WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
3055 Wilshire Blvd, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010
Tel: (213) 381-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9989
wilshirelawfirm.com

Sean Paisan, Esq.
Justin F. Marquez, Esq.
John Yslas, Esq.

Stephanie Mazepa, Esq.
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.
Thiago Coelho, Esq.

December 18, 2024

LWDA
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
(***Via Online Submission***)

Piggy Express Inc.
19093 Colima Road
Rowland Heights, CA 91748
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 34

Piggyship Inc.
8715 Innovation St.
Chino, CA 91708
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 41

Jiang Chen
21435 Via Pepita,
Yorba Linda, CA 92866
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 58

Cesar Borgas
15785 Mission Street,
Hesperia, CA 92345
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 65

Longfei Cong
Agent for Service of Process
Piggy Express Inc.
19093 Colima Road
Rowland Heights, CA 91748
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 72

Jianting Zhang
Agent for Service of Process
Piggyship Inc.
8715 Innovation St.
Chino, CA 91708
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489 0090 0027 6620 2502 89

Re: ***Antonio Hernandez, Kevin Mora, Omar Rugama, Walter Alvarez-Perez, Jhonatan Ramirez, and William Vargas v. Piggy Express Inc., et al.***
Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Antonio Hernandez, Kevin Mora, Omar Rugama, Walter Alvarez-Perez, Jhonatan Ramirez, and William Vargas ("Employees") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against their former employers, Piggy Express Inc., Piggy Ship Inc., Jiang Chen, and Cesar Borgas ("Employers"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Employers engaged in with respect to Employees and some or potentially all of Employers' Aggrieved Employees.

Employees wish to pursue this action on behalf of Employees as Aggrieved Employees, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of some or potentially all other persons who worked for Employers in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period, including those who were misclassified as independent contractors (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

<u>Employees' Employment with Employers</u>

Piggy Express Inc. and Piggy Ship Inc. are logistics companies that operate a warehouse and offer local delivery services similar to entities such as Amazon. On information and belief, Jiang Chen is and/or was a Director, Officer, and/or managing agent of Piggy Express Inc. and Piggy Ship Inc. who violated or caused to be violated the Labor Code provisions mentioned below and is thus liable under Labor Code § 558.1. Cesar Borjas is and/or was a person acting on behalf of Piggy Express Inc. and/or Piggy Ship Inc., who violated the Labor Code provisions mentioned below and is thus liable under Labor Code § 558.1.

Employees worked as delivery drivers. Their primary job functions included sorting packages in the warehouse, scanning items, loading and unloading vehicles, and delivering goods. In performing their duties, Employees were regularly required to perform work (off-the-clock), without compensation, including by arriving to work at Employer's warehouse to sort, load, and unload packages. However, Employers were only compensated for successful deliveries and were fined or had wages deducted for failed deliveries. Due to understaffing and high workloads, including being required to make more than 100 package deliveries per day, Employees were also frequently deprived of an opportunity to take legally compliant meal and rest breaks as Employees were reprimanded or disciplined for failing to complete their delivery routes on time. Moreover, Employers failed to provide Employees and other Aggrieved Employees with the meal and rest break premiums as required by the Labor Code. Additionally, Employees were expected to and did incur business-related expenses, including having to incur mileage on their personal vehicles, purchase and maintain a personal cell phone for use of Employers' mobile application, GPS, and to communicate with Employers, but Employers failed to reimburse such business-related expenses. These are just non-exhaustive examples of the facts and theories the Employees assert, which are described in more detail below.

Employers own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Employers' business in California, Employers are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Employee Antonio Hernandez is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately June 2024 to approximately August 2024. Employee Antonio Hernandez should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

Employee Kevin Mora is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately April 2024 to present. Employee Kevin Mora should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

Employee Omar Rugama is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately July 2024 to approximately July 2024. Employee Omar Rugama should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

Employee Jhonatan Ramirez is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately May 2024 to approximately June 2024. Employee Jhonatan Ramirez should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

Employee Walter Alvarez-Perez is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately June 2023 to present. Employee Walter Alvares-Perez should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

Employee William Vargas is a resident of California who worked for Employers in Los Angeles County, California from approximately July 2024 to approximately July 2024. Employee William Vargas should have been paid an hourly wage for his services as a non-exempt employee.

