

Karen I. Gold (State Bar No. 258360)
kgold@blackstonepc.com
Marissa A. Mayhood (State Bar No. 334376)
mmayhood@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
Lizeth Marin (State Bar No. 360465)
lmarin@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Telephone: (310) 622-4278 / Facsimile: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiffs NATHAN
BRAMSWAY and EFREN CARDONA,
individually, and on behalf of other similarly
situated employees and aggrieved employees
pursuant to the California Private Attorneys
General Act

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

NATHAN BRAMSWAY and EFREN
CARDONA, individually, and on behalf of other
similarly situated employees and aggrieved
employees pursuant to the California Private
Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BAYLESS MANUFACTURING, LLC; and
DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 24STCV23219

**THIRD AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

- (1) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 1194,
1197, and 1197.1 (Minimum Wages)**
- (2) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 510
and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime)**
- (3) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7
and 512(a) (Meal Break Violations)**
- (4) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226.7
(Rest Break Violations)**
- (5) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 204
and 210 (Wages Not Timely Paid
During Employment)**
- (6) Violation of Cal. Labor Code § 226(a)
(Wage Statement Violations)**
- (7) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 201,
202, and 203 (Untimely Final Wages)**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- (8) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses)**
- (9) Violation of Cal. Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***
- (10) Violation of Cal. Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs NATHAN BRAMSWAY and EFREN CARDONA (together, “Plaintiffs”),
2 individually, and on behalf of other similarly situated employees and aggrieved employees and the
3 State of California pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), allege as
4 follows against Defendant BAYLESS MANUFACTURING, LLC, and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive
5 (collectively, “Defendants”):

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This is a class action to recover damages on behalf of Plaintiffs and all current and
8 former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of
9 California at any time during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original
10 Complaint through final judgment (“Class Members”).

11 2. This is also an enforcement action under PAGA to recover civil penalties on behalf of
12 Plaintiff, the State of California, and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees
13 who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time from one year prior to Plaintiff’s
14 submission of written notice of Defendants’ alleged violations of the California Labor Code to the
15 Labor & Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) through final judgment (“Aggrieved
16 Employees”).

17 3. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants hired Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Aggrieved
18 Employees but, among other things, failed to properly pay them all wages owed for all time worked
19 (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages), failed to provide them with all
20 meal periods and rest periods and associated premium wages to which they were entitled, failed to
21 timely pay them all wages due during their employment, failed to timely pay them all wages due upon
22 termination of their employment, failed to provide them with accurate itemized wage statements, and
23 failed to reimburse them for necessary business expenses.

24 4. As a result, Defendants violated, *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202,
25 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable
26 Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order(s). Defendants’ conduct giving rise to these
27 violations was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA. Through this
28 action, Plaintiffs seek to recover all available remedies, including under PAGA, and including but not

1 limited to actual and liquidated damages and attorney's fees and costs.

2 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3 5. This is a class action lawsuit brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
4 section 382 and a PAGA action brought pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*

5 6. The monetary damages, restitution, statutory penalties, and other applicable legal and
6 equitable relief sought by Plaintiffs exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and
7 will be established according to proof at trial.

8 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,
9 Article VI, section 10, which grants the superior court "original jurisdiction in all other causes" except
10 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify
11 any other basis for jurisdiction.

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

18 9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants
19 maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California,
20 County of Los Angeles, including at 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355. Many of the acts,
21 events, and violations alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs occurred throughout the State of California,
22 including in the County of Los Angeles.

23 **THE PARTIES**

24 10. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff NATHAN BRAMSWAY is and was a resident
25 of the State of California.

26 11. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff EFREN CARDONA is and was an individual
27 residing in Los Angeles County in the State of California.
28

1 12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant BAYLESS MANUFACTURING, LLC was
2 and is an employer who does business in California, with locations throughout the State of California,
3 and whose employees are engaged throughout Los Angeles County and the State of California,
4 including at 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355.

5 13. Plaintiffs are unaware of the true names or capacities of the Defendants sued herein
6 under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 25 but will seek leave of this Court to amend the Complaint
7 and serve such fictitiously named Defendants once their names and capacities become known.

8 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that the acts and omissions
9 alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to defendant BAYLESS MANUFACTURING,
10 LLC, and/or DOES 1 through 25, each acting as the agent, employee, alter ego, and/or joint venturer
11 of, or working in concert with, each of the other co-Defendants and within the course and scope of
12 such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity with legal authority to act on the others'
13 behalf. The acts of Defendants represent and were in accordance with Defendants' official policies.

14 15. At all relevant times, Defendants were the employers of Plaintiffs within the meaning
15 of all applicable state laws and statutes. Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or affected the
16 working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs so as to make
17 each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

18 16. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs, Class Members, and
19 Aggrieved Employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs, Class Members', and
20 Aggrieved Employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

21 17. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of Plaintiffs,
22 Class Members', and Aggrieved Employees' employment for them to be joint employers of
23 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees.

24 18. Defendants directly hired and paid wages to Plaintiffs, Class Members, and
25 Aggrieved Employees.

