



SIRMABEKIAN
LAW FIRM

2600 W Olive Ave, 5th Floor
Burbank, CA 91505

T (818) 473-5003
F (818) 476-5619

contact@slawla.com
www.slawla.com

December 18, 2024

Gomringer Kuhl Builders
5260 W Pico Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90019

via U.S. Certified Mail

Gomringer Flooring, Inc.
1316 E. Palm Dr.
Glendora, CA 91741

via U.S. Certified Mail

Gomringer Hardwood and Moulding LLC
1965 South Myrtle Avenue
Monrovia, CA 91016

via U.S. Certified Mail

Adolfo Gomringer
5260 W Pico Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90019

via U.S. Certified Mail

Robert Kuhl
5260 W Pico Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90019

via U.S. Certified Mail

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
("LWDA")
Department of Industrial Relations
Accounting Unit
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

filed/served online at:
<http://www.dir.ca.gov>

RE: Henry Antonio Martinez Cucalon's Amended Notice of Labor Code Violations Pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2699 et seq. ("PAGA")

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please be advised that HENRY ANTONIO MARTINEZ CUCALON (hereinafter "Plaintiff") have retained the Sirmabekian Law Firm, PC to represent him and other aggrieved employees for various California Labor Code violations including wage and hour claims against GOMRINGER KUHL BUILDERS, GOMRINGER FLOORING, INC., GOMRINGER HARDWOOD AND MOULDING LLC and ADOLFO GOMRINGER (hereafter referred to as "Employer," "Defendants," or "You" and/or referred to with "Your" and "Yours", and "EMPLOYER" or "DEFENDANTS").

EMPLOYER is hereby on notice that Plaintiff seeks compensation and all other available relief. Pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code *Section 2699.3*, Plaintiff claims that EMPLOYER has violated, and/or caused to be violated, several Labor Code provisions, and is therefore liable for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

The scope of this PAGA letter is intended to include Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees of all positions against whom the below labor law violations have been committed. The scope includes each employee of each employer named above, whether or not such employee was also employed by any of the remaining employers. Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees engaged in working as construction workers, laborers and other positions for Defendants.

Defendant GOMRINGER KUHL BUILDERS, GOMRINGER FLOORING, INC., GOMRINGER HARDWOOD AND MOULDING LLC are a construction business operating in California. Defendant ADOLFO GOMRINGER and ROBERT KUHL are owners/operators, officers, and/or managing agents of the business and are liable jointly and severally for damages pursuant to Labor Code §558.1.

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants were in charge of managing, supervising, and controlling Plaintiff's and other employees' wages, work hours, pay, and work conditions, along with managing the day-to-day operations of the business. Therefore, Defendants controlled the employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

Defendants employed Plaintiff as a construction worker for approximately 3 months until December 2024. Below are facts supporting allegations of Defendants' labor code violations against Plaintiff and other employees:

- Defendants misclassified workers as independent contractors in violation of Labor Code 226.8 by paying them outside of payroll.
- Defendants failed to keep track of Plaintiff's and other employees' actual hours worked. Employees' pay was rounded and inaccurate. This is in violation of the "Records" section of Wage Order 16 and other wage orders.
- Meal and rest breaks were not afforded. And most others' breaks were often short, late, interrupted, or nonexistent due to business demands (e.g. construction timelines, business demands).
- Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other for their personal cell phones and devices, which Defendants used to communicate work-related matters.
- Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff's timely and complete final pay upon separation and said final pay was incomplete.
- Defendants violated these and other labor laws as described throughout this letter.

The term "aggrieved employees" is broadly defined as all employees of either Defendant, regardless of exempt or non-exempt status, and regardless of whether such employee was also employed by the remaining Defendants. This definition includes all employees, not just those in the Plaintiff's position.

EMPLOYER deprived Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of certain protections of the Industrial Welfare Commission Orders, including overtime pay, minimum wage, meal and

rest periods, and sick pay and failure to reimburse under Labor Code 2802, among numerous other California Labor Code violations. Many other aggrieved employees were also treated as exempt from those protections.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees primarily engage(d) in duties that failed to meet the requirements of the various exemptions. They lacked the requisite discretion and independent judgment required by the labor code and the IWC Orders (without limitation) to qualify as exempt from various labor law protections. By misclassifying aggrieved employees, EMPLOYER deprived them of many protections.

