**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
Victoria B. Rivapalacio (State Bar #275115)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)
victoria@bamlawca.com; deblouw@bamlawca.com
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

Electronically Filed
10/15/2026 8:00 AM
Superior Court of California
County of Stanislaus
Hugh K. Swift
Clerk of the Court
By: Hillary Simonson, Deputy

$435 PAID

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF STANISLAUS**

CIARRA NUNO, on behalf of the State of California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOLDEN BEAR PHYSICAL THERAPY SPORTS INJURY CENTER, INC., a Corporation; GOLDEN BEAR PT PARTNERS, LLC, a Limited Liability Corporation; THERAPY PARTNERS GROUP, a Limited Liability Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CV-26-010194

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 for violations of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s).

This case has been assigned to Judge Speiller, Stacy, Department Dept. 22, for all purposes including Trial.

Plaintiff Ciarra Nuno ("PLAINTIFF"), on behalf of the people of the State of California and as an "aggrieved employee" acting as a private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, ("PAGA") only, alleges on information and belief, except for her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

## INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendants Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc., Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and Therapy Partners Group (referred to as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

3. Accordingly, PLAINTIFF seeks to obtain all applicable relief for DEFENDANT's violations under PAGA and solely for the relief as permitted by PAGA – that is, penalties and any other relief the Court deems proper pursuant to the PAGA. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as attempting to obtain any relief that would not be available in a PAGA-only action.

4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in her individual capacity; she is proceeding herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing in her individual capacity.

## THE PARTIES

5. Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in

California.

6. Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC is a limited liability corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

7. Therapy Partners Group is a limited liability corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

8. The entities named in paragraphs 5-7 above are the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck, standardized company employment handbooks, by standardized policies and procedures, by the company PLAINTIFF performs work for respectively and by the California Secretary of State Business Information which includes but is not limited the same mailing and business addresses and same agent for service of process, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT"). DEFENDANT is a healthcare and rehabilitation services provider that specializes in outpatient physical therapy and wellness services. They operate physical therapy clinics throughout California and provide individualized treatment for orthopedic, neurological, musculoskeletal, sports, and work-related injuries, as well as specialized rehabilitation and wellness services.

9. PLAINTIFF is currently employed by DEFENDANT in California. PLAINTIFF's employment with DEFENDANT started in March of 2024. PLAINTIFF has been at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

10. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group in California, including any employees staffed with Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group by a third

party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of August 7, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

11. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's violation of California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

12. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary, partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

13. The agents, servants and/or employees of the Defendants and each of them acting on behalf of the Defendants acted within the course and scope of his, her or its authority as the agent, servant and/or employee of the Defendants, and personally participated in the conduct alleged herein on behalf of the Defendants with respect to the conduct alleged herein. Consequently, the acts of each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants and all Defendants are jointly and severally liable to PLAINTIFF and all the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, for the loss sustained as a proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants' agents, servants and/or employees.

**THE CONDUCT**

14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

15. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in

which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work. DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

16. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

17. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these

employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under compensated for all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage rates. To the extent that the time worked off the clock does not qualify for overtime premium payment, DEFENDANT failed to pay minimum wages for the time worked off-the-clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

18. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this

paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

19. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

> [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections. . . .204. . .shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each failure to pay each employee; (2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars ($200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

20. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to the "Hourly" regular wage payments.

21. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred by the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

22. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own

personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

23. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Section 410.10.

24. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections 395.5 and 393, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California, employs AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES across California, including in this County, and committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

**For Violation of the Private Attorneys General Act**

**[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]**

**(By PLAINTIFF and Against All Defendants)**

25. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

26. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to

benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution, but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

27. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group in California, including any employees staffed with Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of August 7, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

28. On August 7, 2026, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. *See* **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

29. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,

(d) failed to pay overtime wages, and (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.[1] PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES:

A) Recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004; and,

B) An award of attorneys' fees and cost of suit, as allowable under the law, including, but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §2699.