26 19. Defendants continue to employ hourly paid and/or non-exempt employees within the
27 State of California.

28 20. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each act or omission

1 complained of herein. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts
2 and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

3 21. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each Defendant is in some
4 manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts, omissions, occurrences, and
5 transactions alleged herein.

6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 22. Plaintiff NATHAN BRAMSWAY worked for Defendants from approximately
8 November 2022 through approximately November 2023 as a Welder. Defendants jointly and severally
9 employed NATHAN BRAMSWAY at their location in Valencia, CA. NATHAN BRAMSWAY
10 performed various duties for Defendants including, among other things, welding materials.

11 23. Plaintiff EFREN CARDONA worked for Defendants from approximately January
12 2022 through approximately November 2023 as a Welder. Defendants jointly and severally employed
13 EFREN CARDONA at their location in Valencia, CA. EFREN CARDONA performed various duties
14 for Defendants including, among other things, welding materials.

15 24. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants engaged in a
16 pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees. As set
17 forth in more detail below, this pattern and practice of wage abuse involved, *inter alia*, requiring
18 Plaintiffs, the other Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without
19 compensation, failing to properly pay wages for all hours worked, failing to provide all meal and rest
20 breaks to which they were entitled and failing to pay meal and rest break premiums when due, failing
21 to timely pay wages during employment and upon termination of employment, failing to provide
22 accurate wage statements, failing to reimburse necessary business-related expenses, and failing to
23 adhere to other related protections afforded by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC
24 Wage Order(s).

25 25. Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs,
26 the other Class Members, and the Aggrieved Employees pursuant to California law. Defendants had
27 the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do
28 so to increase Defendants' profits.

1 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

2 26. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit as a class action on behalf of Plaintiffs and all others
3 similarly situated, as members of a proposed class pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
4 section 382. The class satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and
5 superiority requirements under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

6 27. The proposed **Class** is defined as follows:

7 **All current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees**
8 **who worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time**
9 **during the period from four years prior to the date of the filing of**
10 **the original Complaint through final judgment.**

11 28. The proposed **Former Employee Sub-Class** is defined as follows:

12 **All former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked**
13 **for Defendants in the State of California at any time during the**
14 **period from four years prior to the date of the filing of the original**
15 **Complaint through final judgment.**

16 29. Plaintiffs reserve the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

17 30. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the Class is easily
18 ascertainable. While the exact number and identities of Class Members are currently unknown to
19 Plaintiffs, such information can be ascertained through appropriate discovery from records maintained
20 by Defendants and their agents.

21 31. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all its members is impracticable.

22 32. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all Class Members, which predominate
23 over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. The common legal and factual
24 questions which do not vary from Class Member to Class Member, and which may be determined
25 without reference to the individual circumstances of any Class Member include the following:

- 26 i. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay minimum wages to
27 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all hours worked;
28 ii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to pay overtime wages to

1 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for all overtime hours worked;

2 iii. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide meal periods to

3 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

4 iv. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of failing to provide rest periods to

5 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

6 v. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees in

7 the State of California for all hours worked, and for all missed, short, late, and/or

8 interrupted meal periods and rest breaks;

9 vi. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class

10 Members during their employment;

11 vii. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in

12 accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;

13 viii. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class

14 Members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;

15 ix. Whether Defendants failed to comply with wage reporting as required by the California

16 Labor Code, including, *inter alia*, section 226;

17 x. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for

18 necessary business-related expenses and costs;

19 xi. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

20 xii. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California

21 Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

22 xiii. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting

23 from Defendants' violation of California law; and

24 xiv. Whether Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to compensatory damages

25 pursuant to the California Labor Code.

26 33. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Class, and Plaintiffs' interests are

27 coincident with and not antagonistic to those of the other Class Members Plaintiffs seek to

28 represent. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class.

1 Plaintiffs have retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions and Plaintiffs
2 intend to prosecute this action vigorously.

3 34. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient
4 adjudication of this controversy since individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is
5 impracticable. Even if every Class Member could afford individual litigation, the court system could
6 not. It would be unduly burdensome on the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases
7 would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent,
8 and/or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the
9 court system resulting from multiple trials of the same factual and legal issues. By contrast, the conduct
10 of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the
11 parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class Member.

12 35. Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives.
13 Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are
14 often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class
15 actions provide the Class Members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the
16 vindication of their rights.

17 **PAGA ALLEGATIONS**

18 36. PAGA is and was applicable to Defendants' employment of Plaintiffs and Aggrieved
19 Employees.

20 37. PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that
21 provides for a civil penalty, including unpaid wages and premium wages, to be assessed and collected
22 by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through
23 a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of themselves and other current or former
24 employees pursuant to the procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

25 38. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action may be brought by an "aggrieved employee," who is
26 any person employed by the alleged violator and who suffered the violations alleged.

27 39. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are "Aggrieved
28 Employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c).

1 40. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
2 including Plaintiffs, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
3 have been met:

4 (a) The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by certified mail (hereinafter
5 “Employee’s Notice”) to the LWDA and the employer of the specific provisions of the
6 California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to
7 support the alleged violations.

