WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 381-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9989
wilshirelawfirm.com

Sean Paisan, Esq.
John Yslas, Esq.
Tyler Woods, Esq.
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.
Thiago Coelho, Esq.
Benjamin Haber, Esq.

August 7, 2026

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

Ignite Recruitment LLC
2900 San Juan Dr.
Fullerton, CA 92835
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489-0090-0027-6780-5202-22

Chad Bean
Agent for Service of Process for Ignite Recruitment LLC
1601 N. Sepulveda Blvd. # 591
Manhattan Beach, CA 90026
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489-0090-0027-6780-5202-39

Telstar Instruments
500 Sequoia Pacific Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95811
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489-0090-0027-6780-5202-46

John Gardiner
Agent for Service of Process for Telstar Instruments
500 Sequoia Pacific Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95811
(***Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested***)
#9489-0090-0027-6780-5202-53

Re: ***Neil Gardner v. Ignite Recruitment LLC, Telstar Instruments, 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 Neil Gardner ("Mr. Gardner" or "Employee") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against Employee's former employers, Ignite Recruitment LLC, Telstar Instruments (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, agents, and executive employees) (collectively referred to as or "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 Employee and potentially all of Employers' Aggrieved Employees.

Neil Gardner wishes to pursue this action on behalf of Employees as Aggrieved Employees, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of potentially all other persons who worked for Ignite Recruitment LLC, Telstar Instruments in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Employers were the joint employers of Employees and other Aggrieved Employees. Employers were the alter egos, divisions, affiliates, integrated enterprises, joint employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals, related entities, co-conspirators, authorized agents, partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors, actual or ostensible, of each other

Employee and the Aggrieved Employees suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

<u>Mr. Gardner's Employment with Ignite Recruitment LLC, Telstar Instruments</u>

Ignite is a staffing and electrical engineering business. Employee worked as an Electrician, where his job was to build and maintain electrical systems. In performing Employee's duties, Employee was regularly required to perform work (off-the-clock), without compensation, including, but not limited to performing work in lieu of taking a legally compliant meal period. Due to understaffing and high workloads, Employee was also frequently deprived of an opportunity to take legally compliant meal and rest breaks, including because the few breaks he was provided were either cut short, interrupted, or not provided at all. Moreover, Employers failed to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with the meal and rest break premiums as required by the Labor Code. Additionally, Employee was expected to and did incur business-related expenses, including, but not limited to, the use of Employee's personal cell phone for work related purposes, but Employers failed to reimburse such business-related expenses. These are just non-exhaustive examples of the facts and theories the Employee asserts, 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.

Neil Gardner is a resident of Antelope, California who worked for Employers in Orange County, California as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately May 2026 to present.

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

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

<u>Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, 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 failed to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Employers required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to work "off-the-clock," uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work during uncompensated meal periods and rest periods, and requiring Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work before clocking in and/or after clocking out. Specifically, Foreman Sam directed Employee and his coworkers to skip their meal breaks and continue working to avoid losing momentum and to complete projects as quickly as possible. Employers failed to pay the required meal period premiums. Additionally, Employee was required to carry and monitor his personal cell phone continuously throughout his shift, including during meal and rest periods. Managers and coworkers routinely called and texted Employee with work-related questions, status requests, and instructions; if Employee did not respond immediately, they would call repeatedly until he answered, effectively requiring Employee to remain on call and perform uncompensated work during non-work hours and break periods. 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. Employers failed to properly calculate Employee's regular rate of pay when paying overtime, by failing to include all compensation in Employee's overtime calculations, including hours worked off the clock. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Employers also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Employee and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers also engaged 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 Employee 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, Employee consistently was not compensated at least minimum wage for all hours that Employee worked.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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.

