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)
Christine T. LeVu (State Bar #288271)
Justin G. Hewgill (State Bar #259528)
Adolfo Sanchez Contreras (State Bar #354371)
christine@bamlawca.com
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff DANIEL SUNGLAO, on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

Additional Counsel on next page

Electronically
FILED
by Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
ON 09/30/2026
By /s/ Padmani Singh
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

DANIEL SUNGLAO, JORGE DIAS, and EMERALD WILSON, on behalf of the State of California as private attorney generals,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

EXPERIS US LLC, a Limited Liability Company; ZOOX, INC., a Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-CIV-04334

FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*. for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq*., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 *et seq*., and 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) Failure to Provide Seating), and the applicable Wage Order(s)

Barbara DuVan-Clarke (State Bar No. 259268)
BDC@blackstonepc.com
Danielle GruppChang (State Bar No. 313881)
dgruppchang@blackstonepc.com
P.J. Van Ert (State Bar No. 234858)
pjvanert@blackstonepc.com
Alexandra Rose (State Bar No. 329407)
arose@blackstonepc.com
BLACKSTONE LAW, APC
8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 745
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (310) 622-4278 / Fax: (855) 786-6356

Attorneys for Plaintiffs JORGE DIAS and EMERALD WILSON, on behalf of themselves and other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act

Plaintiffs Daniel Sunglao, Jorge Dias, and Emerald Wilson ("PLAINTIFFS"), on behalf of the people of the State of California and as "aggrieved employees" acting as private attorney generals under the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004, § 2699, et seq. ("PAGA") only, allege on information and belief, except for their own acts and knowledge which are based on personal knowledge, the following:

INTRODUCTION

1. PLAINTIFFS bring this action against Experis US LLC and Zoox, Inc. (formerly sued as Zoox Labs, Inc) (referred to as "DEFENDANTS") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees employed by Defendant Experis US LLC and placed to work at Zoox, Inc. PLAINTIFFS do **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFFS do not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFFS to bring an action on behalf of themselves, the State of California, and others aggrieved employees for civil penalties, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

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

4. PLAINTIFFS are not suing in their individual capacities; they are proceeding herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees, including themselves and other aggrieved employees. Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFFS suing in their individual capacities.

THE PARTIES

5. Experis US LLC is a limited liability company that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

6. Zoox, Inc. is a corporation that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

7. Experis US LLC and Zoox, Inc. were the joint employers of PLAINTIFFS as evidenced by paycheck and by the company PLAINTIFFS performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the conduct alleged herein.

8. At all times herein mentioned, Zoox, Inc. was and is a subsidiary of Amazon developing autonomous vehicles that provide mobility as a service. It is headquartered in Foster City, California and does business throughout California.

9. Experis US LLC is a tech staffing and IT solutions limited liability company doing business in California whose employees are engaged in Santa Clara County and throughout California.

10. PLAINTIFF SUNGLAO was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from February 2020 to August 2023 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANTS 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.

11. PLAINTIFF DIAS was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from January 2023 to October 2023 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANTS 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.

12. PLAINTIFF WILSON was employed by DEFENDANTS in California from June 2020 to September 2023 and was at all times classified by DEFENDANTS 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.

13. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to themselves and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Experis US LLC and/or Zoox, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Zoox, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of March 11, 2023 until

a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

14. PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of themselves and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, bring this representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, et seq. seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANTS' violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 *et seq.*, 2800, and 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). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFFS and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.*

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

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

THE CONDUCT

17. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANTS were required to pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, including all the time the

employee is suffered or permitted to work. DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANTS' control. Among other things, DEFENDANTS required PLAINTIFFS to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFFS were from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFFS' off-duty meal break. DEFENDANTS, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administered a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANTS, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANTS engaged in the practice of requiring PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work off the clock in that DEFENDANTS, as a condition of employment, required these employees to submit to mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANTS' timekeeping system for the workday. As a result, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANTS' policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records.

18. State law provides that employees must be paid overtime and meal and rest break premiums at one-and-one-half times their "regular rate of pay." PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are compensated at an hourly rate plus incentive pay that is tied to specific elements of an employee's performance.

19. The second component of PLAINTIFFS' and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' compensation is DEFENDANTS' non-discretionary incentive program that paid PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their performance for DEFENDANTS. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the various performance goals set by

DEFENDANTS. However, when calculating the regular rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANTS failed to include the incentive compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package. As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to do so has resulted in underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANTS.