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

15 41. On September 6, 2024, Plaintiff NATHAN BRAMSWAY provided notice by
16 electronic submission to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific
17 provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
18 to support the alleged violations, pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and**
19 **correct copy of the Employee’s Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A.**

20 42. On October 22, 2024, Plaintiffs provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA
21 and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
22 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, and
23 adding Plaintiff EFREN CARDONA as a claimant pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3.
24 **A true and correct copy of the Employee’s Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B.**

25 43. On October 23, 2024, Plaintiffs provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA
26 and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
27 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
28 pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and correct copy of the Employee’s Notice**

1 **is attached hereto as Exhibit C.**

2 44. On May 12, 2026, Plaintiffs provided notice by electronic submission to the LWDA
3 and by certified mail to Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code
4 alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations,
5 pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.3. **A true and correct copy of the Employee's Notice**
6 **is attached hereto as Exhibit D.**

7 45. Plaintiffs did not receive a LWDA Response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of
8 providing any of the Employee's Notices set forth herein above.

9 46. Therefore, the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code section
10 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies for violations of,
11 *inter alia*, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d),
12 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802 have been satisfied.

13 47. Without limiting any other language in this Third Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs have
14 provided timely notice regarding the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have
15 been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, to each of Bayless
16 Manufacturing, LLC, Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Fabcon CA, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide
17 Rock Management, LLC and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC pursuant to California Labor Code section
18 2699.3. As such, Plaintiffs have timely exhausted administrative remedies and prerequisites under the
19 California Labor Code in connection with their PAGA claim, including as to each of Bayless
20 Manufacturing, LLC, Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Fabcon CA, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide
21 Rock Management, LLC and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC, pursuant to California Labor Code section
22 2699.3.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 1194, 1197, AND 1197.1**

25 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wage**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 48. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

28 49. California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage

1 for employees fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is the minimum wage to be paid to
2 employees, and the payment of a wage less than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Plaintiffs and the
3 other Class Members were frequently suffered or permitted to work “off-the-clock”, such that they
4 were not paid minimum wage for all hours worked.

5 50. Such “off-the-clock” work that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were suffered
6 and/or permitted to work, and for which Plaintiffs and the other Class Members did not receive
7 minimum wage include, *inter alia*: receiving necessary, work-related trainings before clocking in and
8 performing cleaning duties after clocking-out.

9 51. Accordingly, Defendants regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiffs
10 and the other Class Members for all hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections
11 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

12 52. Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
13 were performing such work “off-the-clock” because, among other things, Defendants’ management
14 witnessed, authorized, was made aware of, and/or required Plaintiffs and Class Members to perform
15 such work.

16 53. Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the minimum wage
17 as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections,
18 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum
19 wage compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorney’s fees.

20 54. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiffs and the other Class
21 Members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully
22 unpaid and interest thereon.

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 510 AND 1198**

25 **Unpaid Overtime**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

28 56. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that

1 it is unlawful to employ persons for extended periods of time without compensating them at a rate of
2 pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number
3 of hours worked by the person on a daily and/or weekly basis.

4 57. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants were required
5 to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in
6 excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or in excess of the first
7 eight (8) hours worked on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

8 58. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants were required to pay
9 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular
10 rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day and/or for all hours worked in
11 excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day in a workweek.

12 59. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation at one-
13 and-one half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in
14 excess of forty (40) hours in a week, and/or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
15 consecutive day in a workweek, and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for
16 hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the
17 seventh day of work.

18 60. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members regularly worked in excess of eight (8) hours in
19 a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, seven (7)
20 consecutive days in a workweek and/or in excess of seven (7) consecutive days in a workweek.
21 However, Defendants did not accurately record Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' actual hours
22 worked and intentionally and willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other
23 Class Members. Defendants' failure to pay correct overtime wages included, *inter alia*: (a) when the
24 combined total of the off-the-clock work discussed *supra* and the on-the-clock work exceed the
25 number of hours that trigger the payment of overtime wages under California Labor Code sections
26 510 and 1198 and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order; (b) when Defendants intentionally, willfully,
27 and/or negligently mischaracterized overtime as straight time; (c) when Defendants assigned more
28 work than could reasonably be completed in a workday or workweek to Plaintiffs and Class Members,

1 but refused to authorize the overtime necessary for them to complete the assigned work; and (d) when
2 Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration when calculating setting the
3 overtime rate.

4 61. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members as outlined above
5 violates California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order and is
6 therefore unlawful.

7 62. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
8 are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime compensation, and interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

9 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 226.7 AND 512(a)**

11 **Meal Break Violations**

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 63. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

14 64. California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order
15 govern Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

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

18 66. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide
19 that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five
20 (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than
21 thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six
22 (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

23 67. The applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further
24 provide that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work a work period of
25 more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal
26 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12)
27 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee
28 only if the first meal period was not waived.

1 68. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other Class Members with legally required
2 meal periods, including first meal periods and second meal periods, when they worked shifts of
3 sufficient duration such that Defendants were required to provide them with such meal breaks under
4 California Law.

