

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

Jeffrey S. Herman (State Bar #280058)

jeffrey@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE

NATHAN CAMPBELL, on behalf of the
State of California, as a private attorney
general,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BFS GROUP OF CALIFORNIA LLC, a
Limited Liability Company; PROBUILD
LLC, a Limited Liability Company;
BUILDER'S FIRST SOURCE LLC, a
Limited Liability Company; BUILDERS
FIRSTSOURCE, INC., a Corporation;
PROBUILD COMPANY LLC, a Limited
Liability Company; BFS GROUP LLC, a
Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2026-01566173-CU-OE-CXC

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699 for violations of Labor Code
§§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210,
226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), and the applicable Wage
Order(s).

Assigned for All purposes:

Judge Layne H. Melzer

Dep. CX102

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

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action against defendants BFS Group of California LLC,
8 Probuild LLC, Builder's First Source LLC , Builders Firstsource, Inc., Probuild Company LLC
9 and BFS Group LLC (referred to as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil
10 penalties on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for
11 DEFENDANT. PLAINTIFF does **not seek to recover anything other than penalties as**
12 **permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.** To the extent that statutory violations are
13 mentioned for wage violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special
14 damages for those violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code
15 § 2699.

16 2. California has enacted the PAGA which permits PLAINTIFF to bring an action
17 for PAGA penalties *only*, which is the precise and sole 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 4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in his individual capacity; he is proceeding
24 herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees.
25 Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing in his individual capacity.

26 **THE PARTIES**

27 5. BFS Group of California LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company
28

1 that at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial
2 business in California.

3 6. Probuild LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company that at all relevant
4 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

5 7. Builder's First Source LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company that
6 at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business
7 in California.

8 8. Builders Firstsource, Inc. ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that at all relevant
9 times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in California.

10 9. Probuild Company, LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company that at
11 all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in
12 California.

13 10. BFS Group LLC ("DEFENDANT") is a limited liability company that at all
14 relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business in
15 California.

16 11. The entities named in paragraphs 5-10 above (and any DOE entities later named)
17 are the joint employers of PLAINTIFF as evidenced by paycheck, standardized company
18 employment handbooks, by standardized policies and procedures, by the company PLAINTIFF
19 performs work for respectively and are therefore jointly responsible as employers for the
20 conduct alleged herein, and are therefore collectively referred to herein as ("DEFENDANT").

21 12. DEFENDANT is a supplier of building materials, prefabricated components, and
22 provides design services for new home construction and remodeling in California.

23 13. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from November of
24 2022 to September 19, 2025. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a non-
25 exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
26 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.
27
28

1 14. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
2 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
3 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all
4 individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or
5 Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or
6 Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed
7 with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC
8 and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a
9 third party, and classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during
10 the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA
11 PERIOD").

12 15. PLAINTIFF, on behalf of all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES presently or
13 formerly employed by DEFENDANT during the PAGA PERIOD, brings this representative
14 action pursuant to Labor Code § 2699 seeking fixed civil penalties for DEFENDANT's
15 violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2),
16 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, California Code of
17 Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the applicable Wage
18 Order(s). Based upon the foregoing, PLAINTIFF and all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are
19 aggrieved employees within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699.

20 16. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, subsidiary,
21 partnership, associate or otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are
22 presently unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious
23 names pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 474. PLAINTIFF will seek leave to amend this
24 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of Does 1 through 50, inclusive, when
25 they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and based upon that information
26 and belief alleges, that the Defendants named in this Complaint, including DOES 1 through
27 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
28 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

17. 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 PLAINTIFF 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

18. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT was required to pay PLAINTIFF 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. DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things, DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure, administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT, so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF 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. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the

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

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

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

22 21. As a result of their rigorous work schedules, PLAINTIFF and the
23 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were from time to time unable to take thirty (30) minute off
24 duty meal breaks and were not fully relieved of duty for their meal periods. PLAINTIFF
25 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were required from time to time to perform work as
26 ordered by DEFENDANT for more than five (5) hours during some shifts without receiving
27 a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
28 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in

1 which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work.
2 DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid
3 paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the
4 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation
5 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

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

27 23. During the PAGA PERIOD, DEFENDANT failed to accurately record and
28 pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for the actual amount of time these

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

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

1 paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that
2 lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
3 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage
4 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

9 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
10 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
11 Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
12 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.