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

21. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2) to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first, second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10) hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also not provided with one hour of wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the

applicable California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods, which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit an employee from taking a brief walk – five minutes out, five minutes back. Here, DEFENDANTS' policy restricted PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANTS' rule which states PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during their rest period.

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

23. From time to time, DEFENDANTS also failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226 provides that every

employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFFS 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 DEFENDANTS provided to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this paragraph, DEFENDANTS failed to issue to PLAINTIFFS an itemized wage statement that lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq*. As a result, DEFENDANTS from time to time provided PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

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

25. DEFENDANTS from time to time failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to the "Hourly" regular wage payments, minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest break premiums.

26. Cal Lab. Code § 233 provides that an employer must permit an employee to use accrued

sick leave in accordance with Cal Lab. Code § 246.5 at the employee's then current rate of entitlement. Cal Lab. Code § 246 provides that an employee is entitled to sick pay wages for use of accrued sick leave pursuant to Cal Lab. Code § 246.5. Specifically, once accrued sick leave is used as paid sick time, an employee has a vested right to sick pay wages, which an employer must calculate and compensate based on one of two calculations: (i) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek," or (ii) "Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment."

27. DEFENDANTS underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and other non-exempt employees earned non-discretionary remuneration, including, but not limited to, incentives, shift differential pay, and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANTS underpaid sick pay to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay.

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

29. DEFENDANTS violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely earned non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay. However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.

30. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANTS regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFFS are informed and believe and based thereon allege that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was willful, such that the AGGRIEVED

EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

31. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer to said employee." DEFENDANTS failed to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, failed to disclose all aspects of the deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, and thereby failed to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable pay period and upon termination.

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

33. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANTS to use their own personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for DEFENDANTS but were not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost associated with the use of their personal cellular phones and home offices for DEFENDANTS' benefit. Specifically, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANTS to use their personal cellular phones and home offices. In addition, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by DEFENDANTS to incur mileage and purchase back pads. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of

their personal cellular phones and home offices, mileage, and purchases of back pads all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANTS.

34. In violation of the applicable sections of the California Labor Code and the requirements of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order, DEFENDANTS as a matter of company policy, practice and procedure, intentionally, knowingly and systematically failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES suitable seating when the nature of these employees' work reasonably permitted sitting.

35. DEFENDANTS knew or should have known that PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANTS did not provide suitable seating and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties.

36. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFFS and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANTS violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and Wage Order 4-2001, Section 14 by failing to provide suitable seats. PLAINTIFFS seek penalties on behalf of PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as provided herein. Providing suitable seating is the DEFENDANTS' burden. As a result of DEFENDANTS' intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANTS violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

37. The employment of PLAINTIFFS and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has terminated and DEFENDANTS have not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFFS' employment with DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and accrued vested vacation and holiday time on the date of their termination pursuant to DEFENDANTS' uniform vacation policies and applicable California law. The amount of vacation pay PLAINTIFFS and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANTS' business records. Additionally, DEFENDANTS also underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay and more specifically the final rate of pay that included all non-discretionary incentive compensation. Rather

than pay vacation wages at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANTS underpaid vacation wages to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment calculations. DEFENDANT failed to specify in DEFENDANTS' written vacation policy the rate at which PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would be paid vacation upon leaving employment with DEFENDANTS. As a result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful practice, policy and procedure to deny paying the PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all of their vested vacation and holiday time, DEFENDANTS failed to pay the PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all vested vacation time as wages due upon employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202, 203 and 227.3. Similarly, DEFENDANTS underpaid waiting time penalties to PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFFS' and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary compensation into the waiting time penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANTS is believed to be the result of DEFENDANTS' unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation for earned, accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting time penalties that were paid. DEFENDANTS perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive practice to the detriment of PLAINTIFFS and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. DEFENDANTS' uniform practice and policy of failing to pay the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all vested vacation and holiday time accumulated at employment termination violated and continues to violate Section 227.3 of the California Labor Code.

38. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect PLAINTIFFS during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFFS seek penalties for those violations that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp*. (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 504, 523.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

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

40. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure, Sections

395.5 and 393, because DEFENDANTS operate 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, *et seq.*]

37. PLAINTIFFS reallege and incorporate by this reference, as though fully set forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

38. 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 means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1.

