

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

Jeffrey S. Herman (State Bar #280058)

jeffrey@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

(Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

KENNETH GRAY, on behalf of the State of
California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CLOPAY CORPORATION, a Corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **26NWCV00054**

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699 for violations of Labor Code
§§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7,
510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197,
1197.1, 1198, California Code of
Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040,
Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable
Wage Order(s).

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

6 INTRODUCTION

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendant Clopay Corporation (referred to
8 as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and
9 former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to**
10 **recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.** To
11 the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek
12 underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties
13 permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

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

24 THE PARTIES

25
26
27 5. Clopay Corporation ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all relevant times
28 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

1 6. DEFENDANT manufactures and supplies garage doors in California.

2 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from December of
3 2024 to September 4, 2025. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a
4 non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
5 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

6 8. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
7 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
8 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all
9 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any
10 employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees
11 (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of September 22, 2024 until a date as
12 determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

13 9. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or
14 formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative
15 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT’s
16 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512,
17 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section
18 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the foregoing,
19 PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the
20 meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

21 10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
22 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
23 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious
24 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
25 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when
26 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information
27 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
28

1 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
2 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

11 12 THE CONDUCT

13 12. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
14 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time
15 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
16 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
17 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without
18 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
19 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to
20 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
21 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal
22 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure,
23 administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
24 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT,
25 so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual
27 recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal

1 breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at
2 the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
4 records.

5 13. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off
7 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF
8 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as
9 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving
10 a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in
12 which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work.
13 DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid
14 paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the
15 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation
16 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

17 14. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
18 EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours
19 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied
20 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2)
21 to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes
22 for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first,
23 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10)
24 hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
25 also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable
26 California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods,
27 which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved
28 from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that

1 the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to
2 take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish
3 control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations
4 where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit
5 an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here,
6 DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from
7 unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states
8 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during
9 their rest period.

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

25 16. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
26 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
27 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
28 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate

1 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
2 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
3 worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on
4 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates
5 during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the
6 wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
7 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to
8 identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the
9 accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements
10 were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in
11 violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this
12 paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that
13 lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
14 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage
15 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

20 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
21 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
22 Sections. . . .204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
23 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.

24 18. DEFENDANT from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the
25 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in
26 accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to the “Hourly” regular
27 wage payments.
28

19. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203.

20. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

22. 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)

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

24. 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

1 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
2 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

3 25. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
4 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
5 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
6 with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
7 California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and
8 classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time
9 period of September 22, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA
10 PERIOD").

11 26. On September 22, 2025, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to
12 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
13 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
14 Labor Code § 2699.3. *See Exhibit #1*, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
15 herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the
16 Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
17 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy
18 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

19 27. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
20 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
22 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
23 (d) failed to pay overtime wages, and (e) failed to provide wages when due, all in violation
24 of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210,
25 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, California Code of
26 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage
27
28

1 Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF
2 hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private
3 Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of California for the illegal
4 conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

5
6 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

9 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to all AGGRIEVED
10 EMPLOYEES:

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

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

15 Dated: January 6, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW
16 LLP

17
18 By: /s/ Norman Blumenthal
19 Norman B. Blumenthal
20 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
21 Nicholas J. De Blouw

22 **LAWYERS FOR EMPLOYEE AND
23 CONSUMER RIGHTS, APC**
24 Robert E. Byrnes (State Bar No. 200761)
25 3500 West Olive Avenue, Third Floor
26 Burbank, CA 91505

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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 | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

**WRITERS E-MAIL:
rico@bamlawca.com**

**WRITERS EXT:
1009**

September 22, 2025
CA3788

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

CLOPAY CORPORATION

Certified Mail #9589071052700057735631
CSC-Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and Violation of 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 Kenneth Gray (“Plaintiff”) and all other Aggrieved Employees of Clipay Corporation (“Defendant”). “Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Clipay Corporation in California, including any employees staffed with Clipay Corporation by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of September 22, 2024 until a date as determined by the Court (“PAGA Period”). Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from December of 2024 through September 4, 2025. Plaintiff was 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. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages, for all of their meal and rest break violations, and for all of their time spent working off the clock as described further below.

