

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)

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY

FILED

Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

05/09/2023

Clerk of the Court

BY: JEFFREY FLORES

Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

RENEE HUDSON, on behalf of the State of
California, as a private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PROLINK HEALTHCARE, LLC, a Limited
Liability Company; SAINT AGNES
MEDICAL CENTER, a Corporation; TRINITY
HEALTH CORPORATION, a Corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. **CGC-23-606525**

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 *et*
seq., 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 11070(14)
(Failure to Provide Seating), and the
applicable Wage Order(s).

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

6 **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

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

23 **THE PARTIES**

24 4. Defendant Prolink Healthcare, LLC is a limited liability company that at all
25 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the
26 state of California.

27 5. Defendant Saint Agnes Medical Center is a corporation that at all relevant times
28

1 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of
2 California.

3 6. Defendant Trinity Health Corporation is a corporation that at all relevant times
4 mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in the state of
5 California.

6 7. Prolink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity
7 Health Corporation were the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck and by
8 the company PLAINTIFF performed work for respectively, and are therefore jointly responsible
9 as employers for the conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as
10 (“DEFENDANT”).

11 8. Defendant Prolink Healthcare, LLC owns and operates a staffing company.
12 Defendant Saint Agnes Medical Center owns and operates a hospital in California. Defendant
13 Trinity Health Corporation owns and operates a hospital in California.

14 9. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from August 28, 2022
15 to November 17, 2022. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-
16 exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
17 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

18 10. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
19 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
20 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to herself
21 and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Prolink Healthcare, LLC, and/or
22 Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation in California and classified as
23 non-exempt employees (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of February
24 2, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

25 11. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of herself and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES
26 presently or formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this
27 representative action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* seeking fixed civil penalties for
28

1 DEFENDANT's violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *et seq.*, 210, 218,
2 221, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 246 *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198,
3 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B),
4 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1 1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and
5 the applicable Wage Order(s). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code §
7 2699, *et seq.*

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

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

25 26 **THE CONDUCT**

27 14. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
28 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time

1 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
2 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
3 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without
4 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
5 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to
6 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
7 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal
8 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure,
9 administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
10 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT,
11 so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual
13 recorded time rather than "rounded" time. Additionally, DEFENDANT engages in the
14 practice of requiring PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to perform work off
15 the clock in that DEFENDANT, as a condition of employment, required these employees to
16 submit to mandatory temperature checks and symptom questionnaires for COVID-19
17 screening prior to clocking into DEFENDANT's timekeeping system for the workday. As a
18 result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime
19 wage compensation, and off-duty meal breaks by working without their time being correctly
20 recorded and without compensation at the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and
21 practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is
22 evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records.

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

27 16. The second component of PLAINTIFF's and the AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES' compensation is DEFENDANT's non-discretionary incentive program that

1 paid PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incentive wages based on their
2 performance for DEFENDANT. The non-discretionary incentive program provided all
3 employees paid on an hourly basis with incentive compensation when the employees met the
4 various performance goals set by DEFENDANT. However, when calculating the regular
5 rate of pay in order to pay overtime and meal and rest break premiums to PLAINTIFF and
6 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT failed to include the incentive
7 compensation as part of the employees' "regular rate of pay" for purposes of calculating
8 overtime pay and meal and rest break premium pay. Management and supervisors described
9 the incentive program to potential and new employees as part of the compensation package.
10 As a matter of law, the incentive compensation received by PLAINTIFF and the
11 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES must be included in the "regular rate of pay." The failure to
12 do so has resulted in a underpayment of overtime compensation and meal and rest break
13 premiums to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by DEFENDANT.