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

17 27. DEFENDANT underpaid sick pay wages to PLAINTIFF and the
18 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES by failing to pay such wages at the regular rate of pay in
19 violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 246. Specifically, PLAINTIFF and other non-exempt
20 employees earn non-discretionary remuneration, including, but not limited to, incentives,
21 shift differential pay, and bonuses. Rather than pay sick pay at the regular rate of pay,
22 DEFENDANT underpays sick pay to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at
23 their base rates of pay.

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

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

7 30. As a pattern and practice, DEFENDANT regularly failed to pay PLAINTIFF
8 and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES their correct wages and accordingly owe waiting time
9 penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Section 203. Further, PLAINTIFF is informed and
10 believes and based thereon alleges that such failure to pay sick pay at regular rate was
11 willful, such that the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES whose employment has separated are
12 entitled to waiting time penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code Sections 201-203.

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

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

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

6 33. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has
7 terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by
8 law.

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

12 35. 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]**

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

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

23 37. 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

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

6 38. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
7 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
8 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
9 with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of
10 California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders
11 Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California,
12 including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC
13 and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild
14 Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt
15 employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time period of February 6, 2025
16 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

17 39. On February 6, 2026, PLAINTIFF gave written notice by electronic mail to the
18 Labor and Workforce Development Agency (the "Agency") and by certified mail to the
19 employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by
20 Labor Code § 2699.3. See Exhibit #1, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference
21 herein. The statutory waiting period for PLAINTIFF to add these allegations to the
22 Complaint has expired. As a result, pursuant to Section 2699.3, PLAINTIFF may now
23 commence a representative civil action under PAGA pursuant to Section 2699 as the proxy
24 of the State of California with respect to all AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES as herein defined.

25 40. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described were and are an unlawful
26 business act or practice because DEFENDANT (a) failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
27 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES accurate itemized wage statements, (b) failed to properly
28 record and provide legally required meal and rest periods, (c) failed to pay minimum wages,

1 (d) failed to pay overtime wages and sick pay wages, (e) failed to reimburse employees for
2 required expenses, and (f) failed to provide wages when due, all in violation of the
3 applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210,
4 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 246, 510, 512, 558(a)(1)(2), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802,
5 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 11040, Subdivision 5(A)-(B), and the
6 applicable Wage Order(s), and thereby gives rise to civil penalties as a result of such
7 conduct.¹ PLAINTIFF hereby seeks recovery of only civil penalties as prescribed by the
8 Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 as the representative of the State of
9 California for the illegal conduct perpetrated on other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES.

10
11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

14 1. On behalf of the State of California and with respect to other AGGRIEVED
15 EMPLOYEES:

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

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

20 Dated: April 29, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
21

22 By: /s/ Norman Blumenthal
23 Norman B. Blumenthal
24 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
25 Nicholas J. De Blouw

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

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

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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency	BFS Group LLC
Online Filing	Certified Mail #9589071052703647148248
	CT Corporation System
	1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900
	Dallas, TX, 75201-3136

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

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

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order’s estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas 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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

BFS Group of California LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052703647148255
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, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant

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

failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales

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

people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order's estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas 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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Builder's First Source LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052703647148262
Braheim Queen
631 EAST VERDUGO AVENUE APT I
BURBANK, CA 91501

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

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

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order’s estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas 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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Builders Firstsource, Inc.
Certified Mail #9589071052703647148279
CT Corporation System
1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900
Dallas, TX, 75201-3136

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

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

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order’s estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions of concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas 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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing

Probuild Company LLC
Certified Mail #9589071052703647148286
CT Corporation System
1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900
Dallas, TX, 75201-3136

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

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

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order’s estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas 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 6, 2026
CA3819

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

Labor and Workforce Development Agency	Probuild LLC
Online Filing	Certified Mail #9589071052703647148293
	Dylan E Jacques
	17751 SILVER HAWK TRAIL
	PERRIS, CA 92570

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s) brought Pursuant To California Labor Code Section 2699.5.

