

March 28, 2025

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: *Amended Notice Letter on Behalf of Randy Gamez and Angel Rangel and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor Code section 2699.3*

Employer: MG Electric Inc.
39360 3rd St East #201
Palmdale, CA 93550

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice amends the December 13, 2024, notice originally submitted and provided concerning Randy Gamez and Angel Rangel’s (“Employees”) employment with Employees’ former employer MG ELECTRIC INC (“Employer”). Employees were employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 39360 3rd Street East, #201, with duties that included, but were not limited to wiring, roughing, and laying conduit pipes from approximately June 26, 2022 through approximately October 18, 2023 for Randy Gamez and from approximately January of 2022 through approximately December 31, 2023 for Angel Rangel. Employees seek to represent non-exempt employees of Employer as further set forth below. All employees that Employees seek to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as “Aggrieved Employees.” Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the “PAGA Period,” which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employer’s violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Employer’s control due to, without limitation: to attend company meetings off the clock; to make or receive phone calls off the clock; and to drive off the clock. In addition, Employer failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay

for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employees and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, either the detrimental rounding, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment of Employees and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employees and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employees and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Employer's control due to, without limitation; to attend company meetings off the clock; to make or receive phone calls off the clock; to drive off the clock. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employees and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, either the detrimental rounding, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. In addition, Employer failed to pay Employees and Aggrieved Employees were required to report to work (either telephonically or in person), and did report in such a fashion, but were not put to work and/or were furnished less than half their usual or scheduled day's work without being paid for half the usual or scheduled work at their regular rate of pay. As such, Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1771, 1774, 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or

injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employees and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, each workday, without limitation by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal periods; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employees are informed and believe that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employees and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation: by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to, without limitation, due to interrupting them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee

was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employees are informed and believe that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employees and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employees and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employees, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that thus Employees and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employees are informed and believe that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employees and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; vacation pay and paid time off (in violation of Labor Code section 227.3); and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employees and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to sufficiently reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), for the purchase of tools and safety equipment, and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer are liable to reimburse Employees and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employees and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employees are further informed and believe that sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employees are further informed and believe that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employees and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employees are additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves mandatory

payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employees are thus informed and believe that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employees or their counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employer would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employees may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Henry G. Glitz

Henry G. Glitz

cc: MG Electric Inc.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)