5 69. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other Class Members with legally required
6 meal periods, including as to Class Members who waived their first meal periods, as to Class Members
7 who waived their second meal periods, as to Class Members who waived both their first and second
8 meal periods, and as to Class Members who waived neither of their meal periods.

9 70. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were required to work for periods longer than
10 five (5) hours in a workday without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.
11 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were required to work for periods longer than six (6) hours in
12 a workday without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Plaintiffs and the
13 other Class Members were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours in a workday
14 without a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Plaintiffs and the other
15 Class Members were required to work for periods longer than twelve (12) hours in a workday without
16 a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

17 71. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts no longer
18 than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
19 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not
20 less than thirty (30) minutes.

21 72. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who were scheduled to work for shifts in excess
22 of ten (10) hours but no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated
23 meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without
24 a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

25 73. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who did not waive their legally mandated first
26 meal period by mutual consent, regardless of the duration their shift was scheduled for, were required
27 to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than
28 thirty (30) minutes.

1 74. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who did not waive their legally-mandated
2 second meal period by mutual consent, regardless of the duration their shift was scheduled for,
3 were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without a second uninterrupted meal
4 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.

5 75. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who did waive their legally-mandated first meal
6 period by mutual consent, regardless of the duration their shift was scheduled for, were required to
7 work for periods longer than six (6) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty
8 (30) minutes.

9 76. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who did waive their legally-mandated second
10 meal period by mutual consent, regardless of the duration their shift was scheduled for, were required
11 to work for periods longer than twelve (12) hours without a second uninterrupted meal period of not
12 less than thirty (30) minutes.

13 77. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other Class
14 Members with legally compliant meal periods, required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to
15 work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other Class Members for work
16 performed during meal periods. This includes, among other things, requiring Plaintiffs and Class
17 Members to work through their meal breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiffs and Class Members
18 to take late meal breaks, permitting and/or requiring Plaintiffs and Class Members to take short meal
19 breaks, interrupting and/or allowing others to interrupt Plaintiffs and Class Members during their meal
20 breaks, failing to relieve Plaintiffs and Class Members of all duties during their meal breaks, and
21 restricting Plaintiffs and Class Members from leaving the premises during their meal breaks.

22 78. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class
23 Members all meal period premiums due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7 and 512 and
24 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

25 79. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to include all required wages and
26 remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-
27 discretionary performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay for meal period premiums and/or
28 merely using straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for meal period premiums.

80. Defendants' conduct therefore violates the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

81. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period was not provided as well as interest thereon.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226.7

Rest Break Violations

(Against All Defendants)

82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

83. California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order govern Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment by Defendants.

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

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

86. Defendants routinely required Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to work three and one-half (3 ½) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a compliant ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period, or major fraction thereof, worked.

87. Moreover, Defendants willfully required, suffered, and permitted Plaintiffs and the other Class Members to work during what should have been their rest periods. Defendants also failed to relieve Plaintiffs and the other Class Members of all duties for ten (10) minutes as required for compliant rest breaks.

88. As a result, Plaintiffs worked through rest periods, took late rest periods, took interrupted rest periods, and/or took short rest periods, if at all.

89. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members were entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) additional hour of pay at their regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that compliant rest period(s) were not provided.

90. Defendants had no policy or practice to pay a premium when rest periods were missed, short, late, and/or interrupted, or otherwise failed to comply with California law, and thus Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the full rest period premium due to them in violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

91. Defendants failed to include all required wages and remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay, when calculating regular rates of pay for rest period premiums and/or merely using straight time pay to calculate regular rates of pay for rest period premiums.

92. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(c), Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation for each workday compliant rest period(s) were not provided as well as interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 204 AND 210

Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment

(Against All Defendants)

93. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

94. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

95. California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any

1 employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those
2 wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of
3 the following month.

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

6 97. California Labor Code section 204 provides that the requirements of its section shall
7 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the
8 wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

9 98. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (including failure to pay overtime,
10 failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants
11 intentionally and willfully failed to timely pay Plaintiffs and the other Class Members all wages due
12 to them within the period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

13 99. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover all available remedies for
14 Defendants' violations of California Labor Code section 204, including statutory penalties pursuant to
15 California Labor Code section 210(b).

16 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE § 226(a)**

18 **Wage Statement Violations**

19 **(Against All Defendants)**

20 100. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

21 101. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides
22 that every employer shall furnish each of its employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing,
23 including, but not limited to, the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, total hours
24 worked, and all applicable hourly rates.

25 102. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (including failure to pay overtime,
26 failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), Defendants
27 intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other Class Members with complete and
28 accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to state all hours

1 worked, the failure to state the actual gross wages earned, the failure to include meal and rest break
2 premiums, and the failure to include correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Defendants violated California
3 Labor Code 226(a).

