

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***SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA****IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**EMILY TRAN, on behalf of the State of
California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RINGCENTRAL, INC., a corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-CIV-08730**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, 2802, California Code of
Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040,
Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable
Wage Order(s).

1 Plaintiff Emily Tran (“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 her own acts and knowledge which are based on personal
5 knowledge, the following:

6 INTRODUCTION

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendant RingCentral, Inc. (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 her individual capacity; she 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 her individual capacity.

24 THE PARTIES

25
26
27 5. RingCentral, Inc. (“DEFENDANT”) is a corporation that at all relevant times
28 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

1 6. DEFENDANT provides cloud-based communication and collaboration solutions
2 for businesses.

3 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from November of
4 2024 to approximately January 17, 2025. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by
5 DEFENDANT as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally
6 required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time
7 worked.

8 8. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
9 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
10 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all
11 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any
12 employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees
13 (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of July 31, 2024 until a date as
14 determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

15 9. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or
16 formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative
17 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT’s
18 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512,
19 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8,
20 Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the
21 foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees
22 within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

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

1 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
2 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
3 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

12 13 THE CONDUCT

14 12. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
15 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time
16 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
17 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
18 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without
19 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
20 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out. DEFENDANT, as a matter
21 of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the
22 actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,
23 always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment,
24 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been
25 paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result,
26 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage and overtime
27 wage compensation by working without their time being correctly recorded and without
28 compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay

1 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by
2 DEFENDANT's business records.

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

24 14. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and
25 pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these
26 employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
27 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for
28 all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of

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

11 15. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
13 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
14 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
15 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
16 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
17 worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on
18 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates
19 during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the
20 wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
21 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to
22 identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the
23 accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements
24 were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in
25 violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this
26 paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that
27 lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
28

1 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage
2 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

7 [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
8 in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
9 Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
10 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.

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

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

18 19. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify
19 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred
20 by the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of
21 discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section
22 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course
23 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer
24 shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the
25 employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her
26 obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at
27 the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."
28

1 20. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
2 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
3 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
4 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost
5 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit.
6 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by
7 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones. As a result, in the course of their
8 employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
9 incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs
10 related to the use of their personal cellular phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of
11 DEFENDANT.

12 21. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has
13 terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by
14 law in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202, 203.

15
16 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

19 23. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
20 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and
21 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and
22 facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)
23 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against PLAINTIFF and other
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

2

3

4

5
6

7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6

7
8
9
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27
28

1 Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
2 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy
3 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

4 28. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
5 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
7 record and provide legally required rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages, (d) failed
8 to pay overtime wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, and (f)
9 failed to provide wages when due, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections
10 listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2),
11 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040,
12 Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil
13 penalties as a result of such conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil
14 penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the
15 representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF
16 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

26
27
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

Dated: October 28, 2025 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW
LLP

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

July 31, 2025
CA3648

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

RINGCENTRAL, INC.
Certified Mail #9589071052702856168405
CT Corporation System
Amanda Garcia
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700
GLENDALE, CA 91203

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, 2802, 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 Emily Tran (“Plaintiff”) and all other Aggrieved Employees of RingCentral, Inc. (“Defendant”). “Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by RingCentral, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with RingCentral, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of July 31, 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 in California from November of 2024 to approximately January 17, 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 non-compliant rest breaks, for all of their time spent working off the clock as described further below, and for business expenses incurred but not reimbursed.

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

Plaintiff worked as an on-boarding coordinator for Defendant at its office located at 20 Davis Dr., Belmont, CA 94002. 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. For example, Plaintiff was responsible for leading on-boarding sessions for new hires which occurred every Monday morning starting at 8 a.m. On these days, Plaintiff arrived at least thirty minutes early in order to get the computer started, prepare the slide show, turn the video camera on and plug in the monitor for a zoom video dual screen – all while off the clock resulting in unpaid minimum and overtime wages. Plaintiff's typical shift from Tuesday-Friday was 9 a.m. - 6 p.m. and from time to time Defendant expected her to stay late and work past 6 p.m. while off the clock. For example, on at least one occasion, Plaintiff was given a data clean up project late in the afternoon with the expectation that she finish or complete a significant portion of the project before she left for the day, which resulted in her staying until at least 6:30 p.m.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment and during the PAGA period, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were often unable to receive compliant rest breaks, which were always taken, if at all, well after working 3 hours, and therefore were late and/or missed on a regular basis in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Sections 226.7 and 512. Plaintiff's wage statements show that no rest break penalty payments were paid for any rest break violations that Plaintiff suffered. Attached as **Exhibit #1** are true and correct copies of Plaintiff's wage statements from November 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024, showing no rest break premiums paid during a period when Plaintiff regularly suffered rest break violations.

Pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the rest break penalties described above. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide her and other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Plaintiff's wage statements should accurately display 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)(2). 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 preparing for Monday morning on-board meetings and post-shift work assignments as set forth above.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of her job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. For example, Plaintiff had to use her cell phone for work-related purposes but was not

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

reimbursed, such as when Plaintiff's manager would call her cell phone to instruct her to join a work call and/or a zoom call. Plaintiff was also required to install and use the RingCentral app on her cell phone which was a method in which RingCentral employees could communicate with each other via group chat or texting. Plaintiff was not reimbursed the reasonable expenses associated with using her cell phone for work-related purposes. See **Exhibit #1** (no line item for cell phone reimbursement).

Finally, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and 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, such as when Plaintiff's employment with Defendant ended in January 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. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 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), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

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

AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

Pay Stub Detail
PAY DATE: 11/30/2024
NET PAY: \$2,404.87

Emily Tran
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

EMPLOYER
AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

PAY PERIOD
Period Beginning: 11/01/2024
Period Ending: 11/15/2024
Pay Date: 11/30/2024
Total Hours: 80.00

EMPLOYEE
Emily Tran
[Redacted]

SS#: [Redacted]

BENEFITS	Accrued	Used	Available	NET PAY:	\$2,404.87
Sick	2.64	0.00	2.64		

MEMO:

PAY	Hours	Rate	Current	YTD	DEDUCTIONS	Current	YTD
Regular Pay	80.00	40.00	3,200.00	3,200.00			

TAXES	Current	YTD
Federal Income Tax	364.04	364.04
Social Security	198.40	198.40
Medicare	46.40	46.40
CA Income Tax	151.09	151.09
CA State Disability Ins	35.20	35.20

SUMMARY	Current	YTD
Total Pay	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
Taxes	\$795.13	\$795.13
Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00

Net Pay \$2,404.87

AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

Pay Stub Detail
PAY DATE: 12/15/2024
NET PAY: \$2,018.54

Emily Tran
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

EMPLOYER
AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

PAY PERIOD
Period Beginning: 11/16/2024
Period Ending: 11/30/2024
Pay Date: 12/15/2024
Total Hours: 64.00

EMPLOYEE
Emily Tran
[Redacted]

SS#: [Redacted]

BENEFITS	Accrued	Used	Available	NET PAY:	\$2,018.54
Sick	2.11	0.00	4.75		

MEMO:

PAY	Hours	Rate	Current	YTD	DEDUCTIONS	Current	YTD
Regular Pay	64.00	40.00	2,560.00	5,760.00			

TAXES	Current	YTD
Federal Income Tax	224.53	588.57
Social Security	158.72	357.12
Medicare	37.12	83.52
CA Income Tax	92.93	244.02
CA State Disability Ins	28.16	63.36

SUMMARY	Current	YTD
Total Pay	\$2,560.00	\$5,760.00
Taxes	\$541.46	\$1,336.59
Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00

Net Pay **\$2,018.54**

AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

Pay Stub Detail
PAY DATE: 12/31/2024
NET PAY: \$2,404.87

Emily Tran
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

EMPLOYER
AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

PAY PERIOD
Period Beginning: 12/01/2024
Period Ending: 12/15/2024
Pay Date: 12/31/2024
Total Hours: 80.00

EMPLOYEE
Emily Tran
[Redacted]

SS#: [Redacted]

BENEFITS	Accrued	Used	Available	NET PAY:	\$2,404.87
Sick	2.64	0.00	7.39		

MEMO:

PAY	Hours	Rate	Current	YTD	DEDUCTIONS	Current	YTD
Regular Pay	80.00	40.00	3,200.00	8,960.00			

TAXES	Current	YTD
Federal Income Tax	364.04	952.61
Social Security	198.40	555.52
Medicare	46.40	129.92
CA Income Tax	151.09	395.11
CA State Disability Ins	35.20	98.56

SUMMARY	Current	YTD
Total Pay	\$3,200.00	\$8,960.00
Taxes	\$795.13	\$2,131.72
Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00

Net Pay **\$2,404.87**

AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

Pay Stub Detail
PAY DATE: 01/15/2025
NET PAY: \$2,416.95

Emily Tran
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

EMPLOYER
AccuPay LLC
2010 Crow Canyon Place
Ste 100
San Ramon CA 94583
650-980-7712

PAY PERIOD
Period Beginning: 12/16/2024
Period Ending: 12/31/2024
Pay Date: 01/15/2025
Total Hours: 80.00

EMPLOYEE
Emily Tran
[Redacted]

SS#: [Redacted]

BENEFITS	Accrued	Used	Available	NET PAY:	\$2,416.95
Sick	2.64	0.00	10.03		

MEMO:

PAY	Hours	Rate	Current	YTD
Regular Pay	80.00	40.00	3,200.00	3,200.00

DEDUCTIONS	Current	YTD
-------------------	----------------	------------

TAXES	Current	YTD
Federal Income Tax	354.58	354.58
Social Security	198.40	198.40
Medicare	46.40	46.40
CA Income Tax	145.27	145.27
CA State Disability Ins	38.40	38.40

SUMMARY	Current	YTD
Total Pay	\$3,200.00	\$3,200.00
Taxes	\$783.05	\$783.05
Deductions	\$0.00	\$0.00

Net Pay **\$2,416.95**