Unlawful Failure to Pay Overtime

EMPLOYER fails to maintain a policy that compensates Plaintiff and other employees for all hours worked, including overtime. Specifically, EMPLOYER only pays employees for the majority of time that they spend at work. Many employees, including Plaintiff, routinely worked work over eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week but are not paid one and one-half their regular rate of pay for overtime work. As a result of violations of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders for failure to pay overtime, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Provide Unpaid Balance of Full Amount of Overtime Compensation

As described above, EMPLOYER has required employees to work hours in excess of eight hours in a day and forty hours in a week as a result of working their regular shifts, but EMPLOYER has not paid these employees overtime compensation. Here, Defendants failed to keep track of Plaintiff's and other employees' actual hours worked. Employees' pay was rounded and inaccurate. This is in violation of the "Records" section of Wage Order 5 and other wage orders. As a result, Plaintiff and other employees have been denied "the unpaid balance of the full amount of this ... overtime compensation" as required by California Labor Code § 1194, and EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

EMPLOYER has failed to maintain a policy that compensates Plaintiff and other employees an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked, as required by California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate and no part of this rate may be used as a credit against a minimum wage obligation. EMPLOYER did not compensate Plaintiff and other employees for time spent working off the clock. Here, Defendants failed to keep track of Plaintiff's and other employees' actual hours worked. Employees' pay was rounded and inaccurate. This is in violation of the "Records" section of Wage Order 2, 4, 5, 16, 17 and other wage orders. As a result of violations of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, for failure to pay minimum wage, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 558, 1197.1, and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Provide Uninterrupted Off-Duty Meal Periods

EMPLOYER has failed to maintain a policy that provides Plaintiff and other employees with off-duty meal periods as required by California law. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees regularly worked in excess of five (5) hours a day without being provided at least

half-hour meal periods in which they were relieved of all duties, as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders. EMPLOYER failed to pay Plaintiff and other employees the premium compensation mandated by Labor Code § 226.7(b) for these missed meal periods. Some employees were also due a second meal break as they worked in excess of ten (10) hours. They would be required to work through their meal breaks, or take short meal breaks, and no premium compensation was provided. They would be required to work through their meal breaks, or take short meal breaks, and no premium compensation was provided. Many employees, including Plaintiff, were forced to skip or take untimely breaks without appropriate compensation. Here, Defendants afforded employees no compliant meal and rest breaks. As a result of violations of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Provide Uninterrupted Off-Duty Rest Periods

EMPLOYER has failed to maintain a policy that provides Plaintiff and other employees with off-duty rest periods as required by California law. Plaintiff and other employees regularly worked in excess of 3.5 hours or major fraction thereof during work days without being provided at least a ten-minute rest period in which they were relieved of all duties, as required by Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders. EMPLOYER failed to pay Plaintiff and other employees the premium compensation mandated by Labor Code § 226.7(b) for these missed rest periods. Many employees, including Plaintiff, were forced to skip or take untimely rest breaks without appropriate compensation. Here, Defendants afforded employees no compliant meal and rest breaks. As a result of violations of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Reimburse Expenses

EMPLOYER has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and other employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiff. Here, Defendants failed to reimburse their employees for reasonable business expenses. California Labor Code § 2802 requires the employer to indemnify employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of the discharge their duties. As a result of violations of California Labor Code § 2802, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 558, 2802 and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Furnish Wage Statements

EMPLOYER has violated California Labor Code § 226(a) by willfully failing to furnish Plaintiff and other employees with required wage statement information. As a result of violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 2698 *et seq.*

Every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of her or her employees, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order

of the Industrial Welfare Commission, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of her or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payment of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement and the record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the State of California.

Here, Defendants' wage statements were inaccurate. Further, Defendants unfair rounding of employees' hours resulted in an underpayment of wages to their employees. As a result of violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 2698 *et seq.*

Unlawful Failure to Keep Accurate Payroll Records of Daily Hours Worked

EMPLOYER has failed to keep payroll records showing total hours worked and wages paid to Plaintiff and other employees. Under California Labor Code § 1174(d), employers must keep "payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to ... employees". Because EMPLOYER did not keep complete and accurate time records reflecting hours worked for Plaintiff and other employees, including, but not limited to, beginning work prior to the start of their shifts, working after the end of their shifts, and missed/short/late rest and meal breaks, it is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §2698 *et seq.* Section 6 or 7 of the applicable wage order requires the recording of this time. EMPLOYER would not keep track of action time. Instead, Defendants unfairly rounded employees' hours, which resulted in underpayment of wages to their employees. To the extent that EMPLOYER's failure to keep accurate payroll records was willful, it is liable for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 1174.5.

