f) *Quizon v. CF Watsonville East, LLC*., Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Case No. 20CV01868 (Hon. Paul Marigonda); (g) *Cesena v. JYM Enterprises, Inc.,* Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV27949 (Hon. Monica Bachner); (h) *In re Mobileone Wage And Hour Cases*, San Mateo Superior Court, Case No. JCCP 5039 (Hon. Marie S. Weiner); (i) *Ly v. Prime Comms Retail*, *LLC*, Sacramento County Superior Court, Case No. 34-2020-00281668 (Hon. Christopher E. Krueger); (j) *Savattieri et al.v. AMI Expeditionary Healthcare et al.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. 21STCV33372 (Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman).

12. For purposes of this motion, the “Class” or “Class Members” consist of all individuals employed by Defendant as non-exempt, hourly employees in California at any time between August 1, 2020, through the date of preliminary approval. I do not believe that I have any conflicts of interest with the Class or with the Class Representatives. I am not related to the Class Representatives. I have not previously represented Defendant in any matter. I respectfully submit that I, and D.Law, Inc. are well suited to act as Class Counsel in this action, and we have and will continue to vigorously represent the interests of the Class Members.

SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE

13. Based on Class Counsel’s knowledge and expertise in class action litigation, Class Counsel believes this Settlement will provide a substantial benefit to the Class Members.

14. From Class Counsel’s review of the facts, strengths, and weaknesses of the case, the risks and delays posed by further litigation, and Class Counsel’s own prior litigation experience,

Class Counsel believes that the recovery for each class member is fair, reasonable, and adequate taking into consideration the amounts received in other wage and hour class actions; the risks inherent in litigation of this genre, including numerous potential appellate issues; and the reasonable tailoring of each Class Member's claim to the settlement award he or she will receive. Class Counsel is aware of the burdens of proof necessary to establish liability for the claims asserted in the Action and the difficulties in establishing damages for Class Members. Further, the settlement negotiations were extensive and conducted in good faith and at arm's length between attorneys with substantial experience litigating class actions and wage and hour cases, the Settlement Agreement was the product of a non-collusive settlement process in which the Parties were forced to make significant compromises in the interest of reaching a full and complete settlement of the lawsuit.

COSTS

15. My firm has incurred costs including, but not limited to, filing fees (e.g. complaints, case management conference statements, notices), service of process, and attorney service costs for court filings.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 11th of July 2025, at Glendale, California.

Roman Shkodnik

Roman Shkodnik

EXHIBIT A

June 20, 2024

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:
https://dir.tfaforms.net/128 **(copy by certified mail to all Defendants)**

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

4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services
2 Daniels Way
Cranston, RI 02921
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 4779 9651 71

CSC Lawyers Incorporating Service, Agent for Service
4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 4779 9895 42

Gateway Services Inc.
109 – 230 Hanlon Creek Boulevard
Guelph, Ontario NIC 0A1 Canada
USPS Priority Mail Tracking Number: 9405 5112 0620 4774 0544 20

Michael Delaney, Agent for Service
Gateway Services Inc.
10731 Treena ST Suite 100
San Diego, CA 92131
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8112 0620 4779 9058 56

Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq*. Penalties – PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
Reveles v. 4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services, et al.

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Darren Reveles ("Plaintiff") and other similarly situated aggrieved non-exempt employees (collectively "Aggrieved Employees") for violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218.5, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245 *et seq*., 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.* and 2802; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*.

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* ("the Act"). Plaintiff would like to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against Defendants, 4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services; Gateway Services Inc.; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as "Defendants").

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act.

We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. This Notice Letter addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Aggrieved Employees were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below. Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked.

Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time that they worked off-the-clock without compensation by answering work-related phone calls and text messages, watching training videos, and reading training policies. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for hours worked during alleged meal periods. Thus, Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours, under the control of Defendants, without wages.

Because of the foregoing understatement of hours worked, Defendants also failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper overtime wages. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Additionally, Defendants did not pay Aggrieved Employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In addition to an hourly wage, Defendants paid Aggrieved Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate. Therefore, during times when Aggrieved Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

Moreover, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that all or substantially all of Defendants' hourly paid employees are subject to Defendants' policies and practices requiring them to call in or otherwise report to work without being put to work or working less than half of said employee's usual or scheduled day's work. On such days, Aggrieved Employees were not paid reporting time pay as required.