Dear Sir/Madam:

This letter serves as a written notice under California Labor Code Section 2699.3 on behalf of Nathan Campbell ("Plaintiff") and all other Aggrieved Employees of BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC ("Defendant"). "Aggrieved Employees" refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC in California, including any employees staffed with BFS Group of California LLC and/or Probuild LLC and/or Builder's First Source LLC and/or Builders Firstsource, Inc. and/or Probuild Company LLC and/or BFS Group LLC by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of February 6, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court ("PAGA Period").

Our offices represent Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in a lawsuit against Defendant. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant in California from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025. Plaintiff was at all times classified by Defendant as a non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

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

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 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 as described further below.

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an inventory control specialist from November of 2022 to September 19, 2025 working at 7292 Miramar Rd. San Diego, CA 92121. Plaintiff performed his job duties consisting of managing inventory and production. Plaintiff would receive orders from a salesperson. Then he would fill the orders himself by going into the yard, gathering all the product, banding the product together, and loading the product into the trucks for delivery. Plaintiff also ordered product to the yard for special deliveries. Due to Plaintiff's laborious job duties and of the strenuous tasks of other Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees were subjected to numerous violations during their employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was regularly unable to take rest breaks and took many of his meal breaks late, after the 5th hour of work as a result of his strenuous job duties in violation of Cal. Labor Codes Section 226.7, 512 & 1198. 10-15 orders came in each week, and Plaintiff had to fill them all. Depending on the size of the order, some would take two work days to complete. In order for Plaintiff to complete his orders in a timely manner, Plaintiff was forced to take his breaks late. Further, Defendant did not allow Plaintiff to take his rest break until certain orders were done. Though Defendant paid some meal penalties to Plaintiff, considering Plaintiff's strenuous job duties, Defendant failed to pay the proper meal and rest break penalties for every meal and rest break Plaintiff was forced to miss due to those job duties.

Further, as a result of Plaintiff's job duties, there were also times when Plaintiff, while clocked out for a meal break, continued with his job duties mentioned above. While clocked out for a meal break, Plaintiff would take calls from managers and sales people regarding orders and would have to end his meal break early to go back to his job duties. There were also many instances where Plaintiff performed work prior to clocking in for the day. Plaintiff would arrive at work around 7:30 in the morning, which was earlier than his normal start time, and load up trucks. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for any of this off the clock work. These actions above resulted in unpaid minimum and overtime wages in violation of California Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, & 1198. Further, in violation of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210, Defendant failed to timely provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their wages, including the meal and rest break penalties described above.

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

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to his, and other Aggrieved Employees, in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). 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 proper overtime/minimum/and meal and rest break premium wages earned. Defendant also violated 226(a)(2) as Defendant paid Plaintiff “Sick” “Vacation” and “Vacation Payout” payments but improperly included those hours in the Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Defendant knowingly and intentionally failed to include all hours worked and the correct wages owed in violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a). Attached as **Exhibit #1** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 2, 2025 to August 15, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Sick” and “Vacation” payments in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period. Attached as **Exhibit #2** is the true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period from August 30, 2025 to September 12, 2025 showing the improper inclusion of the “Vacation Payout” payment in Plaintiff’s total hours worked during the pay period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff’s regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff’s correct overtime, sick pay, and meal and rest break premium rates during certain pay periods. For example, Defendant paid Plaintiff, including but not limited to a “Quarterly Profit Sharing” and “Holiday Pay” non-discretionary incentive wage during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid break premiums and/or sick pay. As a result, Defendant underpaid Plaintiff his wages during those pay periods. Plaintiff was underpaid earned wages as a result in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Sections 246, 510, and 512.

Further, pursuant to Labor Code § 204(d), all wages earned by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees must be paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Defendant violated this section as Defendant paid Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees eight (8) days following the close of the payroll period. Attached hereto as **Exhibit #3** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s pay stub showing this violation.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that she incurred as a result of his job duties for Defendant in violation of Cal. Lab. Code Section 2802. Plaintiff used his personal cell phone to talk to managers and sales people from other locations regarding any problems with orders, any updates on them, an order’s estimated time of arrival, and any other things related to the orders Plaintiff had to complete. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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

Further, as described in detail in this notice, Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees during their employment and also failed to timely pay those amounts due and earned to departing employees upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code Sections 201-204. Defendant also failed to pay the waiting time penalties owed to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees that stemmed from the non-payment of wages and premiums owed based on the allegations above. Said conduct, in addition to the foregoing, violates Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204(d), 210, 226(a), 226(a)(2), 226.7, 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), Violation of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s), and is therefore actionable under California Labor Code section 2699.3.

