

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION

5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Tel.: 818-293-5623
Fax: 888-850-1310

September 30, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Robert Half Inc.
2884 San Hill Road, Suite 200
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Defendant certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8074 74

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Agent for Service of Process
Amanda Garcia
330 N. Brand Blvd
Glendale, CA 91203
Agent certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8074 81

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

San Andreas Regional Center
6203 San Ignacio Avenue, Suite 200
San Jose, CA 95119
Defendant certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8074 98

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Agent for Service of Process
Javier Zaldivar
6203 San Ignacio Avenue, Suite 200
San Jose, CA 95119
Agent certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8074 98

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

San Andreas Regional Center
P.O. Box 50002
San Jose, CA 95150
Defendant certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8075 04

Labor & Workforce Development Agency
Robert Half, Inc.
San Andreas Regional Center
September 30, 2024
Page 2

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

San Andreas Regional Center
1370 S. Main St
Salinas, CA 93901
Defendant certified mail # 9589 0710 5270 1505 8075 11

Re: ***Kimberly Berenice Reyes Maravillo v. Robert Half, Inc., San Andreas Regional Center – Labor Code Violations of Robert Half, Inc., San Andreas Regional Center – Compliance Letter of California Labor Code § 2698 – Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear Sir or Madam:

This office represents Kimberly Berenice Reyes Maravillo (“Plaintiff”), a former California employee of Robert Half, Inc., San Andreas Regional Center (“Defendants”). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client worked for Defendants in Northern California. Herein we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendants engaged in with respect to our client and Defendant’s other California non-exempt employees.

Plaintiff began working for Defendants on or about December 1, 2023. While working for Defendants as a Unit Secretary, Plaintiff was earning twenty-six dollars (\$26.00) per hour.

Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were forced to continue working through their meal and rest breaks in order to assist Defendant’s needs. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour’s pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. Plaintiff and Defendant California employees were asked to perform tasks prior to clocking in such as, opening the office, swiping their badge to access the main entrance and the reception area, turning on the lights and TV for kids in the reception zone, and setting up their desk, all without receiving compensation for this work. It took Plaintiff on the average of 5-10 minutes to complete these tasks. Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees if these tasks were completed outside of her regular work hours. These excess hours were not recorded on our client’s and Defendant’s California employees wage statements. Plaintiff and Defendant’s California employees should have been compensated for

that time, but she was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendants has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of Defendants regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendant's failure to pay all overtime wages due. Since the wage statements provided to Plaintiff failed to accurately reflect the total number of Plaintiff's worked hours, these violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees.

Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

Our client further alleges that Defendants paid her and Defendant's California employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of Defendant's failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Defendants pay Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the

violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b).

Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendants. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendants, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to comply with Labor Code § 227.3, which states that unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, 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 such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness, pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3. Defendant violated Labor Code § 227.3 because they failed to pay Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees wages for unused vested vacation time.

Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants is liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

We invite Defendants or its attorney(s) to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Roman Otkupman', is written over a horizontal line.

ROMAN OTKUPMAN