

**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](mailto:jeffrey@bamlawca.com)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: [www.bamlawca.com](http://www.bamlawca.com)

Assigned for All Purposes

Judge Randall J. Sherman

CX-105

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**

NAYELI PLATA, on behalf of the State of  
California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROYALE HEALTH CARE CENTER, INC., a  
Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. . 30-2024-01419883-CU-OE-CXC

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**  
**COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code  
§ 2699, *et seq.* for violations of Labor  
Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218,  
221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512,  
558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,  
2802, California Code of Regulations,  
Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-  
(B), California Code of Regulations, Title  
8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide  
Seating), and the applicable Wage  
Order(s).

1 Plaintiff Nayeli Plata (“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 Labor  
3 Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et seq.* (“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 Royale Health Care Center, Inc.  
8 (referred to as “DEFENDANT”) seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all  
9 current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not**  
10 **seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code §**  
11 **2699**. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF  
12 does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the  
13 civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

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

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  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

1           10.     The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,  
2 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are  
3 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious  
4 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this  
5 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when  
6 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information  
7 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through  
8 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings  
9 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

### 18                                   THE CONDUCT

19           12.     Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT  
20 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time  
21 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an  
22 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.  
23 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without  
24 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,  
25 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to  
26 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by  
27 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal  
28 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure,

1 administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by  
2 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT,  
3 so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED  
4 EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual  
5 recorded time rather than “rounded” time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the  
6 practice of requiring PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work off  
7 the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to  
8 submit to mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19  
9 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANT’s timekeeping system for the workday. As a  
10 result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime  
11 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly  
12 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT’s policy and  
13 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is  
14 evidenced by DEFENDANT’s business records.

15 13. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and rest  
16 break premiums at one-and-one-half times their “regular rate of pay.” PLAINTIFF and the  
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is  
18 tied to specific elements of an employee’s performance.

19 14. The second component of PLAINTIFF’s and the AGGRIEVED  
20 EMPLOYEES’ compensation is DEFENDANT’s non-discretionary incentive program that  
21 paid PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their  
22 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all  
23 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the  
24 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular  
25 rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and  
26 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive  
27 compensation as part of the employees’ “regular rate of pay” for purposes of calculating  
28 overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described

1 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.  
2 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and the  
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included in the “regular rate of pay.” The failure to  
4 do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break  
5 premiums to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANT.

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

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

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

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

26 18. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the  
27 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to  
28 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226

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

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

21 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided  
22 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in  
23 Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial  
24 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.

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

1           21.     DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the  
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in  
3 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt  
4 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration, including, but not limited to, incentives,  
5 shift differential pay, and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay,  
6 DEFENDANT underpays sick pay to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at  
7 their base rates of pay.

8           22.     Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(l)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt  
9 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime  
10 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90  
11 days of employment.

12           23.     DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay  
13 at the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely  
14 earned non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay.  
15 However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and  
16 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as  
17 required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

18           24.     As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF  
19 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time  
20 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and  
21 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was  
22 willful, such that the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are  
23 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

24           25.     Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer  
25 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer  
26 to said employee." DEFENDANT failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and  
27 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to  
28 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, failed to disclose all aspects of the

1 deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED  
2 EMPLOYEES, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable  
3 pay period and upon termination.

4 26. DEFENDANT intentionally and knowingly failed to reimburse and indemnify  
5 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for required business expenses incurred  
6 by the PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES in direct consequence of  
7 discharging their duties on behalf of DEFENDANT. Under California Labor Code Section  
8 2802, employers are required to indemnify employees for all expenses incurred in the course  
9 and scope of their employment. Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 expressly states that "an employer  
10 shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the  
11 employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her  
12 obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at  
13 the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful."

14 27. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED  
15 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own  
16 personal cellular phones and home offices as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties  
17 as employees for DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT  
18 for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones and home offices for  
19 DEFENDANT's benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES  
20 were required by DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones and home offices. As  
21 a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and the  
22 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but  
23 were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular phones and home  
24 offices all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

25 28. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the  
26 requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order,  
27 DEFENDANT as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally,  
28 knowingly and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES suitable seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably  
2 permitted sitting.

3 29. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and other  
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit  
5 when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did  
6 not provide suitable seating and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with  
7 the performance of their duties.