Additionally, Defendants also paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which sick pay and vacation pay were calculated and paid. During Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, Defendants also maintained a vacation policy containing an unreasonable maximum carry over component. Specifically, Employees who work for Defendants for 10 years or more may accrue 60 hours of vacation time annually; however, the maximum hours that may be carried over to the following year is 40 hours, less than one and a half times the annual accrual rate.

Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of denying Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees proper meal periods. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work through their meal periods which they were consistently denied. Also, what meal periods Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did take, were consistently less than 30 minutes and taken well after their fifth consecutive hour of work, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. In addition, Defendants had a policy and practice of requiring Employees to record meal periods before the fifth hour of work regardless of when meal periods were taken or if they were taken at all to avoid paying meal period premiums. Similarly, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work in excess of ten (10) hours a day, without ever receiving a second meal compliant period, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. Defendants also paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which premium pay was calculated and paid.

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than 10 minutes for every work period of 4 or more consecutive hours, as required by Labor Code. What rest breaks were taken were often taken late and were less than 10 minutes. Defendants also paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which premium pay was calculated and paid.

Defendants had a common policy and practice of failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures incurred in execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants including, cell phone usage, which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ.

Defendants consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned, and the total amount of compensation of Aggrieved Employees. The wage statements provided to Employees failed to accurately include the total hours worked and the applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and (9). As a result, the wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct, potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees. Moreover, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.

Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all wages owed at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation as required by Labor Code §§ 201-203. Defendants also consistently failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due on a semi-monthly basis.

Lastly, Defendants failed to produce requested employment records to Plaintiff as required by Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:
As addressed above Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

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

In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines "Hours Worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

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

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

Defendants thus failed to pay Employees minimum wages they were owed, including by their consistent policy of failing to pay Employees for all hours worked. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not paid for the time that they worked off-the-clock without compensation by answering work-related phone calls and text messages, watching training videos, and reading training policies. Accordingly, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work without pay. Thus, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to work hours without wages. Additionally, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked. Defendants have the ability to pay minimum wages for all time worked and have willfully refused to pay such wages with the intent to secure for Defendants a discount upon this indebtedness with the intent to annoy, harass, oppress, hinder, delay, or defraud Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

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

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

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime. Specifically, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees consistently worked in excess of eight (8) hours a day, and/or forty (40) hours a week. However, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime wages for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above including the time they worked off-the-clock without compensation by answering work-related phone calls and text messages, watching training videos, reading training policies, and working through meal breaks caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code § 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Additionally, Defendants did not pay Aggrieved Employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In addition to an hourly wage, Defendants paid Aggrieved Employees nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all remunerations, including nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate. Therefore, during times when Aggrieved Employees worked overtime and received nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

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

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

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

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

Failure to Pay Reporting Time Pay

Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants' policies and practices required Aggrieved Employees to call in or show up to work but were not put to work or worked less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work. On such days when Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report to work only to be sent home, they were not paid half of said Employees' usual or scheduled day's work in violation of California law. California Labor Code § 1198 requires that ". . . the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." Paragraph (5)(A) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders provides that "Each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two (2) hours nor more than four (4) hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay."

In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees reporting time pay. Defendants knew or should have known that Aggrieved Employees were entitled to reporting time pay.

With their conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code § 1198 and Paragraph 5 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to pay reporting time pay to Aggrieved Employees. Defendants have violated the California Labor Code, including Section 1198, and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged, including Paragraph 5 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Failure to Pay Vacation Wages

Pursuant to California Labor Code § 227.3, whenever a contract of employment or employment policy provides for paid vacation and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with said contract of employment or policy respecting eligibility or time served. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which vacation wages were calculated and paid. In addition, Defendants' vacation policy contains an unreasonable maximum carry over component. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees who work for Defendants for 10 years or more accrue 60 hours of vacation time annually; however, the maximum hours that mya be carried over to the following year is 40 hours, less than one and a half times the annual accrual rate. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3. Plaintiff accordingly seeks this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code § 227.3 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Comply with Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246