Dated: October 15, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Nicholas J. De Blouw

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

[1]Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor Code §558(a)(3).

# EXHIBIT 1

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **novel@bamlawca.com**
**WRITERS EXT: (858)-336-6865**

August 7, 2026
CA3954

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC
Certified Mail # 9589071052704045663203
Rebecca Vang
1505 CORPORATION
CSC LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE
SUITE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Ciarra Nuno ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group. "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group in California, including any employees staffed with Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of August 7, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff is employed as a Physical Therapy Technician and is paid on an hourly basis. Plaintiff is classified as a non-exempt employee and is entitled to payment of minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked, legally compliant meal and rest periods, and reimbursement of necessary business expenses. Plaintiff's duties include assisting physical therapists and physical therapy assistants with patients, obtaining information from patients regarding how they are feeling, running patients through exercises prescribed as part of their treatment, monitoring patients receiving modalities such as icing and heating treatments, doing laundry, changing linens, wiping down treatment tables, preparing equipment, and otherwise assisting providers with patient care and treatment.

Due to the nature of Plaintiff's duties and Defendants practices, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have been subjected to violations of the California Labor Code during the PAGA Period.

During the PAGA Period, Plaintiff has from time to time been unable to take timely and uninterrupted meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Plaintiff is sometimes actively assisting a patient when the fifth hour of her shift approaches. For example, patients receive treatments utilizing modality machines for icing and heating, and Plaintiff will need to monitor the treatment and remove the patient from the modality when the timer expires. On some occasions, the treatment continues past the time Plaintiff should begin her meal period, causing Plaintiff to delay her meal period until after the fifth hour so that she can finish assisting the patient.

Plaintiff has also sometimes been required to perform work after clocking out for her meal period. For example, if the modality timer expires during Plaintiff's meal period and another employee is not available to assist the patient, Plaintiff has had to return to the patient, discontinue the modality, and otherwise assist the patient despite remaining clocked out for her meal period. As a result, some of Plaintiff's meal periods have been interrupted by compensable work.

Plaintiff has also from time to time been required to participate in work-related activities during her meal periods. For example, there have been instances where Plaintiff was required to remain for company meetings during lunch or watch work-related training videos during her meal period without remaining clocked in for the entire period. These work obligations prevented Plaintiff from being completely relieved of duty for a compliant meal period.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

Defendant has also failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant rest periods. Plaintiff is sometimes unable to take the legally required rest periods because she remains engaged in patient care and the other duties described above. Plaintiff assists both physical therapists and physical therapy assistants and is responsible for moving patients through exercises and treatments, monitoring modalities, cleaning treatment areas, doing laundry, changing linens, and preparing equipment. Plaintiff reports that rest breaks are generally not scheduled or provided at her location, and she has sometimes worked through periods in which she otherwise should have received a rest period. Defendant has failed to provide Plaintiff with all premium payments owed for the non-compliant meal and rest periods described herein in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

Further, Plaintiff has performed compensable work while off the clock, resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Defendant uses Paylocity, a mobile application, for Plaintiff to clock in and out of work and for meal periods. Plaintiff sometimes clocks out for her meal period but thereafter performs patient-related work. As described above, Plaintiff has had to return to patients receiving icing and heating modalities and turn off or remove patients from modality machines even though Plaintiff has already clocked out for lunch. Plaintiff has also sometimes performed compensable work after clocking out at the end of her shift. For example, when a patient remained on a modality machine at the end of Plaintiff's scheduled workday, Plaintiff has returned to the patient after clocking out to discontinue the modality treatment and assist the patient. This time was not recorded or compensated by Defendant.

The uncompensated work described above resulted in Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not receiving payment for all compensable hours worked. The off-the-clock work resulted in unpaid minimum wages and, where the additional uncompensated time caused Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees to exceed applicable daily or weekly overtime thresholds, unpaid overtime wages. The additional unrecorded compensable time described herein resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages where applicable.