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

26 18. During the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES were also required from time to time to work in excess of four (4) hours
28 without being provided ten (10) minute rest periods. Further, these employees were denied

1 their first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of at least two (2)
2 to four (4) hours from time to time, a first and second rest period of at least ten (10) minutes
3 for some shifts worked of between six (6) and eight (8) hours from time to time, and a first,
4 second and third rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for some shifts worked of ten (10)
5 hours or more from time to time. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were
6 also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof. Additionally, the applicable
7 California Wage Order requires employers to provide employees with off-duty rest periods,
8 which the California Supreme Court defined as time during which an employee is relieved
9 from all work related duties and free from employer control. In so doing, the Court held that
10 the requirement under California law that employers authorize and permit all employees to
11 take rest period means that employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish
12 control over how employees spend their time which includes control over the locations
13 where employees may take their rest period. Employers cannot impose controls that prohibit
14 an employee from taking a brief walk - five minutes out, five minutes back. Here,
15 DEFENDANT's policy restricted PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES from
16 unconstrained walks and is unlawful based on DEFENDANT's rule which states
17 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES cannot leave the work premises during
18 their rest period.

19 19. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT fails to accurately record and pay
20 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these
21 employees worked. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders,
22 DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for
23 all time worked, meaning the time during which an employee was subject to the control of
24 an employer, including all the time the employee was permitted or suffered to permit this
25 work. DEFENDANT required these employees to work off the clock without paying them
26 for all the time they were under DEFENDANT's control. As such, DEFENDANT knew or
27 should have known that PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were under
28 compensated for all time worked. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES forfeited time worked by working without their time being accurately
2 recorded and without compensation at the applicable minimum wage and overtime wage
3 rates. To the extent that the time worked off the clock does not qualify for overtime
4 premium payment, DEFENDANT fails to pay minimum wages for the time worked off-the-
5 clock in violation of Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

6 20. From time to time, DEFENDANT also fails to provide PLAINTIFF and the
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
8 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
9 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
10 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
11 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
12 worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on
13 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates
14 during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the
15 wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
16 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to
17 identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the
18 accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements
19 were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in
20 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this
21 paragraph, DEFENDANT fails to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that lists
22 all the requirements under California Labor Code 226 *et seq.* As a result, DEFENDANT
23 from time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage
24 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226. DEFENDANT also violated Cal. Lab.
25 Code Section 226(a)(8) by failing to correctly list the name of the legal entity that employed
26 PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

27 21. Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d) provides, the requirements of this section shall be
28 deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if

1 the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll
2 period. Cal. Lab. Code § 210 provides:

3 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
4 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
5 Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
6 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.

7 22. DEFENDANT from time to time fails to pay PLAINTIFF and the
8 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES within seven (7) days of the close of the payroll period in
9 accordance with Cal. Lab. Code § 204(d), including but not limited to for the “Hourly”
10 regular wage payments.

11 23. DEFENDANT underpays sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the
12 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
13 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt
14 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration, including, but not limited to, incentives,
15 shift differential pay, and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay,
16 DEFENDANT underpays sick pay to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at
17 their base rates of pay.

18 24. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
19 employees be calculated by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime
20 premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90
21 days of employment.

22 25. DEFENDANT violated Cal. Lab. Code Section 246 by failing to pay sick pay
23 at the regular rate of pay. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES routinely
24 earned non-discretionary incentive wages which increased their regular rate of pay.
25 However, when sick pay was paid, it was paid at the base rate of pay for PLAINTIFF and
26 the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, as opposed to the correct, higher regular rate of pay, as
27 required under Cal. Lab. Code Section 246.
28

1 26. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF
2 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
3 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and
4 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was
5 willful, such that the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are
6 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

7 27. Pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 221, "It shall be unlawful for any employer
8 to collect or receive from an employee any part of wages theretofore paid by said employer
9 to said employee." DEFENDANT fails to pay all compensation due to PLAINTIFF and the
10 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, made unlawful deductions from compensation payable to
11 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, fails to disclose all aspects of the
12 deductions from compensation payable to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
13 EMPLOYEES, and thereby fails to pay these employees all wages due at each applicable
14 pay period and upon termination.

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

25 29. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
27 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for
28 DEFENDANT but are not reimbursed or indemnified by DEFENDANT for the cost

1 associated with the use of their personal cellular phones for DEFENDANT's benefit.
2 Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required by
3 DEFENDANT to use their personal cellular phones to perform work functions for
4 DEFENDANT. As a result, in the course of their employment with DEFENDANT,
5 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred unreimbursed business expenses
6 which included, but were not limited to, costs related to the use of their personal cellular
7 phones all on behalf of and for the benefit of DEFENDANT.