4 103. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiffs
5 and the other Class Members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

6 104. Specifically, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have been injured by Defendants'
7 intentional violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because they were denied both their legal
8 right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving accurate, itemized wage statements under
9 California Labor Code section 226(a). In addition, because Defendants failed to provide the accurate
10 number of total hours worked on wage statements, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members have been
11 prevented by Defendants from determining if all hours worked were paid and the extent of the
12 underpayment. Plaintiffs had to file this lawsuit, and will further have to conduct discovery,
13 reconstruct time records, and perform computations in order to analyze whether in fact Plaintiffs and
14 the other Class Members were paid correctly and the extent of the underpayment, thereby causing
15 Plaintiffs to incur expenses and lost time. Plaintiffs would not have had to engage in these efforts and
16 incur these costs had Defendants provided the accurate number of total hours worked. This has also
17 delayed Plaintiffs' ability to demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

18 105. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants the
19 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code
20 section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000).

21 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, AND 203**

23 **Untimely Final Wages**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 106. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

26 107. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203, Defendants are required
27 to timely pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code
28 section 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and

1 unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202
2 mandates that if an employee quits, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than
3 seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of
4 his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
5 quitting.

6 108. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay,
7 in accordance with California Labor Code sections 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is
8 discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date
9 thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced; but the wages shall not
10 continue for more than thirty (30) days.

11 109. As a result of the violations set forth in detail above (including failure to pay overtime,
12 failure to pay minimum wages, meal break violations, and rest break violations), at the
13 time that Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' employment with Defendants ended,
14 Defendants knowingly and willfully failed to pay them all wages owed to them pursuant to California
15 Labor Code sections 201 and 202, including, without limitation, overtime wages, minimum wages,
16 meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages, and all wages due to Plaintiffs and Class
17 Members as they became due, as required per California Labor Code section 204.

18 110. As a result, Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are entitled to all available
19 statutory penalties, including the waiting time penalties provided in California Labor Code section
20 203, together with interest thereon, as well as other available remedies.

21 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 2800 AND 2802**

23 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business Expenses**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 111. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

26 112. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
27 reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures and/or losses incurred by the employee in direct
28 consequence of the discharge of the employee's job duties or in direct consequence of the employee's

1 job duties or in direct consequence of the employee's obedience to the directions of the employer.

2 113. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members incurred necessary business-related losses,
3 expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

4 114. Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class
5 Members for all necessary business-related losses, expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the other Class
6 Members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related losses, expenses and costs
7 incurred during the course and scope of employment, plus interest accrued from the date on which
8 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members incurred the necessary losses, expenditures and costs at the
9 same rate as judgments in civil actions in the State of California.

10 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **VIOLATION OF CAL. BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, *ET. SEQ.***

12 **Unfair and Unlawful Business Practices**

13 **(Against All Defendants)**

14 115. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

15 116. Each and every one of Defendants' acts and omissions in violation of the California
16 Labor Code and/or the applicable IWC Wage Order as alleged in this Complaint, including but not
17 limited to Defendants' failure and refusal to pay overtime compensation, Defendants' failure and
18 refusal to pay minimum wages, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required meal periods and/or
19 pay meal period premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to provide required rest periods and/or pay
20 the required rest break premiums, Defendants' failure and refusal to timely pay wages at the correct
21 rate during employment, Defendants' failure and refusal to furnish accurate itemized wage statements,
22 Defendants' failure and refusal to reimburse business-related expenses, losses and costs, and
23 Defendants' failure and refusal to timely pay wages upon termination constitutes unfair and unlawful
24 business practices under California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

25 117. Defendants' violations of California wage and hour laws constitute unfair and unlawful
26 business practices because, among other things, they were done repeatedly over a significant period
27 of time, and in a systematic manner, to the detriment of Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

28 118. Defendants have avoided payment of overtime wages, minimum wages, meal period

1 premiums, rest period premiums, timely wages at the correct rate of pay, and other benefits as required
2 by the California Labor Code, the California Code of Regulations, and the applicable IWC Wage
3 Order. Further, Defendants have failed to record, report, and pay the correct sums of assessment to the
4 state authorities under the California Labor Code and other applicable regulations.

5 119. As a result of Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices, Defendants have
6 reaped unfair and illegal profits during Plaintiffs and the other Class Members' tenure at the expense
7 of Plaintiffs, the other Class Members, and members of the public. Defendants should be made to
8 disgorge their ill-gotten gains and to restore them to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members.

9 120. Defendants' unfair and unlawful business practices entitle Plaintiffs and the other Class
10 Members to seek preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, including but not limited to orders that
11 Defendants account for, disgorge, and restore to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members the wages and
12 other compensation unlawfully withheld from them. Plaintiffs and the other Class Members are
13 entitled to restitution of all monies to be disgorged from Defendants in an amount according to proof
14 at the time of trial.

15 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2699, *ET SEQ.***

17 **California Private Attorneys General Act**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 121. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
20 allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

21 122. Plaintiffs bring this action on an individual basis and on a representative basis on behalf
22 of other Aggrieved Employees and the State of California, in Plaintiffs' (and each of their) capacity
23 as a private attorney general pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor
24 Code § 2698, *et seq.*

25 123. PAGA expressly provides for a private right of action to recover civil penalties for
26 violations of the California Labor Code as follows: "*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any*
27 *provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and*
28 *Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies,*

1 *or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action*
2 *brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former*
3 *employees against whom a violation of the same code provision was committed pursuant to the*
4 *procedures specified in Section 2699.3.” Cal. Lab. Code § 2699(a).*

5 124. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
6 agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action is authorized to
7 exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to assess a civil penalty.