Additionally, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for necessary business expenses incurred in performing her duties for Defendant in violation of California Labor Code section 2802. Defendant requires Plaintiff to use the Paylocity mobile application to clock in and out of work. Plaintiff uses her personal cellular phone for this purpose and also uses her personal cellular phone to make and receive company-related calls. Plaintiff has not been reimbursed for the reasonable portion of her cellular telephone expenses incurred for these work-related purposes

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 204 and 210, Defendant has also failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned during the applicable pay periods. Specifically, because Defendant failed to pay all minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages when those amounts became due, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not timely paid all wages earned in accordance with Labor Code section 204. These failures subject Defendant to the penalties available under Labor Code section 210.

Defendant also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis, and their wage statements should accurately reflect all compensable hours worked, applicable rates of pay, and wages earned during each pay period. However, because Defendant failed to record and compensate Plaintiff for the off-the-clock work described above, Plaintiff's wage statements from time to time failed to identify the correct number of hours she actually worked and the corresponding wages earned.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Elizabeth Novel Cefalu*
Elizabeth Novel Cefalu, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **novel@bamlawca.com**
**WRITERS EXT: (858)-336-6865**

August 7, 2026
CA3954

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc.
Certified Mail # 958907105270404566322 7
Rebecca Vang
1505 CORPORATION
CSC LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE
SUITE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Ciarra Nuno ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group. "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group in California, including any employees staffed with Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group by a

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of August 7, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff is employed as a Physical Therapy Technician and is paid on an hourly basis. Plaintiff is classified as a non-exempt employee and is entitled to payment of minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked, legally compliant meal and rest periods, and reimbursement of necessary business expenses. Plaintiff's duties include assisting physical therapists and physical therapy assistants with patients, obtaining information from patients regarding how they are feeling, running patients through exercises prescribed as part of their treatment, monitoring patients receiving modalities such as icing and heating treatments, doing laundry, changing linens, wiping down treatment tables, preparing equipment, and otherwise assisting providers with patient care and treatment.

Due to the nature of Plaintiff's duties and Defendants practices, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have been subjected to violations of the California Labor Code during the PAGA Period.

During the PAGA Period, Plaintiff has from time to time been unable to take timely and uninterrupted meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Plaintiff is sometimes actively assisting a patient when the fifth hour of her shift approaches. For example, patients receive treatments utilizing modality machines for icing and heating, and Plaintiff will need to monitor the treatment and remove the patient from the modality when the timer expires. On some occasions, the treatment continues past the time Plaintiff should begin her meal period, causing Plaintiff to delay her meal period until after the fifth hour so that she can finish assisting the patient.

Plaintiff has also sometimes been required to perform work after clocking out for her meal period. For example, if the modality timer expires during Plaintiff's meal period and another employee is not available to assist the patient, Plaintiff has had to return to the patient, discontinue the modality, and otherwise assist the patient despite remaining clocked out for her meal period. As a result, some of Plaintiff's meal periods have been interrupted by compensable work.

Plaintiff has also from time to time been required to participate in work-related activities during her meal periods. For example, there have been instances where Plaintiff was required to remain for company meetings during lunch or watch work-related training videos during her meal period without remaining clocked in for the entire period.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

These work obligations prevented Plaintiff from being completely relieved of duty for a compliant meal period.