Unlawful Violation of California Labor Code § 1199

Under California Labor Code §§ 1199(a) and (c) and 2699.5 *et seq.*, an employer who "requires or causes any employee to work for longer hours than those fixed" or "violates or refuses or neglects to comply with any provision of" the Labor Code regarding employees' wages, hours, and working conditions, is subject to PAGA penalties. As described above, EMPLOYER has required Plaintiff and other employees to work hours in excess of eight (8) in a day and forty (40) in a week (thereby violating § 1199(a)), failed to provide adequate rest and meal breaks, failed to pay minimum wage and has violated numerous provisions of the Labor Code pertaining to employee wages and hours (thereby violating § 1199(b)). Accordingly, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Misclassification of Employees

It unlawful for any person or employer to willfully misclassify an individual as an

independent contractor. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.8(a)(1). This permits Plaintiff to recover a civil penalty from five thousand dollars (\$5,000) to twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) for each violation, in addition to any other penalties or fines permitted by law. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.8(b)-(c). Here, Defendants misclassified Plaintiff and others as independent contractors, sometimes paying them outside of payroll or partially in cash. Defendants paid certain employees in cash and outside of payroll, as independent contractors, thereby depriving employees of wage statements and other labor law protections. As such, Defendants violated California Labor Code § 226.8 and numerous other Labor Code sections. Plaintiff and others were always employees as evidenced by the following facts: Plaintiff's position required her to work for EMPLOYER, among many other duties which were directly related to the services provided by EMPLOYER. EMPLOYER supplied the instrumentalities, tools, and the place for the employees to do their work (all work was done under EMPLOYER's supervision; the employees' investment in the equipment or materials required were limited or non-existent; no special skills were required of the employees; the employees' services were to be performed for a long period of time with a high degree of permanence in the working relationship; and the parties believed they were maintaining an employer-employee relationship.).

Unlawful Failure to Pay Wages Due Upon Termination

EMPLOYER has violated California Labor Code § § 201 and 202 by willfully failing to pay all compensation due and owing to Plaintiff and other employees at the time employment was terminated, EMPLOYER willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other employees who are no longer employed by it all compensation due upon termination of employment as required under California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 including, but not limited to, missing wages due to inaccurate tracking of employees' time records and failing to properly track their hours works and premium pay for missed/short/late meal and rest breaks. Here, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff's final pay upon separation. Plaintiff and other employees are now also entitled to recover up to thirty (30) days of wages due to EMPLOYER's "willful" failure to comply with the statutory requirements of sections 201 and 202 of the Labor Code. Additionally, because EMPLOYER violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 201and 203 of the Labor Code, EMPLOYER is liable for civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Mandated Seating

Defendants were required to provide Plaintiff (and the other aggrieved employees encompassed by Plaintiff's PAGA Notice Letter) with the seating required under the applicable Industrial Wage Order ("IWO"). In violation of the applicable IWO, Defendants have adopted and continue to adopt a custom and practice of failing to provide its current and former Employees with: 1) Suitable seating when the nature of the Employees' work reasonably permits use of seats and 2) Suitable seating in reasonable proximity to Employee's work areas for use by Employees when a) they are not engaged in active duty, b) their work requires standing and c) such seats would not interfere with the performance of their duties.

Unlawful Failure to Pay Timely Wages

EMPLOYER has failed to timely pay wages to employees as required by California Labor Code section 204. Specifically, the employer has engaged in a pattern and practice of paying employees later than the established paydays, failing to pay wages earned in the current pay period by the required due date. This includes but is not limited to instances where employees were required to work off-the-clock without compensation, or where wages earned,

including overtime and other premium pay such as meal and rest break premiums, were not timely paid. These practices have resulted in the systematic delay of wages owed to employees, causing financial hardship and detriment to their economic security.

Injunctive Relief

Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k)(1) to prevent Defendant from continuing its unlawful employment practices. Specifically, Claimant requests the Court to enjoin Defendant from committing further violations of the California Labor Code, including but not limited to the violations of wage payment provisions. Plaintiff also seeks any additional equitable relief necessary to enforce the provisions of the Labor Code and ensure compliance with California labor laws, in order to protect the rights of the Plaintiff and similarly aggrieved employees.

Conclusion

EMPLOYER has violated or has caused to be violated a number of California wage and hour laws. Plaintiff therefore intends to file civil claims for the aforementioned violations of the Labor Code and other law. Plaintiff requests the agency review this notice per PAGA's provisions.

Sincerely,

SIRMABEKIAN LAW FIRM, PC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarkis Sirmabekian', with a stylized, cursive script.

Sarkis Sirmabekian, Esq.