



Nazo@Koullaw.com

P (213) 761 – 5484

F (818) 561 – 3938

3435 WILSHIRE BLVD

SUITE 1710

LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

www.koullaw.com

October 30, 2024

Via E-filing:

California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via Certified U.S. Mail:

Stanford Health Care
500 Pasteur Drive, MC 5690
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Re: PAGA Notice Pursuant to California Labor Code §2699
Claimants: Asefash Rivera
Employer: Stanford Health Care

Dear Sir or Madam:

Claimant Asefash Rivera has retained Nazo Koulloukian, Esq. of the Koul Law Firm, APC, to represent her, and all other aggrieved employees, for wage and hour claims against her former employer, Stanford Health Care (hereafter “Employer”). Claimant currently works for Employer as a Clinical Assistant / Medical Assistant / Patient Care Coordinator on an hourly, non-exempt basis.

Employer has violated, and/or has caused to be violated, several Labor Code provisions and is therefore liable for civil penalties under Cal. Labor Code §2698 *et seq.* We request that your agency investigate the claims alleged below or permit Claimant to seek civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”), Labor Code §2698 *et seq.*, on behalf of the Labor and Workforce and development Agency (“LWDA”) and the State of California in a representative action. This letter will serve as notice of these allegations pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code §2699.3.

Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime Hours Worked

(Cal. Labor Code §§218, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698 *et seq.*, Wage Order 5)

The Wage Orders define “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Employer has been engaged in many unlawful employment practices which resulted in underpayment for hours worked each pay period, including overtime hours worked, as more fully set forth below. Employer has also failed to pay

the required minimum wage for all hours worked and has failed to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Claimant and aggrieved employees have been employed under conditions prohibited by the wage order, and thus Employer has also violated §§1198 and 1199. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2699 *et seq.*

Off-the-Clock Hours Worked

Claimant and aggrieved employees frequently worked off the clock and were routinely subjected to periods wherein they were under the Employer's control but not compensated for their time. For example, Claimant reports that she and her coworkers were often asked by the managers to continue working after clocking out for their meal breaks. For example, Claimant would occasionally be asked to run specimens during her unpaid meal period.

Failure to Pay All Wages Owed Twice Per Month

(Cal. Lab. Code §§204, 210, and 2698 *et seq.*)

Employer was required to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees all wages earned twice during each calendar month pursuant to Labor Code §204(a).

Employer failed to pay all wages earned to employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices discussed herein. As a result of these practices, employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Due to these failures, Employer is liable under Labor Code §204, 210 and 2698 *et seq.* for failure to pay wages as required by law.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 200, 218.5, 226, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.2, 1198, 1199, 2698 *et seq.*)

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2 and 1197, it is unlawful for an employer to suffer or permit a California employee to work without paying wages at the proper minimum wage for all time worked as required by the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Employer failed to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees for all hours worked as a result of Employer's practices described herein. Based on Employer's unlawful conduct Employer's failure to pay for all hours worked, including overtime, resulted in a payment of zero wages for off the clock work, and less than the minimum wage for all hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §1197, 1197.1, 1199 and the Wage Orders. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2699 *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Rest Breaks

(Cal. Labor Code §§226, 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*)

Employer failed to maintain a compliant rest period policy and practice that provides its employees with off-duty rest periods as required by California law. Claimant reports that she and her coworkers frequently missed rest periods as a result of Employer's staffing and business practices, and that rest breaks were not scheduled into daily shifts. Employer's unlawful rest break practices were well known. Recently, Employer instituted an ineffective program wherein employees partner up with a buddy, instructing employees that it was their responsibility to find a buddy and that the buddies could help cover each other for breaks. However, Employer did not modify workloads or provide relief workers, and still failed to schedule breaks into shifts, and Claimant and aggrieved employees continue to be denied the opportunity to take rest breaks.

Rest periods were either less than ten minutes, not provided, interrupted or late, "on duty," or not scheduled before and after a meal period for shifts greater than six hours, as prescribed by California law because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to rest breaks and premium payments for non-compliant rest breaks; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; and/or (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant rest break policy.