<u>Failure to Provide Meal Periods</u>

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 period no later than the start of the 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 wrongfully failed to provide Employee and the Aggrieved Employees with their legally mandated 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods. For example, Foreman Sam instructed Employee and his coworkers to skip their meal breaks to maintain project momentum and ensure faster completion. Employers failed to provide the mandatory duty-free period and withheld the requisite one-hour meal period premiums. Furthermore, Employers maintained a policy and practice of requiring employees to remain on-call during their breaks; Employee was required to carry his personal cell phone at all times, including during meal and rest periods. Throughout the workday, managers routinely contacted Employee via calls and texts regarding work-related questions, project updates, and instructions. If Employee did not respond immediately, they would continue calling until he answered, creating an environment where Employee understood he was required to monitor his device at all times in lieu of taking a compliant, uninterrupted meal period. Employers also continued to assert control over Employee and the Aggrieved Employees by pressuring them to perform work tasks that could not be completed without working through mandatory breaks, all while failing to provide the legally required compensation for these violations. Accordingly, Employers failed to provide meal periods to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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, regularly failed to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods that were not provided. Employee does not recall receiving any meal and rest break premiums.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods in a manner required by law. Employers regularly required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without authorizing or permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction thereof), and failed to compensate Employee for these missed breaks. Specifically, supervisors such as Adam would amend project deadlines to ensure work was completed as quickly as possible, effectively forcing Employee to work several hours of uninterrupted labor to meet these accelerated timelines. Furthermore, Employers maintained a pervasive practice of requiring Employee to remain on-call during all breaks. Employee was required to carry his personal cell phone at all times, including during rest periods. Managers and coworkers, such as Adam, routinely contacted Employee with work-related questions, status updates, and instructions; if Employee did not answer immediately, they would call repeatedly until he responded, forcing Employee to monitor his device and remain effectively "on duty" throughout his designated break times.

Instead, Employers continued to assert control over Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 Employee and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Indeed, similar to its meal period practices, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees, routinely and consistently were not afforded complaint rest periods due to the busy nature and understaffing of the work environment. Accordingly, Employers failed to authorize and permit Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Employers, however, regularly failed to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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, during all such times, Employers failed and refused to pay the Employee all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that Employee was 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. As a result, Employers owe Employee the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Employee and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employee 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

Employee seeks 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, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Employee and the Aggrieved Employees.

Employers' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 Employee 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 failed, and continue to fail to pay Employee and terminated Aggrieved Employees, 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, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 failed to, and continue to fail to timely furnish Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 violated Labor Code § 226, Employee and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Employee and similarly Aggrieved Employees 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 Employee and the Aggrieved Employees 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 wrongfully required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Employers. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses. Specifically, Employers required Employee to utilize his personal cell phone to perform essential work duties. Employee was mandated to carry his personal device at all times, including during meal and rest breaks, to remain available for work-related communications. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Employers, but

Employers failed to indemnify Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

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

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 failed, and continue 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 Employee 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 failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by Employee and Aggrieved Employees by virtue of Employers' time rounding and/or auto deduction policies and practices and/or other off-the-clock work policies and practices.

Employers failed and continue to fail to keep accurate and complete records showing total hours worked by virtue of Employers' failure to relieve Employee and Aggrieved Employees of all duties and Employers' control for unpaid meal periods, resulting in unpaid hours worked.

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

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

Additionally, Employers failed, and continue to fail to keep accurate records and issue accurate wage statements by not documenting accrued sick time for Employee and Aggrieved Employees. Employers' failure to keep "accurate and complete" payroll records for Employee and Aggrieved Employees 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, results in a separate civil penalty.[1]

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Employee alleges that Employers violated the following provisions of the

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

Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees, or some of them:

1. Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing at times to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing at times to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing at times to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing at times to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing at times to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing at times to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing at times to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing at times to indemnify for necessary expenditures; and
9. Labor Code § 1174 by failing at times to keep accurate and complete payroll records.

Therefore, on behalf of potentially Aggrieved Employees, Employee seeks 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.

Employee has 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

Jose Maria D. Patino, Jr.

Jose Maria D. Patino, Jr., Esq.