This notice is provided to enable Plaintiff to proceed with a Complaint against Defendant as authorized by California Labor Code section 2699. The lawsuit will consist of other Aggrieved Employees. As counsel, our intention is to vigorously prosecute the claims, and to procure civil penalties as provided by the Private Attorney General Statute of 2004 on behalf of Plaintiff and all Aggrieved Employees. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above number and email address.

Respectfully,

/s/ Nicholas De Blouw

Nicholas De Blouw, Esq.

EXHIBIT #1

Employee Name: Nathan A Campbell
Employee #: 
Employee Address: 

Department: General Admin

Job Title: Inventory Control Specialist I
Pay Type: Hourly

Pay Date: 8/22/2025
Pay Period: 8/2/2025 - 8/15/2025
Deposit Advice #: 998294385
Pay Frequency: Bi-Weekly
Federal Filing Status: 
Federal 2c/Extra Withholding: 
State Filing Status: 
State Exemptions: 

Employer Name: BFS Group LLC
Employer Phone: 1-866-888-6360
Employer Address: 6031 Connection Drive
Suite 400
Irving, TX 75039

	Current 8/2/2025 - 8/15/2025			YTD As of 8/15/2025	
	Hours/Units	Rate	Amount	Hours/Units	Amount
Earnings	38.7167		\$939.73	1,423.0834	\$34,456.42
Holiday Pay				40.0000	\$907.66
Overtime 1.5				144.7833	\$4,978.93
Premium OT Adj					\$9.18
Regular Nonexempt	6.7167	23.0952	\$155.12	1,116.3001	\$25,511.57
Sick	8.0000	24.9875	\$199.90	48.0000	\$1,165.23
Sick	8.0000	24.9890	\$199.91		
Sick	8.0000	25.0056	\$200.04		
Missed Break CA Premium					\$0.07
Missed Meal CA Premium					\$0.26
Missed Break CA				1.0000	\$22.42
Missed Meal CA				1.0000	\$23.10
Vacation	8.0000	23.0952	\$184.76	72.0000	\$1,657.47
Quarterly Profit Sharing					\$180.53
Memo Information			\$4.70		\$172.32
401K ER Match			\$4.70		\$172.32
Unpaid Hours	40.0000			40.0000	
Pre-Tax Deductions			\$9.40		\$344.58
401K %			\$9.40		\$344.58
Taxes			\$123.45		\$6,822.74
Federal W/H			\$35.34		\$2,831.49
Soc Sec/FICA EE			\$58.27		\$2,136.30
Medicare EE			\$13.63		\$499.62
CA W/H			\$4.93		\$941.85
CA DT EE			\$11.28		\$413.48
	Routing #	Account #	Amount		Amount
Net Pay			\$806.88		\$27,289.10
Direct Deposit			\$806.88		

Accruals & Balances					
Vacation Balance:	12.48 Hours	Vacation Accrued:	3.08 Hours	Vacation Taken:	8.00 Hours
Sick Balance:	0.00 Hours			Sick Taken:	24.00 Hours
Floating Holiday Balance:	0.00 Hours				

EXHIBIT NO. 2

Employee Name: Nathan A Campbell
Employee #: 
Employee Address: 

Department: General Admin
Job Title: Inventory Control Specialist I
Pay Type: Hourly

Check Date: 9/22/2025
Pay Period: 8/30/2025 - 9/12/2025
Check #: 001107796
Pay Frequency: Bi-Weekly
Federal Filing Status: 
Federal 2c/Extra Withholding: 
State Filing Status: 
State Exemptions: 

Employer Name: BFS Group LLC
Employer Phone: 1-866-888-6360
Employer Address: 6031 Connection Drive
Suite 400
Irving, TX 75039