The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided"). Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. (*Id.* at 268) (relying on January 3, 1986, and February 22, 2002, DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). *Id.*; *see also*, *Bufile v. Dollar Fin. Grp., Inc.*, (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

Employer did not authorize or permit all of its hourly employees to take at least a ten-minute rest period in which they were relieved of all duties, for every 4 hours of work, or major fraction thereof, as required by Cal. Lab. Code §226.7, §512 and the Wage Orders. When breaks were missed Employer failed to pay the 1-hour penalty, as required. Because Employer violated the Wage Order, Employer is liable under Labor Code §1198. As a result of these violations, Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §2698 *et seq.*

Failure to Provide Suitable Resting Facilities

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*)

Per section 13 of all applicable IWC Wage Orders, employees shall be provided with suitable resting facilities. Section 13(B) of the Wage Orders provides: “Suitable resting facilities shall be provided in an area separate from the toilet rooms and shall be available to employees during work hours.”

Employer’s locations/facilities are generally similar in layout and design, and there was, and continue to be, space that allows for a resting facility that employees may use to cease work and recover during meal or rest periods. Employer could have provided employees with a resting facility within the facilities/locations with reasonable or no modification, but instead denied and continue to deny, employees with suitable areas to rest (e.g. a breakroom).

Claimant reports that Employer failed to provide a breakroom and that she and her coworkers would have to go outside or stay at their desk when taking breaks.

Employer did not provide employees with suitable resting facilities during their hours of work, particularly during meal and/or rest periods. Employer’s failure to provide suitable resting facilities to aggrieved employees violated and continues to violate the applicable Wage Order, section 13(B) and the California Labor Code, including but not limited to section 1198.

Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Breaks

(Cal. Labor Code §§226, 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*)

Labor Code §512 provides, “[a]n employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes...” Labor Code §226.7(a) provides, “[n]o employer shall require an employee to work during any meal... period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” Paragraph 11 of the Wage Order provides, in pertinent part, “[u]nless an employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an ‘on duty’ meal period and counted as time worked.”

Although meal breaks were the only rest period the aggrieved employees were provided, when the meal breaks were provided, they were often late, short, and/or interrupted. Additionally, as discussed above, Claimant and her coworkers were sometimes told to clock out but continue performing tasks for Employer while off the clock.

Full, uninterrupted, off-duty, thirty-minute meal periods were not provided because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to meal periods and premium payments for non-compliant meal periods; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant meal period policy; and/or (6) because Employer unlawfully shaved and/or rounded clock in and clock out times for meal periods. Employees were not paid a premium payment, paid as an hour's wage when meal periods were not given to them in compliance with California law.

Employer failed to permit Claimant and others to take timely, off-duty, meal breaks of "not less than 30 minutes" for each five consecutive hours of work in violation of Labor Code §§226.7 and 512. Employer failed to pay all penalty pay to Claimant or aggrieved employees for noncompliant meal periods. As a derivative claim, Claimant alleges that pay statements were inaccurate, failing to include required meal period penalties, thus failing the requirements of Labor Code §226(a). As a result of these violations, Employers are liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §558 and §2698 *et seq.*

Failure to Reimburse for Required Business Expenses

(Cal. Labor Code §§1198, 2802, 2699 *et seq.*)

Labor Code §2802 requires employers to indemnify employees for necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of the discharge of duties. Accordingly, Employers are liable for civil penalties under PAGA §2699 *et seq.*

Claimant and aggrieved employees are required to use their personal cell phones for work related communications, although Employers did not reimburse them in any way for the expense of their personal cell phone use as required by the Labor Code. Claimant and her coworkers continue to receive updates, assignments, and shift information through their personal phones.

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements & Violation of Record Keeping Requirements

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 246, 248, 1174, 1174.5, 2699 *et seq.*)

Employer knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Claimant and the aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code §§ 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d).

The statements provided to Claimants and aggrieved employees, and the records maintained by Employer, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay

for all hours worked and the accurate rate of pay for all hours worked, and overtime pay, and pay for meal and rest period premium wages.

§226 (a) requires:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (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, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee...

Such failures called injury to Claimant and others, by, among other things, impeding them from knowing the total hours worked and the amount of wages to which they are and were entitled. Employer knowingly and intentionally failed to accurately itemize the gross wages earned, net wages earned, and total hours worked.

Finally, Employer has violated Labor Code §432.5 for forcing Claimant and aggrieved employees to sign employment-related contracts and documents that contained unlawful terms of employment, including invalid meal period waivers resulting from a noncompliant meal period policy and/or practice.

Conclusion

Employer has violated a number of California wage and hour laws. Claimant respectfully requests that the agency investigate the above allegations and hereby provides notice of the allegations pursuant to PAGA's provisions. Alternatively, Claimant requests that the agency inform her if it does not intend to investigate these violations so that she may pursue her claims as a representative action in civil court.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nazo Koulloukian', written over a horizontal line.

Nazo Koulloukian, Esq.
Attorneys for Claimant