8 125. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid, non-exempt employees are “aggrieved employees”
9 as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c).

10 126. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, violates numerous sections of the California
11 Labor Code, including, but not limited to, the following:

- 12 (a) Violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 for failure to pay
13 overtime wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 14 (b) Violation of California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 for failure to
15 pay minimum wages, as set forth more fully above;
- 16 (c) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to provide
17 legally required meal periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 18 (d) Violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) for failure to pay
19 required meal period premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 20 (e) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to provide legally
21 required rest periods, as set forth more fully above;
- 22 (f) Violation of California Labor Code section 226.7 for failure to pay required rest
23 period premiums, as set forth more fully above;
- 24 (g) Violation of California Labor Code section 204 for failure to timely pay wages to
25 Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees during employment, as set forth more fully
26 above;
- 27 (h) Violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 for failure to pay all
28 wages at time of discharge from employment, as set forth more fully above;

- 1 (i) Violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) for failure to provide accurate
2 wage statements to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees, as set forth more fully
3 above;
- 4 (j) Violation of California Labor Code section 1174(d) for failure to keep complete
5 and accurate payroll records relating to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees, as set
6 forth more fully above; and
- 7 (k) Violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
8 Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees for necessary business-related expenses, as set
9 forth more fully above.

10 127. Defendants' conduct giving rise to these violations was malicious, fraudulent, and/or
11 oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

12 128. Pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3,
13 and 2699.5, Plaintiffs, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seek assessment and
14 collection of civil penalties for Plaintiffs, all Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California against
15 Defendants for violations of California Labor Code sections set forth herein, including penalties under
16 California Labor Code sections 2699, 558, 210, 1197.1, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, penalties
17 under the applicable IWC Wage Order, and any and all additional penalties and remedies as provided
18 by the California Labor Code and/or other statutes.

19 129. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(m), civil penalties recovered by the
20 Aggrieved Employees shall be distributed as follows: sixty-five percent (65%) to the LWDA for the
21 enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and
22 responsibilities and thirty-five (35%) to the Aggrieved Employees.

23 130. Plaintiffs retained counsel to file this court action, and to assess and collect the civil
24 penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiffs therefore seek an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and
25 costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1), and any other applicable
26 statute.

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

1 Plaintiffs, on behalf of all others similarly situated and other aggrieved employees and the State
2 of California pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, pray for relief and judgment
3 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

4 **Class Certification**

- 5 1. That this action be certified as a class action as to the first nine causes of action;
6 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class as to the first nine causes
7 of action;
8 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel; and
9 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel the names and most current/last known
10 contact information (addresses, e-mails, and telephone numbers) of all Class Members.

11 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 12 5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
13 Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the
14 other Class Members;
15 6. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
16 7. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
17 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members in the amount as may be established according to proof at trial;
18 8. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts
19 were due;
20 9. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
21 Labor Code section 1194(a);
22 10. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and
23 11. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

24 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 25 12. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
26 Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to pay all
27 overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;
28 13. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages

as may be appropriate;

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a); and

16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

18. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

20. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

21. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

24. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(c);

25. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

26. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and

27. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

28. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 204 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time required by California Labor Code section 204 to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members;

1 29. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 210; and

2 30. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

3 **As to the Sixth Cause of Action**

4 31. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the provisions of
5 California Labor Code section 226(a) as to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members, and willfully failed
6 to provide accurate itemized wage statements to them;

7 32. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

8 33. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

9 34. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
10 California Labor Code section 226(h); and

11 35. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

12 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

13 36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
14 Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of
15 termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and the other Class Members no longer employed by
16 Defendants;

17 37. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

18 38. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
19 Plaintiffs and the other Class Members who have left Defendants' employ;

20 39. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date due; and

21 40. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

22 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

23 41. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor
24 Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other Class Members
25 for all necessary business-related expenses, costs and losses as required by California Labor Code
26 sections 2800 and 2802;

27 42. For actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

28 43. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

- 1 44. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and
2 45. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

3 **As to the Ninth Cause of Action**

4 46. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the following
5 California Labor Code sections as to Plaintiffs and the other Class Members: 1194, 1197, and 1197.1
6 (by failing to pay minimum wages); 510 and 1198 (by failing to pay overtime wages); 226.7 and 512(a)
7 (by failing to provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof); 204 (by failing to timely
8 pay wages during employment); 226(a) (by failing to provide accurate wage statements); 201, 202,
9 and 203 (by failing to pay all wages owed upon termination); and 2800 and 2802 (by failing to
10 reimburse business-related expenses, costs and losses);

11 47. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiffs and all the other Class Members and all
12 pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

13 48. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage, and distribute any and all funds
14 disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a
15 result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

16 49. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California
17 Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and

18 50. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California
19 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*

20 **As to the Tenth Cause of Action**

21 51. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699,
22 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1, and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code
23 and/or other applicable statutes;

24 52. For injunctive relief;

25 53. For statutory attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to sections 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1)
26 of the California Labor Code; and

27 54. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

28 ///

1 ///

2 ///

3 Dated: September 10, 2026

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

4
5 By: *Lizeth Marin*
6 Karen I. Gold, Esq.
7 Marissa Mayhood, Esq.
8 Alexandra Rose, Esq.
9 Lizeth Marin, Esq.