During their employment for Employers, Employers paid Employees an hourly wage and classified them as non-exempt from overtime. Employers typically scheduled Employees to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Employees also worked more than eight hours in a workday and more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

Throughout Employees' employment, Employers failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Employees with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Employees to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Employees when Employers terminated Employees' employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Employees, failed to indemnify Employees for business expenditures, and failed to timely produce Employees' requested employment records. As discussed below, Employees' experience working for Employers was typical and illustrative.

<u>Misclassification of Employees and Aggrieved Employees as Independent Contractors</u>

Under Labor Code § 226.8, it is unlawful for any person or employer to engage in any of the following activities: (1) willful misclassification of an individual as an independent contractor; and (2) charging an individual who has been willfully misclassified as an independent contractor a fee, or making any deductions from compensation, for any purpose, including goods, materials, space rental, services, government licenses, repairs, equipment maintenance, or fines arising from the individual's employment where any of the acts described in this paragraph would have violated the law if the individual had not been misclassified.

Additionally, under Business & Professions Code § 7451, an app-based driver is an independent contractor and not an employee or agent with respect to the app-based driver's relationship with a network company if all of the following conditions are met: (a) the network company does not unilaterally prescribe specific dates, times of day, or a minimum number of hours during which the app-based driver must be logged into the network company's online-enabled application or platform; (b) the network company does not require the app-based driver to accept any specific rideshare service or delivery service request as a condition of maintaining access to the network company's online-enabled application or platform; (c) the network company does not restrict the app-based driver from performing rideshare services or delivery services through other network companies except during engaged time; and (d) the company does not restrict the app-based driver from working in any other lawful occupation or business.

Moreover, under Business & Professions Code § 7453(a) a network company shall ensure that for each earnings period, an app-based driver is compensated at not less than the net earnings floor set forth in this section. Under subsection (d), "net earnings floor" means, for any earnings period, a total amount of 120 percent of the applicable minimum wage for all engaged time (which is the per-mile compensation for vehicle expenses multiplied by the total number of engaged miles).

Here, throughout Employees' employment, Employers misclassified Employees and other Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, as independent contractors and cannot meet the requirements of Business & Professions Code § 7451, *et seq.* Employers required that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees work a certain number of hours at specific times. Indeed, if

Employees refused to work certain hours, they were reprimanded for failing to take the routes and were either given less desirable routes, less hours, or terminated. Moreover, Employers did not pay at least 130% of the minimum wage as they only paid Employees and other Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by the number of deliveries that were made. Employees were not compensated for any time spent driving, for mileage, yet alone for the hours they spent each shift prior to making a delivery sorting packages and loading them into vehicles for delivery. Furthermore, Employers violated Labor Code § 226.8 by deducing wages from Employees and other Aggrieved Employees for failing to make a timely or satisfactory delivery. The deductions made to Employees could be as high as several hundred dollars per unsatisfactory delivery. Additionally, Employers charged a fee for use of their mobile-application, which Employees used to track which deliveries they had made. Worse, Employers also failed to pay, and still continue to fail to pay Employees and other Aggrieved Employees for wages withheld even for the deliveries that were paid. In particular, Employees complained to Cesar Borgas about their missing payments, to Employees' knowledge, nothing was resolved.

As a result of the misclassification, Employers have violated Labor Code § 226.8 as well as each of the referenced Labor Code provisions below.

<u>Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight, and Overtime Wages</u>

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers at times failed to pay Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Employers at times required Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Employees and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal periods and rest periods, and requiring Employees and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work before clocking in and/or after clocking out, including by requiring that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to arrive to Employers' warehouse to sort, load, and unload delivery packages for up to two hours before any compensation began to accrue. Thus, even if Employees are held to be independent contractors, which they are not, Employees were not making deliveries when working inside Employers' warehouse and thus, Business & Professions Code § 7451, et seq. is inapplicable.