Defendant has also failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant rest periods. Plaintiff is sometimes unable to take the legally required rest periods because she remains engaged in patient care and the other duties described above. Plaintiff assists both physical therapists and physical therapy assistants and is responsible for moving patients through exercises and treatments, monitoring modalities, cleaning treatment areas, doing laundry, changing linens, and preparing equipment. Plaintiff reports that rest breaks are generally not scheduled or provided at her location, and she has sometimes worked through periods in which she otherwise should have received a rest period. Defendant has failed to provide Plaintiff with all premium payments owed for the non-compliant meal and rest periods described herein in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

Further, Plaintiff has performed compensable work while off the clock, resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Defendant uses Paylocity, a mobile application, for Plaintiff to clock in and out of work and for meal periods. Plaintiff sometimes clocks out for her meal period but thereafter performs patient-related work. As described above, Plaintiff has had to return to patients receiving icing and heating modalities and turn off or remove patients from modality machines even though Plaintiff has already clocked out for lunch. Plaintiff has also sometimes performed compensable work after clocking out at the end of her shift. For example, when a patient remained on a modality machine at the end of Plaintiff's scheduled workday, Plaintiff has returned to the patient after clocking out to discontinue the modality treatment and assist the patient. This time was not recorded or compensated by Defendant.

The uncompensated work described above resulted in Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not receiving payment for all compensable hours worked. The off-the-clock work resulted in unpaid minimum wages and, where the additional uncompensated time caused Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees to exceed applicable daily or weekly overtime thresholds, unpaid overtime wages. The additional unrecorded compensable time described herein resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages where applicable.

Additionally, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for necessary business expenses incurred in performing her duties for Defendant in violation of California Labor Code section 2802. Defendant requires Plaintiff to use the Paylocity mobile application to clock in and out of work. Plaintiff uses her personal cellular phone for this purpose and also uses her personal cellular phone to make and receive company-related calls. Plaintiff has

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

not been reimbursed for the reasonable portion of her cellular telephone expenses incurred for these work-related purposes

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 204 and 210, Defendant has also failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned during the applicable pay periods. Specifically, because Defendant failed to pay all minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages when those amounts became due, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not timely paid all wages earned in accordance with Labor Code section 204. These failures subject Defendant to the penalties available under Labor Code section 210.

Defendant also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis, and their wage statements should accurately reflect all compensable hours worked, applicable rates of pay, and wages earned during each pay period. However, because Defendant failed to record and compensate Plaintiff for the off-the-clock work described above, Plaintiff's wage statements from time to time failed to identify the correct number of hours she actually worked and the corresponding wages earned.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Elizabeth Novel Cefalu*
Elizabeth Novel Cefalu, Esq.

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL: **novel@bamlawca.com**
**WRITERS EXT: (858)-336-6865**

August 7, 2026
CA3954

**VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT**

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Therapy Partners Group
Certified Mail # 9589071052704045663210
ILLINOIS CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
801 ADLAI STEVENSON DRIVE
SPRINGFIELD, IL 62703

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)(B), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Ciarra Nuno ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group. "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group in California, including any employees staffed with Golden Bear Physical Therapy Sports Injury Center, Inc. and/or Golden Bear PT Partners, LLC and/or Therapy Partners Group by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of August 7, 2025 through a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff is employed as a Physical Therapy Technician and is paid on an

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

hourly basis. Plaintiff is classified as a non-exempt employee and is entitled to payment of minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked, legally compliant meal and rest periods, and reimbursement of necessary business expenses. Plaintiff's duties include assisting physical therapists and physical therapy assistants with patients, obtaining information from patients regarding how they are feeling, running patients through exercises prescribed as part of their treatment, monitoring patients receiving modalities such as icing and heating treatments, doing laundry, changing linens, wiping down treatment tables, preparing equipment, and otherwise assisting providers with patient care and treatment.

Due to the nature of Plaintiff's duties and Defendants practices, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees have been subjected to violations of the California Labor Code during the PAGA Period.

During the PAGA Period, Plaintiff has from time to time been unable to take timely and uninterrupted meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order. Plaintiff is sometimes actively assisting a patient when the fifth hour of her shift approaches. For example, patients receive treatments utilizing modality machines for icing and heating, and Plaintiff will need to monitor the treatment and remove the patient from the modality when the timer expires. On some occasions, the treatment continues past the time Plaintiff should begin her meal period, causing Plaintiff to delay her meal period until after the fifth hour so that she can finish assisting the patient.