10 *Attorneys for* Plaintiffs NATHAN BRAMSWAY
11 and EFREN CARDONA, individually, and on
12 behalf of other similarly situated employees and
13 aggrieved employees pursuant to the California
14 Private Attorneys General Act
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

September 6, 2024

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

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

**RE: *Nathan Bramsway v. Fabcon, Inc.; Fabcon, LLC; Tide Rock Holdings, LLC;
Tide Rock Management, LLC; Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC***

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Nathan Bramsway (“Claimant”) with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Nathan Bramsway from approximately November 2022 to November 2023 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Nathan Bramsway worked as a Welder for Employers and was based out of Employers’ facility located at 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant’s notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimant’s employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the

meaning of PAGA.

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

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

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

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

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant

to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

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

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

California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

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

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly,

Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

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

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

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

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

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

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

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

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

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

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

Karen I. Gold
Karen I. Gold, Esq.



cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Fabcon, Inc. 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solana Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, Inc. Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Fabcon, Inc. 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355.	Fabcon, LLC 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355
Fabcon, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solana Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock Holdings, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solana Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock Management, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solana Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solana Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203

EXHIBIT B

October 22, 2024

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

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

RE: AMENDED PAGA LETTER

Nathan Bramsway & Efren Cardona v. Fabcon, Inc.; Fabcon, LLC; Tide Rock Holdings, LLC; Tide Rock Management, LLC; Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC

Case Number: LWDA-CM-1055557-24

To Whom It May Concern:

On September 6, 2024, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) (California Labor Code § 2699.3), our office provided notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC on behalf of Nathan Bramsway (“Mr. Bramsway”) that Mr. Bramsway may allege a cause of action under PAGA in a civil action against Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”).

We write to inform you that we have been retained by Efren Cardona (“Mr. Cardona”) who was employed by Employers as a Welder from approximately January 2022 to November 2023 at Employers’ facility located at 26100 Ave. Hall, Valencia, CA 91355. Mr. Cardona intends to be added to also bring a representative action as a named plaintiff and seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under PAGA. Mr. Cardona seeks these penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”).

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimants' employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order"). Employers' conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

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

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

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

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimants and Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

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

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

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

(7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

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

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

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train

Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

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

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

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

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

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

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

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

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period,

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

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

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

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

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimants hereby provide notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code

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

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

Karen I. Gold
Karen I. Gold, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Fabcon, Inc. 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, Inc. Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Fabcon, Inc. 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355.	Fabcon, LLC 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355
Fabcon, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock Holdings, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock Management, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203



8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

EXHIBIT C

October 23, 2024

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

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

RE: SECOND AMENDED PAGA LETTER

Nathan Bramsway & Efren Cardona v. Fabcon, Inc.; Fabcon, LLC; Bayless Manufacturing, LLC; Tide Rock Holdings, LLC; Tide Rock Management, LLC; Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC

Case Number: LWDA-CM-1055557-24

To Whom It May Concern:

On September 6, 2024, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) (California Labor Code § 2699.3), our office provided notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC on behalf of Nathan Bramsway (“Mr. Bramsway”) that Mr. Bramsway may allege a cause of action under PAGA in a civil action against Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof).

On October 22, 2024, our office wrote to inform you that we have been retained by Efren Cardona (“Mr. Cardona”) who was employed by Employers as a Welder from approximately January 2022 to November 2023 at Employers’ facility located at 26100 Ave. Hall, Valencia, CA 91355. Mr. Cardona intends to be added to also bring a representative action as a named plaintiff and seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under PAGA. Mr. Cardona seeks these penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who

suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”).

We are now writing to inform you that Mr. Bramsway and Mr. Cardona intend to add an employer, Bayless Manufacturing, LLC, to their representative action. Mr. Bramsway and Mr. Cardona will allege a cause of action under PAGA in a civil action against Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Bayless Manufacturing, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers thereof)(collectively referred to herein as “Employers”).