California Labor Code § 245 *et seq.* requires that Defendants provide paid sick time to Aggrieved Employees, including at the amount, terms, and rate of compensation set forth in said law. At times relevant, Defendants have failed to compute the amount due for paid sick time in conformance with the pay calculation under California Labor Code § 246(l). Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which sick pay was calculated and paid. Rather than calculating the amount of paid sick time due when sick time is used according to the requirements set forth in California Labor Code § 246(1), Defendants paid sick leave to Aggrieved Employees at a lower rate, in violation of the law. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Defendants have violated California Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246. Plaintiff accordingly seeks this relief available for Defendants' violations of section Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 in connection with Aggrieved Employees and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.*, 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

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

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods, were provided with meal periods late and well after the fifth hour of work, could not be relieved to take their meal periods, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty meal periods or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required meal periods.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or less than thirty minutes, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees “premium pay,” i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee’s effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Specifically, Defendants had a uniform policy and practice of requiring Aggrieved Employees to record meal periods before their fifth hour of work even if they did not take their meal periods or took them after the fifth hour of work to avoid paying meal period premiums. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which premium pay was calculated and paid. Therefore, Defendants also miscalculated the rate at which they paid any meal period or rest period premiums when Defendant did attempt to pay them, resulting in further violations of section 226.7.

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

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations. Defendants paid nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses to Aggrieved Employees but Defendants failed to include these forms of remuneration in the regular rate of pay from which premium pay was calculated and paid. Therefore, Defendants also miscalculated the rate at which they paid any rest period premiums when Defendants did attempt to pay them, resulting in further violations of section 226.7.

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

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

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

Defendants have consistently required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to incur necessary business expenses in the execution of their duties under Defendants' employ. Specifically, Defendants have failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their job duties for Defendants including, cell phone usage, which were necessary to perform their duties under Defendants' employ in violation of Labor Code § 2802. Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work-related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiff seeks all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

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

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

///

Defendants failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. Specifically, Defendants failed to provide Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code. The wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees, by Defendants, failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks. Additionally, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records of the correct overtime wages based on proper regular rate calculations that included nondiscretionary commissions, incentive pay, and/or nondiscretionary bonuses earned. The wage statements provided to Employees failed to accurately include the total hours worked and the applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2) and (9).The wage statements provided to Aggrieved Employees were confusing and required Aggrieved Employees to engage in discovery and refer to outside sources to verify whether their pay was correct and potentially resulting in a miscalculation by the Aggrieved Employees.

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

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

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

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

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

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

Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records Under Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5

Pursuant to Labor Code § 226, current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. The employer must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request. Similarly, under Labor Code § 1198.5, every current and former employee, or his/her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employee's performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. The employer must make these records available for inspection or provide a copy, not later than thirty (30) calendar days after receiving a written request.

Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5 by failing to timely provide Plaintiff with all of his requested employment records. Upon information and belief, this is consistent with Defendants' policy and practice that applied to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees.

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

Plaintiff's PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*. and Recovery Bases:
After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the Class Action Complaint, Plaintiff will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 245 *et seq*., 246, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq*. and 2802, including as follows:

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

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

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiff and Aggrieved

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

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

(e) Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records: For Defendants' failure to produce Employment Records in violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198 and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 226, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

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

(g) Failure to Provide Paid Sick Days: For Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their required and earned sick days in violation of Labor Code §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246 the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ §§ 245 *et seq.* and 246, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(h) Failure to Pay Vacation Wages: For Defendants' failure to provide Employees with all their vacation days in violation of Labor Code § 227.3and seeking the civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 227.3, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.3(b), and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(i) Failure to Pay Wages Due, Negotiable and Payable in Cash on Demand: For Defendants failure to pay reporting time pay, under Labor Code § 212 and seeking all applicable civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 212, 225.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2) and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1); and

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

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

This letter therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against 4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services; Gateway Services Inc.; and any other named Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

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

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.

David Yeremian

Cc: 4283929 Delaware LLC dba West Coast Pet Memorial Services; Gateway Services Inc. by Certified Mail