39. PLAINTIFFS, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General Act, bring this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to themselves and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES during the PAGA PERIOD.

40. On March 11, 2024, PLAINTIFF SUNGLAO gave written notice by electronic submission to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. The statutory waiting period of 65 days for PLAINTIFF SUNGLAO to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF SUNGLAO may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined. A true and correct copy of this notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit A.**

41. On February 22, 2024, PLAINTIFF DIAS gave written notice by electronic submission to the Agency and by certified mail to the Defendant Zoox, Inc. of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. A true and correct copy of this notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**. On April 17, 2024, PLAINTIFFS DIAS and WILSON gave an amended written notice by electronic submission to the Agency and by certified mail to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code § 2699.3. A true and correct copy of this amended notice is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. The statutory waiting period of 65 days for PLAINTIFFS DIAS and WILSON to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3, PLAINTIFF DIAS and WILSON may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

42. Because this action is brought with respect to notices filed prior to June 19, 2024, the 2024 amendments to PAGA do not apply to this action pursuant to Labor Code §2699(v)(1) and (2).

43. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful business act or practice because DEFENDANTS (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay legally required meal and rest premiums, (d) failed to pay minimum wages, (e) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (f) failed to reimburse employees for required expenses, (g) failed to provide wages when due during employment, (h) failed to provide wages when due at time of discharge from employment, (i) failed to provide suitable seating, and (j) failed to keep complete and accurate payroll records, all in violation of the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 et seq., 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 et seq., 2800, and 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), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.[1] PLAINTIFFS hereby

[1] Plaintiffs specifically exclude and/or do not allege any claims under California Labor Code § 558(a)(3).

seek recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representatives of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on PLAINTIFFS and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFFS, on behalf of the State of California pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, pray for judgment against each Defendant, jointly and severally, as follows:

1. For the imposition of civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699, 210, 558, 226, 226.3, 1174.5, and 1197.1 and all other penalties allowed by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes:
2. An award of attorneys fees and costs of suit, as allowable under the law, including but not limited to, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, and 2699(g)(1); and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

Dated: September 30, 2026

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOMIK DE BLOUW LLP

By: */s/ Christine T. LeVu*
Norman B. Blumenthal
Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Nicholas J. De Blouw
Christine T. LeVu

Attorneys for Plaintiff Daniel Sunglao

Dated: September 30, 2026

BLACKSTONE LAW, APC

By: */s/ Alexandra Rose*
Barbara DuVan-Clarke
Alexandra Rose

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jorge Dias and Emerald Wilson

EXHIBIT A

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

WRITERS E-MAIL:
Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:
1004

March 11, 2024
CA3153

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Experis US LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052700408543151
Shawn Rossmann
100 MANPOWER PLACE
PAYROLL TAX
MILWAUKEE, CA 53212

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 et seq., 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 Experis US LLC and/or Zoox Labs, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Zoox Labs, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of March 11, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Daniel Sunglao ("Plaintiff") and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Experis US LLC and/or Zoox Labs, Inc. ("Defendants"). Plaintiff Sunglao was employed by Defendants in California from February of 2020 to August 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 Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but "furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work," Defendants 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 Defendants 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 Defendants failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B).

Further, Defendants 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. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendants failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendants 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 Defendants 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 Defendants failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendants failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees performed 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. Defendants 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 *et seq.*, 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 Defendants as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq*. 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.

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: **Nick@bamlawca.com**
WRITERS EXT: 1004

March 11, 2024
CA3153

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Zoox Labs, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052700408543168
CSC - LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE
BECKY DEGEORGE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, Suite 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218, 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 et seq., 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2100 et seq., 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 Experis US LLC and/or Zoox Labs, Inc. in California, including any employees staffed with Zoox Labs, Inc. by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of March 11, 2023 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Daniel Sunglao ("Plaintiff") and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Experis US LLC and/or Zoox Labs, Inc. ("Defendants"). Plaintiff Sunglao was employed by Defendants in California from February of 2020 to August 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 Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but "furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work," Defendants 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 Defendants 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 Defendants failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendants 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. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendants failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendants 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 Defendants 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 Defendants failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendants failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees performed 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. Defendants 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 *et seq.*, 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 Defendants as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699, *et seq*. 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.