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimants’ employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

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

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

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

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimants and Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

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

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically

disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

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

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

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

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

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

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

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; injunctive relief; and

attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimants and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

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

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

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

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimants hereby provide notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

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

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

Karen I. Gold
Karen I. Gold, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Fabcon, Inc. 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, Inc. Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Fabcon, Inc. 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355	Fabcon, LLC 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355
Fabcon, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075	Fabcon, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Bayless Manufacturing, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200	Bayless Manufacturing, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service



Solano Beach, CA 92075	330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203
Bayless Manufacturing, LLC 26100 Avenue Hall Valencia, CA 91355.	Tide Rock Holdings, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075
Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203	Tide Rock Management, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075
Tide Rock Holdings, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203	Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC 343 S Highway 101 Suite 200 Solano Beach, CA 92075
Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service 330 N Brand Blvd. Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 91203	

EXHIBIT D



8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Lizeth Marin, Esq.
lmarin@blackstonepc.com

May 12, 2026

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)

Sacramento, CA 95814

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

RE: AMENDED PAGA LETTER

Nathan Bramsway & Efren Cardona v. Bayless Manufacturing, LLC; Fabcon, Inc.; Fabcon, LLC; Fabcon CA, LLC; Tide Rock Holdings, LLC; Tide Rock Management, LLC; Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC

Case Number: LWDA-CM-1049367-24

To Whom It May Concern:

On September 6, 2024, pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) (California Labor Code § 2699.3), our office provided notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) on behalf of Nathan Bramsway (“Mr. Bramsway”) that Mr. Bramsway may allege a cause of action under PAGA.

We write to inform you that we have been retained by Efren Cardona (“Mr. Cardona”) who was employed by Employers (as defined below) as a Welder from approximately January 2022 to November 2023 at Employers’ facility located at 26100 Ave. Hall, Valencia, CA 91355. Mr. Cardona intends to be added to Mr. Bramsway’s action as a named plaintiff, and Mr. Cardona and Mr. Bramsway (“Claimants”) intend to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under PAGA. Mr. Cardona and Mr. Bramsway seek these penalties on behalf of themselves and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers (as defined below) in the State of California during the relevant statutory period who suffered the violations alleged (“Aggrieved Employees”).

Further, we are also writing to inform you that Mr. Bramsway and Mr. Cardona intend to add Bayless Manufacturing, LLC and Fabcon CA, LLC, to their representative action. Mr. Bramsway and Mr. Cardona will allege a cause of action under PAGA in a civil action against

Bayless Manufacturing, LLC, Fabcon CA, LLC, Fabcon, Inc., Fabcon, LLC, Tide Rock Holdings, LLC, Tide Rock Management, LLC, and Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, predecessors, parents, directors, and officers thereof) (collectively referred to herein as “Employers”).

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Claimants’ employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order (“IWC Wage Order”). Employers’ conduct giving rise to the violations detailed below was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive within the meaning of PAGA.

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

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

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

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

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

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

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimants and Aggrieved Employees.

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

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

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

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4)

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

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

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

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

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

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

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

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies

regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

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

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

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

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

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers willfully and intentionally failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

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

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

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

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Employers' failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements was knowing and intentional. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

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

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

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

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the

discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimants and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order **Error! Reference source not found.** and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; injunctive relief; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

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

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

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

9. CONCLUSION

Claimants hereby provide notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for



8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

the violations discussed in this letter.

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

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

BLACKSTONE LAW

Lizeth Marin

Lizeth Marin, Esq.

cc: By E-mail and U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Bayless Manufacturing, LLC
C/O John Wicker (jwicker@stradlinglaw.com)
C/O Micol Small (msmall@stradlinglaw.com)
STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH LLP
660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 600
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Attorneys for Bayless Manufacturing, LLC

Bayless Manufacturing, LLC
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Bayless Manufacturing, LLC
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.



BLACKSTONE
LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Glendale, CA 91203

Bayless Manufacturing, LLC
26100 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355

Fabcon, Inc.
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Fabcon, Inc.
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

Fabcon, Inc.
26100 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355

Fabcon, LLC
26100 Avenue Hall
Valencia, CA 91355

Fabcon, LLC
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Fabcon, LLC
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

Fabcon CA, LLC
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Fabcon CA, LLC
330 N Brand Blvd
Glendale, CA 91203

Tide Rock Holdings, LLC
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Tide Rock Holdings, LLC
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

Tide Rock Management, LLC



BLACKSTONE
LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Tide Rock Holdings, LLC
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC
343 S Highway 101 Suite 200
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Tide Rock GrowCo, LLC
Attn: C T Corporation System, Agent for Service
330 N Brand Blvd.
Glendale, CA 91203

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I, Lorena Bautista, certify and declare as follows:

I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to the within action; my business address is 8383 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 745, Beverly Hills, California 90211. On September 10, 2026, I served a copy of the following document(s):

• **THIRD AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

on the interested parties as follows:

JOHN WICKER

jwicker@stradlinglaw.com

MICOL SMALL

msmall@stradlinglaw.com

STRADLING YOCCA CARLSON & RAUTH LLP

660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1600

Newport Beach, CA 92660-6422

Telephone: 949 725 4000

Facsimile: 949 725 4100

Attorneys for Defendant

BAYLESS MANUFACTURING, LLC

☒ **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE (CASE ANYWHERE):** I caused said document(s) to be sent to the addressee(s) listed above via Case Anywhere. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **BY ONLINE SUBMISSION:** The above-referenced documents were transmitted to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency through the online system established for the submission of notices and documents, in conformity with California Labor Code section 2699(I). I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

☒ **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on September 10, 2026 at Beverly Hills, California.

/s/ Lorena Bautista
Lorena Bautista