Additionally, by deducing wages from Employees and other Aggrieved Employees for unsatisfactory deliveries, Employers failed to pay at least the minimum wage, yet alone 130% of the minimum wage. Notwithstanding, some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. California Labor Code § 510 requires that employers compensate employees 1.5 times their regular rate of pay when employees work over eight hours per day, 40 hours per week, or when employees work up to eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek. Employer at times failed to properly calculate Employees' regular rate of pay when paying overtime, by failing to include all compensation in Employees' overtime calculations. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Employers also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Employees are informed and believe that Employers also engaged, at times, in a practice of improper rounding. Under Camp v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc. (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638, because Employers could and did track the exact time in minutes that Employees worked, they must pay for all time worked. When an employer uses an electronic timekeeping system to record time worked, this ability to "precisely capture time worked" means that "the employer must pay the employee for that worktime when due." (Id. at 671.) As a result of Employers' rounding policy, Employees consistently were not compensated at least minimum wage for all hours that Employees worked.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Employers at times wrongfully failed to provide Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing at times to provide Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the opportunity to leave the work premises to take meal periods). Employers also continued to assert control over Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by, among other things, requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, permission to take a meal period under the conditions required by law, and without properly compensating Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for meal periods that were not provided as required by law. Specifically, Employers engaged in an undue pressure campaign by threatening Employees and other Aggrieved Employees with termination if they did not agree to the delivery routes provided by the Employer, which could include delivery of more than 100 packages in a shift. Employers also did not inform Employees of their right to, nor permitted them to take, all of Employees' second meal periods when they worked at least ten hours of work in a workday and otherwise unlawfully pressured Employees to waive such breaks. Accordingly, Employers at times failed to provide meal periods to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, in compliance with California law.

Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s). Employers, however, at times failed to pay Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e., more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers at times have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to take legally compliant rest periods in a manner required by law (and also including but not limited to failing, at times, to authorize and permit Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the opportunity to leave the work premises to take rest periods). Employers at times required Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Employers authorizing and permitting Employees to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Employers at times continued to assert control over Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, permission to take a rest period. Specifically, Employers engaged in an undue pressure campaign by threatening Employees and other Aggrieved Employees with termination if they did not agree to the delivery routes provided by the Employer, which could include delivery of more than 100 packages in a shift. Accordingly, Employers at times failed to authorize and permit Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Employers, however, at times failed to pay Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on Employers' failure at times to pay Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for all wages as discussed above, Employers also violated Labor Code § 204.Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, at times, Employers failed and refused to pay the Employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that Employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Employers, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Employers, and all wages for all hours worked. Specifically, Employers, at times, paid Employees and other Aggrieved Employees only once a month, only partial payment on their wages, or not at all. As a result, Employers owe Employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Employees seek penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Employers, however, at times failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them. Employers' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Employers' records. Therefore, Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Employers. As a direct result, Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorneys' fees in seeking to compel Employers to fully perform their obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Employers' knowing failure, at times, to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 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 that if an employee voluntarily leaves 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 previous 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. Direct deposits of wages to an employee's bank, saving and loan, or credit union account that were previously authorized by the employee are immediately terminated when an employee quits or is discharged, and the payment of wages upon termination of employment in the manner described above shall apply unless the employee has voluntarily authorized that deposit and provided that the employer complies with the provisions of Labor Code § 213(d) relating to the payment of wages upon termination or quitting of employment.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Employees and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Employers at times failed, and continue at times to fail to pay Employees and terminated Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Employers' employment.

These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Employers also violated, and continue to violate, Labor Code section 213(d) by paying final wages (if any are paid at all) via direct deposit without the employee's voluntary authorization.