Plaintiff has also sometimes been required to perform work after clocking out for her meal period. For example, if the modality timer expires during Plaintiff's meal period and another employee is not available to assist the patient, Plaintiff has had to return to the patient, discontinue the modality, and otherwise assist the patient despite remaining clocked out for her meal period. As a result, some of Plaintiff's meal periods have been interrupted by compensable work.

Plaintiff has also from time to time been required to participate in work-related activities during her meal periods. For example, there have been instances where Plaintiff was required to remain for company meetings during lunch or watch work-related training videos during her meal period without remaining clocked in for the entire period. These work obligations prevented Plaintiff from being completely relieved of duty for a compliant meal period.

Defendant has also failed to provide Plaintiff with compliant rest periods. Plaintiff is sometimes unable to take the legally required rest periods because she remains engaged

in patient care and the other duties described above. Plaintiff assists both physical therapists and physical therapy assistants and is responsible for moving patients through exercises and treatments, monitoring modalities, cleaning treatment areas, doing laundry, changing linens, and preparing equipment. Plaintiff reports that rest breaks are generally not scheduled or provided at her location, and she has sometimes worked through periods in which she otherwise should have received a rest period. Defendant has failed to provide Plaintiff with all premium payments owed for the non-compliant meal and rest periods described herein in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

Further, Plaintiff has performed compensable work while off the clock, resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Defendant uses Paylocity, a mobile application, for Plaintiff to clock in and out of work and for meal periods. Plaintiff sometimes clocks out for her meal period but thereafter performs patient-related work. As described above, Plaintiff has had to return to patients receiving icing and heating modalities and turn off or remove patients from modality machines even though Plaintiff has already clocked out for lunch. Plaintiff has also sometimes performed compensable work after clocking out at the end of her shift. For example, when a patient remained on a modality machine at the end of Plaintiff's scheduled workday, Plaintiff has returned to the patient after clocking out to discontinue the modality treatment and assist the patient. This time was not recorded or compensated by Defendant.

The uncompensated work described above resulted in Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not receiving payment for all compensable hours worked. The off-the-clock work resulted in unpaid minimum wages and, where the additional uncompensated time caused Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees to exceed applicable daily or weekly overtime thresholds, unpaid overtime wages. The additional unrecorded compensable time described herein resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages where applicable.

Additionally, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for necessary business expenses incurred in performing her duties for Defendant in violation of California Labor Code section 2802. Defendant requires Plaintiff to use the Paylocity mobile application to clock in and out of work. Plaintiff uses her personal cellular phone for this purpose and also uses her personal cellular phone to make and receive company-related calls. Plaintiff has not been reimbursed for the reasonable portion of her cellular telephone expenses incurred for these work-related purposes

Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 204 and 210, Defendant has also failed to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned during the

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**
**2255 CALLE CLARA**
**LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**
**Web Site: www.bamlawca.com**
San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange
Phone: (858) 551-1223
Fax: (858) 551-1232

applicable pay periods. Specifically, because Defendant failed to pay all minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages when those amounts became due, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were not timely paid all wages earned in accordance with Labor Code section 204. These failures subject Defendant to the penalties available under Labor Code section 210.

Defendant also failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are paid on an hourly basis, and their wage statements should accurately reflect all compensable hours worked, applicable rates of pay, and wages earned during each pay period. However, because Defendant failed to record and compensate Plaintiff for the off-the-clock work described above, Plaintiff's wage statements from time to time failed to identify the correct number of hours she actually worked and the corresponding wages earned.

Defendant's unlawful policies and practices described herein resulted in numerous Labor Code violations affecting Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA period. Said conduct violated California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, as well as the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ *Elizabeth Novel Cefalu*
Elizabeth Novel Cefalu, Esq.