	Current 8/30/2025 - 9/12/2025			YTD As of 9/12/2025	
	Hours/Units	Rate	Amount	Hours/Units	Amount
Earnings	78.1090		\$1,806.06	1,660.0257	\$40,098.52
Holiday Pay				48.0000	\$1,092.42
Overtime 1.5	0.1830	34.6428	\$6.34	155.3163	\$5,343.82
Premium OT Adj					\$12.44
Regular Exempt	55.2060	23.0952	\$1,274.99	55.2060	\$1,274.99
Regular Nonexempt				1,256.7834	\$28,756.06
Sick				48.0000	\$1,165.23
Vacation Payout	21.7200	23.0952	\$501.63	21.7200	\$501.63
Missed Break CA Premium					\$0.07
Missed Meal CA Premium					\$0.34
Missed Break CA				1.0000	\$22.42
Missed Meal CA	1.0000	23.0952	\$23.10	2.0000	\$46.20
Vacation				72.0000	\$1,657.47
Quarterly Profit Sharing					\$225.43
Memo Information			\$9.03		\$200.53
401K ER Match			\$9.03		\$200.53
Unpaid Hours				40.0000	
Pre-Tax Deductions			\$18.06		\$401.00
401K %			\$18.06		\$401.00
Taxes			\$333.46		\$7,886.00
Federal W/H			\$136.16		\$3,266.57
Soc Sec/FICA EE			\$111.98		\$2,486.11
Medicare EE			\$26.19		\$581.43
CA W/H			\$37.46		\$1,070.71
CA DT EE			\$21.67		\$481.18
	Routing #	Account #	Amount		Amount
Net Pay			\$1,454.54		\$31,811.52
Check			\$1,454.54		

Accruals & Balances

Vacation Balance: 18.64 Hours
Sick Balance: 0.00 Hours
Floating Holiday Balance: 0.00 Hours

EXHIBIT NO. 3

Employee Name: Nathan A Campbell
Employee #: 
Employee Address: 

Department: General Admin

Job Title: Inventory Control Specialist I
Pay Type: Hourly

Check Date: 9/22/2025
Pay Period: 8/30/2025 - 9/12/2025
Check #: 001107797
Pay Frequency: Bi-Weekly
Federal Filing Status: 
Federal 2c/Extra Withholding: 
State Filing Status: 
State Exemptions: 

Employer Name: BFS Group LLC
Employer Phone: 1-866-888-6360
Employer Address: 6031 Connection Drive
Suite 400
Irving, TX 75039

	Current 8/30/2025 - 9/12/2025			YTD As of 9/12/2025	
	Hours/Units	Rate	Amount	Hours/Units	Amount
Earnings	78.1090		\$1,806.06	1,738.1347	\$41,904.58
Holiday Pay				48.0000	\$1,092.42
Overtime 1.5	0.1830	34.6428	\$6.34	155.4993	\$5,350.16
Premium OT Adj					\$12.44
Regular Exempt				55.2060	\$1,274.99
Regular Nonexempt	55.2060	23.0952	\$1,274.99	1,311.9894	\$30,031.05
Sick				48.0000	\$1,165.23
Vacation Payout	21.7200	23.0952	\$501.63	43.4400	\$1,003.26
Missed Break CA Premium					\$0.07
Missed Meal CA Premium					\$0.34
Missed Break CA				1.0000	\$22.42
Missed Meal CA	1.0000	23.0952	\$23.10	3.0000	\$69.30
Vacation				72.0000	\$1,657.47
Quarterly Profit Sharing					\$225.43
Memo Information			\$9.03		\$209.56
401K ER Match			\$9.03		\$209.56
Unpaid Hours				40.0000	
Pre-Tax Deductions			\$18.06		\$419.06
401K %			\$18.06		\$419.06
Taxes			\$333.46		\$8,219.46
Federal W/H			\$136.16		\$3,402.73
Soc Sec/FICA EE			\$111.98		\$2,598.09
Medicare EE			\$26.19		\$607.62
CA W/H			\$37.46		\$1,108.17
CA DT EE			\$21.67		\$502.85
	Routing #	Account #	Amount		Amount
Net Pay			\$1,454.54		\$33,266.06
Check			\$1,454.54		

Accruals & Balances

Vacation Balance: 18.64 Hours
Sick Balance: 0.00 Hours
Floating Holiday Balance: 0.00 Hours