Employers' conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are entitled to recover from Employers their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203. Moreover, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination, and for unlawfully making any such payment (if any) via direct deposit without the employee's voluntary authorization.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000) and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Employers at times failed to, and continue at times to fail, to timely furnish Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Employers at times violated Labor Code § 226, Employees and similarly Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Employees and similarly Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, are entitled to recover from Employers the greater of their actual damages caused by Employers' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars ($4,000) per employee.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to timely furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify their employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of his or her duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Employers at times wrongfully required Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Employers. Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, at times paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including but not limited to expenses incurred for mileage and personal cell phones. Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Employers, but Employers failed to indemnify Employees and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for necessary business expenditures.

Failure to Produce Requested Employment Records

Labor Code § 226 provides that current and former employees have the right to inspect or receive a copy of their records pertaining to their employment, upon reasonable request to their employer. Under this statute, an employer that receives a request to inspect or receive a copy of records pertaining to a current or former employee must comply with the request as soon as practicable, but no later than twenty-one (21) calendar days from the date of the request.

Labor Code § 1198.5(a) also provides that every current and former employee, or his or her representative, has the right to inspect and receive a copy of the personnel records that the employer maintains relating to the employees' performance or to any grievance concerning the employee. Under this statute, upon written request from a current or former employee or his or her representative, an employer must make the contents of those personnel records available for inspection or provide a copy of the personnel records to the current or former employee, or his or her representative, not later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date the employer receives the written request, subject to some limited exceptions. Labor Code § 432 provides that if an employee or applicant signs any instrument relating to the obtaining or holding of employment, he or she shall be given a copy of the instrument upon request.

On information and belief, Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, submitted written request(s) to Employers for their payroll records, timecards, and personnel records but did not timely receive them as required by the Labor Code. Employees specifically sent a records request on or about October 4, 2024. To date, Employees did not receive any response to their request.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employees and the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 226(f), 1198.5(k), and 2699 for failing to timely produce the requested records.

/ / /
/ / /

Recordkeeping Requirement Violations

California Labor Code section 1174 requires employers to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by Employees and Aggrieved Employees. All applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7 similarly requires employers to keep accurate time records reflecting the times during which all owed meal periods were provided each day.

Based on information and belief, Employers at times failed, and continue at times to fail, to keep accurate and complete payroll records as required by law, including but not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked, applicable rates of pay, time records showing when Employees and other Aggrieved Employees began and ended each work period, time records of meal periods, and accurate itemized wage statements.

Based on information and belief, Employers at times failed and continue at times to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by Employees and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, by virtue of Employers' time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices. Employers at times failed and continue at times to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of Employers' failure to relieve Employees and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, of all duties and Employers' control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

Based on information and belief, Employers further failed at times, and continue at times to fail, to record the true start and end times of Employees' and Aggrieved Employees' meal periods, or some of them.

Based on further information and belief, Employers further failed at times and continue at times to fail, to record the true start and end times of Employees' and Aggrieved Employees' work shifts, or some of them.

Additionally, Employers at times failed, and continue at times to fail to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for Employees and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them.

Employers' failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for Employees and Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, violates Labor Code sections 1174, 1198, 1199, and all applicable IWC Wage Orders, section 7. These violations subject Employers to civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558.1, 226.6, 1174.5 and 2699. Each violation of each Labor Code section and Wage Order provision, for each Aggrieved Employees (or some of them), results in a separate civil penalty.[1]

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Employees allege that Employers violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;

---

[1] See Lab. Code §2699(f)(2) (establishing that the civil penalty is "for each aggrieved employee per pay period").

2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 226.8 and applicable Wage Orders for misclassification of employees and independent contractors;
5. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
6. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
7. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
8. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
9. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures;
10. Labor Code §§ 226, 432, and 1198.5 by failing to timely produce requested payroll records, timecards, and personnel records; and
11. Labor Code § 1174 by failing to keep accurate and complete payroll records.

Therefore, on behalf of potentially all Aggrieved Employees, Employees seek applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699.

Employees have placed Employers on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

John G. Yslas, Esq.