Plaintiff was employed as an Associate at Defendant’s distribution center located at 44400 Osgood Rd., Fremont, CA 94539. During the PAGA Period, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were often unable to receive compliant meal breaks and rest breaks. Plaintiff’s typical work shift was from 6:45 a.m. to 3:15 p.m. which meant he should have taken his meal break by 11:45 a.m. but sometimes he took his meal break

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 | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

late, after 11:45 a.m. – even though he usually clocked out by 11:45 a.m., in order to avoid getting in trouble from his supervisors. From time to time when Plaintiff did not clock out by 11:45 a.m. for his meal break, he would notify his supervisor who would in turn adjust Plaintiff's time records to reflect he clocked out for lunch before his 5th hour of work. Plaintiff's meal breaks were also interrupted on a regular basis by customers and/or his supervisor. Plaintiff's meal breaks were interrupted by work-related issues at least twice every 2 weeks by his supervisor. Plaintiff was also unable to take compliant rest breaks. For example, Plaintiff usually took his 1st rest break well after his first 3 hours of work, usually sometime after his meal break and/or around 1 p.m. Plaintiff's rest breaks were also interrupted by work-related issues similar to his experiences with interrupted meal breaks in that they were interrupted by his supervisor and/or customers. As a result, during the PAGA period Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were often unable to take compliant meal breaks and rest breaks which is in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Sections 226.7 and 512. Despite these meal and rest break violations, Plaintiff's wage statements indicate that during the PAGA Period he did not receive the meal and rest break penalty payments he was entitled to. Attached as **Exhibit #1** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's wage statement for the pay period August 23, 2025 through September 5, 2025, which shows no meal or rest break premiums paid in that period.

In addition, Plaintiff worked while off the clock which resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197 & 1198. As set forth above, Plaintiff was regularly interrupted with work issues during his meal breaks and rest breaks. On one occasion, for example, while Plaintiff was attempting to have a duty-free meal break in his car, he was accosted by his supervisor who inquired about whether a forklift was charged or not, even though there were other employees in the warehouse he could have asked the same question to, causing Plaintiff to discuss work-related matters with his supervisor while off the clock. Pursuant to Labor Code § 204 & 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. The violations by Defendant were numerous as a result of the non-payment of meal and rest break penalties and the failure to pay for all the off the clock work.

Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid on an hourly basis. Therefore, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the proper regular and overtime wages earned. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to him, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved employees were not accurate because, for example, the wage statements failed to identify the correct number of hours worked since Defendant failed to record the time Plaintiff spent working during meal breaks & rest breaks.

Finally, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and

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 | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment, including Plaintiff, whose employment with Defendant ended in September of 2025, in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq.* 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 of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Ricardo R. Ehmann

Ricardo R. Ehmann, Esq.

EXHIBIT 1



HR-San Jose DC
Distribution Center - San Jose
Clopay Corporation
44400 Osgood Rd
Fremont, CA 94539

Employee Number: [REDACTED]
SSN: [REDACTED]
Base Salary: 22.50/Hourly
Pay Period: 08/23/25
-
09/05/25
Pay Date: 09/05/25
Check Number:

FILING STATUS EXEMPTIONS ADD. W/H
California Single/Married w/Two Incomes
Federal Head of household [REDACTED]

Kenneth J. Gray III
[REDACTED]

EARNINGS							DEDUCTIONS				
DESCRIPTION			Cur Hrs	YTD Hrs	RATE	AMT	YTD	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	YTD	
Earnings							Pre-Tax Deductions				
OT time and half			0.22	5.29	34.77	7.65	179.64	Medical1	21.28	358.04	
Holiday				56.00		0.00	1,270.88	LHFlex	1.00	18.00	
Vacation Pay NE			3.00	11.00	23.18	69.54	254.98	Vision	3.05	54.90	
Sick Pay NE			8.00	24.00	23.18	185.44	545.44	Dental1	5.03	90.54	
Time Entry Wages			61.68	1300.31	23.18	1,429.75	29,659.68	V401k	50.77	903.51	
Total Earnings						1,692.38	31,910.62	Total Pre-Tax Deductions	81.13	1,424.99	
GROSS EARNINGS						1,800.00	1,800.00	Tax Deductions			
MESSAGE							Federal Tax	76.43	1,557.69		
							Social Security	103.05	1,946.13		
							Medicare	24.10	455.14		
							CA State Tax	35.39	704.05		
							CA Disability	19.94	376.67		
							Total Tax Deductions	258.91	5,039.68		
							Voluntary Deductions				
							Safety Shoes NR	0.00	-38.19		
							Total Voluntary Deductions	0.00	-38.19		
							TOTAL DEDUCTIONS			340.04	6,426.48
							Other Information				
							Dental ER	7.24	130.32		
							Medical ER	262.41	4,414.38		
							V401k ER	50.77	903.51		
							Total Other Information	320.42	5,448.21		
NET PAY DISTRIBUTION											
PAYMENT METHOD		DEPOSIT BANK					ACC'T TYPE	ACC'T #	AMOUNT	YTD	
Direct Deposit		1st United Credit Union- San Leandro, CA					Checking		1,352.34		
TOTAL NET PAY DISTRIBUTION									1,352.34	25,484.14	