EXHIBIT B

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.
bdc@blackstonepc.com

February 22, 2024

PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: ***Jorge Dias v. Zoox Labs, Inc. dba Zoox, Inc / Actalent, Inc.***

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Jorge Dias ("Claimant") with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Zoox Labs, Inc. dba Zoox, Inc. and Actalent, Inc. (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Jorge Dias from approximately January 2023 to October 2023 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Jorge Dias worked as a Vehicle Operator for Employers and was based out of Employers' facilities located at 1149 Chess Dr, Foster City, California 94404 and 1300 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Claimant intends to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Claimant is seeking penalties on behalf of his or herself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimant's notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimant's employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order").

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

The claims made on behalf of Claimant and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock including, receiving and answering text messages with work related questions in between shifts. Employers failed to compensate Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages,

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id*.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimant and

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia,* overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia,* (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimant and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the necessary usage of personal cell phones and the necessary purchase of back pads.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimant and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimant and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimant and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. EMPLOYER'S OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc*. (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 ("*Huff*"), as an Aggrieved Employee, Claimant has standing, and intends to pursue civil penalties on behalf of the LWDA against Employers for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employers. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against Employer for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Claimant, as an "aggrieved" employee affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby does, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for all Labor Code violations by Employer.

Employers are in direct violation of numerous California wage and hour laws including but not limited to said sections stated above. Claimant hereby provides notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically asks for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that Claimant may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimant's intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW

Barbara DuVan-Clarke

Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Zoox Labs, Inc. 1505 Corporation - CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr # 150 Sacramento, CA 95833	Zoox Labs, Inc. 1149 Chess Drive Foster City, CA 94404
Actalent, Inc. 7301 Parkway Drive Hanover, MD 21076	Actalent, Inc. 1505 Corporation - CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr # 150 Sacramento, CA 95833

EXHIBIT C

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.
bdc@blackstonepc.com

April 17, 2024

Amended PAGA Claim Notice Via Online Electronic Submission
California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, Suite 5000 (MIC-55)
Sacramento, CA 95814
https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html

RE: ***Jorge Dias and Emerald Wilson v. Zoox Labs, Inc. dba Zoox, Inc / Actalent, Inc. / Experis Us LLC***

Amended PAGA Letter - LWDA-CM-1012632-24

To Whom It May Concern:

This office represents Jorge Dias and Emerald Wilson ("Claimants") with respect to their claims under the California Labor Code against Zoox Labs, Inc. dba Zoox, Inc / Actalent, Inc. / Experis Us LLC (including all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, and officers) (collectively referred to herein as "Employers"). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employers by certified mail.

Employers employed Jorge Dias from approximately January 2023 to October 2023 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee. Jorge Dias worked as a Vehicle Operator for Employers and was based out of Employers' facilities located at 1149 Chess Dr, Foster City, California 94404 and 1300 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Employers employed Emerald Wilson from approximately June 2020 to September 2023 as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee Emerald Wilson worked as a Vehicle Operator for Employers and was based out of Employers' facility located at 1149 Chess Dr, Foster City, CA 94404 and 1300 Bryant St, San Francisco, CA 94103.

Claimants intend to bring a representative action seeking penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA"). Claimants are seeking penalties on behalf of themselves and in representative capacities on behalf of the State of California and all current and former hourly-paid and/or non-exempt employees who worked for Employers in the State of California during the relevant statutory period ("Aggrieved Employees"). This letter is

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3 and shall serve as Claimants' notice of the provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories in support thereof.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California's wage and hour laws during Claimants' employment, including but not limited to California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC Wage Order").

The claims made on behalf of Claimants and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Employers engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to pay at least the legal minimum wage to their employees. California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order further require employers to pay no less than one and one-half times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday, for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one workweek, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and to pay no less than twice an employee's regular rate of pay of the employee for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one workday and for any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh day of a workweek.

Throughout the relevant time, Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock including, receiving and answering text messages with work related questions in between shifts. Employers failed to compensate Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for any of this off-the-clock work, in violation of California law.

This uncompensated work often resulted in the total number of hours worked by Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees exceeding the daily and/or weekly triggers for overtime wages, yet Employers failed to pay Claimants and Aggrieved Employees applicable overtime rate(s) for these hours.

Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Claimant and Aggrieved Employees. In addition, Employers utilized time rounding practices that resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages (including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages) to Claimant and Aggrieved Employees.