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

14 31. DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF and other
15 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were entitled to suitable seating and/or were entitled to sit
16 when it did not interfere with the performance of their duties, and that DEFENDANT did
17 not provide suitable seating and/or did not allow them to sit when it did not interfere with
18 the performance of their duties.

19 32. By reason of this conduct applicable to PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED
20 EMPLOYEES, DEFENDANT violated California Labor Code Section 1198 and Wage
21 Order 4-2001, Section 14 by failing to provide suitable seats. PLAINTIFF seeks penalties
22 on behalf of PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as provided herein.
23 Providing suitable seating is the DEFENDANT's burden. As a result of DEFENDANT's
24 intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, DEFENDANT violated the
25 California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

26 33. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has
27 terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by
28 law. Additionally, at all times during the term of PLAINTIFF's employment with

1 DEFENDANT, PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and accrued
2 vested vacation and holiday time on the date of their termination pursuant to
3 DEFENDANT's uniform vacation policies and applicable California law. The amount of
4 vacation pay PLAINTIFF and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES earned and
5 accumulated is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business records. Additionally,
6 DEFENDANT also underpaid accrued vested vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and other
7 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay and
8 more specifically the final rate of pay that included all non-discretionary incentive
9 compensation. Rather than pay vacation wages at the regular rate of pay, DEFENDANT
10 underpaid vacation wages to PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their
11 base rates of pay, instead of including all of PLAINTIFF's and other AGGRIEVED
12 EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary incentive compensation into the vacation wage payment
13 calculations. DEFENDANT failed to specify in DEFENDANT's written vacation policy the
14 rate at which PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES would be paid vacation
15 upon leaving employment with DEFENDANT. As a result of DEFENDANT's unlawful
16 practice, policy and procedure to deny paying the PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED
17 EMPLOYEES all of their vested vacation and holiday time, DEFENDANT failed to pay the
18 PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES all vested vacation time as wages due
19 upon employment termination, in violation of the California Labor Code, Sections 201, 202,
20 203 and 227.3. Similarly, DEFENDANT underpaid waiting time penalties to PLAINTIFF
21 and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at their base rates of pay, instead of including all of
22 PLAINTIFF's and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' non-discretionary compensation into
23 the waiting time penalty calculations. This failure by DEFENDANT is believed to be the
24 result of DEFENDANT's unlawful, unfair and deceptive refusal to provide compensation for
25 earned, accrued and vested vacation and holiday time, as well as the corresponding waiting
26 time penalties that were paid. DEFENDANT perpetrated this unlawful, unfair and deceptive
27 practice to the detriment of PLAINTIFF and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.
28 DEFENDANT's uniform practice and policy of failing to pay the AGGRIEVED

1 EMPLOYEES for all vested vacation and holiday time accumulated at employment
2 termination violated and continues to violate Section 227.3 of the California Labor Code.

3 34. All of the conduct and violations alleged herein occurred during the PAGA
4 PERIOD. To the extent that any of the conduct and violations alleged herein did not affect
5 PLAINTIFF during the PAGA PERIOD, PLAINTIFF seeks penalties for those violations
6 that affected the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES pursuant to *Carrington v. Starbucks Corp.*
7 2018 AJDAR 12157 (Certified for Publication 12/19/18).

8
9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

12 36. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure,
13 Sections 395.5 and 393, because DEFENDANT operates in locations across California,
14 employs AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES across California, including in this County, and
15 committed the wrongful conduct herein alleged in this County against AGGRIEVED
16 EMPLOYEES.

17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

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

23 38. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
24 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
25 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
26 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
27 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
28 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the

1 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
2 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
3 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
4 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

5 39. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
6 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
7 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
8 with respect to herself and all individuals who are or previously were employed by Prolink
9 Healthcare, LLC, and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation in
10 California and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during
11 the time period of February 2, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA
12 PERIOD").