8 30. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED  
9 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and Wage  
10 Order 4-2001, Section 14 by failing to provide suitable seats. PLAINTIFF seeks penalties  
11 on behalf of PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as provided herein.  
12 Providing suitable seating is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's  
13 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT violated the  
14 California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

15 31. The employment of some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has terminated and  
16 DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by law.  
17 Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFF's employment with DEFENDANT,  
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and accrued vested vacation and holiday time on the  
19 date of their termination pursuant to DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies and  
20 applicable California law. The amount of vacation pay PLAINTIFF and the other  
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's  
22 business records. Additionally, DEFENDANT also underpaid accrued vested vacation  
23 wages to AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of  
24 pay and more specifically the final rate of pay that included all non-discretionary incentive  
25 compensation. Rather than pay vacation wages at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT  
26 underpaid vacation wages to AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay, instead  
27 of including all of the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary incentive  
28 compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations. DEFENDANT failed to specify

1 in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the rate at which PLAINTIFF and other  
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would be paid vacation upon leaving employment with  
3 DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful practice, policy and procedure to  
4 deny paying AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all of their vested vacation and holiday time,  
5 DEFENDANT failed to pay the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all vested vacation time as  
6 wages due upon employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code,  
7 Sections 201, 202, 203 and 227.3. Similarly, DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time  
8 penalties to AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay, instead of including all  
9 of the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary compensation into the waiting time  
10 penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is believed to be the result of  
11 DEFENDANT's unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation for earned,  
12 accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting time  
13 penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive  
14 practice to the detriment of AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. DEFENDANT's uniform  
15 practice and policy of failing to pay AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all vested vacation  
16 and holiday time accumulated at employment termination violated and continues to violate  
17 Section 227.3 of the California Labor Code.

18 32. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA  
19 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect  
20 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations  
21 that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*  
22 2018 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

### 23 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

26 34. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,  
27 Sections 395 and 395.5, because PLAINTIFF worked in this County for DEFENDANT and  
28

1 DEFENDANT (i) currently maintains and at all relevant times maintained offices and  
2 facilities in this County and/or conducts substantial business in this County, and (ii)  
3 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against PLAINTIFF and other  
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

7 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*]**

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

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

11 36. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state  
12 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of  
13 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under  
14 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to  
15 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,  
16 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the  
17 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the  
18 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover  
19 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA  
20 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

21 37. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who  
22 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private  
23 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California  
24 with respect to herself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by  
25 DEFENDANT in California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a  
26 third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES")  
27 during the time period of May 16, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA  
28 PERIOD").

1           38. On May 16, 2024, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the  
2 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the  
3 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by  
4 Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference  
5 herein (*PAGA Notice only without draft complaint*). The statutory waiting period for  
6 PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to  
7 Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA  
8 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all  
9 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

10           39. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful  
11 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the  
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly  
13 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,  
14 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for  
15 required expenses, (f) failed to provide wages when due, and (g) failed to provide suitable  
16 seating, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201,  
17 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197,  
18 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision  
19 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11070(14) (Failure to Provide  
20 Seating), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a  
21 result of such conduct.<sup>1</sup> PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as  
22 prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of  
23 the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFF and the  
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

25 ///

---

26  
27           <sup>1</sup>Plaintiff specifically excludes and/or does not allege any claims under California Labor  
28 Code §558(a)(3).

- 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

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

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

By: /s/ Nicholas De Blouw  
 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](http://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:

[Nick@bamlawca.com](mailto:Nick@bamlawca.com)

WRITERS EXT:

1004

May 16, 2024

CA3267

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

Labor and Workforce Development Agency  
Online Filing

Royale Health Care Center, Inc.  
Certified Mail #958907105200298443333  
DONALD P CONNELLY JR  
1030 W WARNER AVE  
SANTA ANA, CA 92707

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and Violation of Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Royale Health Care Center, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Royale Health Care Center, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of May 16, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Nayeli Plata (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Royale Health Care Center, Inc. (“Defendant”). Plaintiff has been employed by Defendant in California since November of 2023. 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 and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest

periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5<sup>th</sup> 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, 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 in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

A true and correct copy of the Complaint by Plaintiff against Defendant, which (i) identifies the alleged violations, (ii) details the facts and theories which support the alleged violations, (iii) details the specific work performed by Plaintiff, (iii) sets forth the people/entities, dates, classifications, violations, events, and actions which are at issue to the extent known to Plaintiff, and (iv) sets forth the illegal practices used by Defendant, is attached hereto. This information provides notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the facts and theories supporting the alleged violations for the agency's reference. Plaintiff therefore incorporates the allegations of the attached Complaint into this letter as if fully set forth herein. If the agency needs any further information, please do not hesitate to ask.

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

Your earliest response to this notice is appreciated. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw  
Nicholas J. De Blouw, Esq.