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Employers also failed to pay overtime to Claimants and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration, including non-discretionary commissions, non-discretionary bonuses, and non-discretionary performance pay.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers failed to pay Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. MEAL BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to provide employees with an opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the fifth hour of work when an employee works more than five (5) hours in a day. Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 512(a). Employers must provide a second meal period of no less than thirty (30) minutes before the end of the tenth hour of work when an employee works more than ten (10) hours in a day. *Id.* For each day that an employer fails to provide compliant meal period(s), the employer must pay the employee a meal penalty equal to one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. *Id*.

During the relevant time period, Employers failed to provide Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were required by Employers to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Meal breaks, when provided, were oftentimes interrupted and/or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded their own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4)

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on maximizing profits over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. REST BREAK VIOLATIONS

California law requires employers to authorize and permit employees to take an uninterrupted rest period of no less than ten (10) minutes for every four (4) hours, or major fraction thereof, worked. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7. For each day that an employer fails to authorize and permit a compliant rest period, the employer owes the employee one hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation. Cal. Lab. Code § 226.7(c).

Employers failed to authorize and permit Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Claimants and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.,* 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees to respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for each day a rest period was not provided to them in compliance with California law. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders; Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, Employers failed to timely pay all wages earned because Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia,* overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages to furnish wage statements to its employees setting forth, *inter alia*, (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, and (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked (including time spent working off-the-clock), the actual gross wages earned (including wages owed for time spent working off the clock and meal and rest period premiums), and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

California Labor Code section 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. During the relevant time period, Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Claimants and other Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

of the employer. The applicable IWC Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Claimants and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the necessary usage of personal cell phones and mileage, and the necessary purchase of back pads..

Accordingly, Employers violated the applicable IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802. Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to penalties paragraph of the applicable IWC Wage Orders; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION

California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours' notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

During the relevant time period, upon the termination of employment (including but not limited to when they were temporarily laid off, laid off, discharged, and/or resigned), Employers failed to pay all wages due to their employees within twenty-four (24) hours of termination or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employers' practices of requiring Claimants and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, unlawful rounding practices, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employers failed to pay Claimants and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employers also failed to pay Claimants and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Claimants and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. EMPLOYER'S OTHER VIOLATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE

Finally, pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc*. (2018) 25 Cal.App.5th 745 ("*Huff*"), as Aggrieved Employees, Claimants have standing, and intend to pursue civil penalties on behalf of the LWDA against Employers for any and all other Labor Code violations committed by Employers. In *Huff*, the California Court of Appeals held that an employee alleging a single violation of the Labor Code under PAGA may also bring PAGA claims against Employer

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

for all other alleged Labor Code violations, even those suffered by other employees of the same employer. According to the *Huff* decision, Claimants, as "aggrieved" employees affected by at least one Labor Code violation may, and hereby do, pursue penalties on behalf of LWDA for all Labor Code violations by Employer.

Employers are in direct violation of numerous California wage and hour laws including but not limited to said sections stated above. Claimants hereby provide notice to the LWDA under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code Sections 2698, *et seq.*, and specifically ask for an investigation, or if the agency does not intend to investigate the alleged violations, a letter confirming the same so that we may allege a cause of action under PAGA against Employers for the violations discussed in this letter.

This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3. By law, an employee alleging a violation of one of the above referenced sections must notify his or her employer and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) before he or she can invoke the provisions of Sections 2699, *et seq.*, by seeking redress in court. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(1). The LWDA must then notify the employer and the employee within 60 calendar days regarding whether it intends to investigate the alleged violation. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(B). If the LWDA advises it will not investigate, or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days, the employee may file a lawsuit invoking the provisions under Labor Code § 2699. Cal. Lab. Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A). It is Claimants' intention to file a civil complaint and to bring the appropriate claims under California Labor Code § 2699 on behalf of themselves, the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees should your office not address Employers' alleged violations within this timeframe.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

BLACKSTONE LAW



Barbara DuVan-Clarke, Esq.

cc: By U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested

Zoox Labs, Inc. 1505 Corporation - CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr # 150 Sacramento, CA 95833	Zoox Labs, Inc. 1149 Chess Drive Foster City, CA 94404

BLACKSTONE LAW

8383 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 745
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Phone: (310) 622-4278
Fax: (855) 786-6356

Actalent, Inc. 7301 Parkway Drive Hanover, MD 21076	Actalent, Inc. 1505 Corporation - CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr # 150 Sacramento, CA 95833
Experis US LLC Agent for Service Shawn Rossmann 100 Manpower Place Milwaukee, WI 53212	