13 40. On February 2, 2023, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
14 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
15 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
16 Labor Code § 2699.3. See **Exhibit #1**, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
17 herein (*PAGA Notice only without draft complaint*). The statutory waiting period for
18 PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to
19 Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now commence a representative civil action under PAGA
20 pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy of the State of California with respect to all
21 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

22 41. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
23 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
24 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
25 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,
26 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for
27 required expenses, (f) failed to provide wages when due, and (g) failed to provide suitable
28 seating, 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 *et seq.*, 510, 512,
558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of Regulations, Title 8,
Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 1
1070(14) (Failure to Provide Seating), and the applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives
rise to civil penalties as a result of such conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of
only civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as
the representative of the State of California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on
PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

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

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

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

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

Dated: May 9, 2023 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW
LLP

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

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

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

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

2255 CALLE CLARA

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

San Diego | San Francisco | Sacramento | Los Angeles | Riverside | Santa Clara | Orange | Chicago

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

WRITERS E-MAIL:

Nick@bamlawca.com

WRITERS EXT:

1004

February 2, 2023

CA 2845

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Prolink Healthcare, LLC
Certified Mail #70222410000149121435
INCORP SERVICES, INC.
Steven Pickett
5716 CORSA AVE SUITE 110
WESTLAKE VILLAGE, CA 91362

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, 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 Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Prolink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation in California and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 2, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Renee Hudson (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Prolink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed from August 28, 2022 to November 17, 2022 by Defendant in California. She was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit.

8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *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 Defendant 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 or 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

February 2, 2023

CA 2845

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Saint Agnes Medical Center
Certified Mail #70222410000149121428
CT Corporation System
AMANDA GARCIA
330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700
GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 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, 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 Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Prolink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation in California and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 2, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Renee Hudson (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Prolink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed from August 28, 2022 to November 17, 2022 by Defendant in California. She was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit.

8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *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 Defendant 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 or 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

February 2, 2023

CA 2845

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Trinity Health Corporation

Certified Mail #70222410000247761267

CT Corporation System

AMANDA GARCIA

330 N BRAND BLVD, Suite 700

GLENDALE, CA 91203

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 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, 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 Applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

“Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by ProLink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation in California and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 2, 2022 until a date as determined by the Court. Our offices represent Plaintiff Renee Hudson (“Plaintiff”) and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against ProLink Healthcare, LLC and/or Saint Agnes Medical Center and/or Trinity Health Corporation (“Defendant”). Plaintiff was employed from August 28, 2022 to November 17, 2022 by Defendant in California. She was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked. Defendant, however, unlawfully failed to record and pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees for, including but not limited to, all of their time worked, including minimum and overtime wages and sick pay wages at the correct rate, for all of their missed meal and rest breaks at the correct regular rates, and for all of their time spent working off the clock. Moreover, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to report for work, but “furnished less than half said employee’s usual or scheduled day’s work,” Defendant violated Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8 § 11040, subd. 5(A) by failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for at least two (2) hours’ worth of work at their regular rate of pay. In addition, when Defendant required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to respond to and engage in additional work, this resulted in a second reporting for work in a single workday, and Defendant failed to pay these employees reporting time pay as required by Cal. Code Regs., tit.

8, § 11040, subd. 5(B). Further, Defendant failed to advise Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees of their right to take separately and hourly paid duty-free ten (10) minute rest periods. *See Vaquero v. Stoneledge Furniture, LLC*, 9 Cal. App. 5th 98, 110 (2017). Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204 *et seq.*, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages. Plaintiff further contends that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to her, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). Specifically, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements Defendant provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the accurate total hours worked each pay period in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 226(a)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff contends that Defendant failed to comply with Industrial Wage Order 7(A)(3) in that Defendant failed to keep time records showing when Plaintiff began and ended each shift and meal period. Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees perform tasks that reasonably permit sitting, and a seat would not interfere with their performance of any of their tasks that may require them to stand. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with suitable seats. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, as well as the conduct alleged in the incorporated Complaint, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204 *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 Defendant 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 or 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.