

1 **BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP**

Christine T. LeVu (State Bar #288271)

2 christine@bamlawca.com

Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)

3 Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)

Nicholas J. De Blouw (State Bar #280922)

4 deblouw@bamlawca.com

Ricardo R. Ehmann (State Bar #320117)

5 rico@bamlawca.com

2255 Calle Clara

6 La Jolla, CA 92037

Telephone: (858)551-1223

7 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

Website: www.bamlawca.com

8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9 [Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 BRAEDEN PALMER, on behalf of the State
13 of California, as a private attorney general,

14
15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 WELLS FARGO BANK, NATIONAL
18 ASSOCIATION, a Corporation; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

19
20 Defendants.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 26TRCV02869

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Civil Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code
§ 2699 for violations of Labor Code
§§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 246,
226.7, 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).

Electronically FILED by
Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles
8/07/2026 11:25 AM
David W. Slayton,
Executive Officer/Clerk of Court,
By C. Nava, Deputy Clerk

1 Plaintiff Braeden Palmer ("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 defendant Wells Fargo Bank, National
8 Association (referred to as "DEFENDANT") seeking only to recover PAGA civil penalties on
9 behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees that worked for DEFENDANT.
10 PLAINTIFF does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
11 California Labor Code § 2699. To the extent that statutory violations are mentioned for wage
12 violations, PLAINTIFF does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those
13 violations, but simply the civil penalties permitted by California Labor Code § 2699.

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

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

21 4. PLAINTIFF is not suing in his individual capacity; he is proceeding
22 herein solely under the PAGA, on behalf of the State of California for all aggrieved employees.
23 Nothing in this complaint should be construed as PLAINTIFF suing in his individual capacity.

24 THE PARTIES

25 5. Wells Fargo Bank, National Association ("DEFENDANT") is a corporation that
26 at all relevant times mentioned herein conducted and continues to conduct substantial business
27 in California.
28

1 6. DEFENDANT is a financial services firm that has several locations in California.

2 7. PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANT in California from August of 2015
3 to November of 2025. PLAINTIFF was at all times classified by DEFENDANT as a
4 non-exempt employee, paid on an hourly basis, and entitled to the legally required meal and rest
5 periods and payment of minimum and overtime wages due for all time worked.

6 8. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who satisfy
7 the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private Attorney General
8 Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California with respect to all
9 individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in California, including any
10 employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees
11 (“AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES”) during the time period of March 19, 2025 until a date as
12 determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

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

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

1 50, inclusive, are responsible in some manner for one or more of the events and happenings
2 that proximately caused the injuries and damages hereinafter alleged.

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

11 THE CONDUCT

12
13 12. Pursuant to the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, DEFENDANT
14 was required to pay PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all their time
15 worked, meaning the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an
16 employer, including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work.
17 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES to work without
18 paying them for all the time they are under DEFENDANT's control. Among other things,
19 DEFENDANT requires PLAINTIFF to work while clocked out during what is supposed to
20 be PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal break. PLAINTIFF was from time to time interrupted by
21 work assignments while clocked out for what should have been PLAINTIFF's off-duty meal
22 break. DEFENDANT, as a matter of established company policy and procedure,
23 administers a uniform practice of rounding the actual time worked and recorded by
24 PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, always to the benefit of DEFENDANT,
25 so that during the course of their employment, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
26 EMPLOYEES are paid less than they would have been paid had they been paid for actual
27 recorded time rather than "rounded" time. As a result, PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
28 EMPLOYEES forfeit minimum wage, overtime wage compensation, and off-duty meal

1 breaks by working without their time being correctly recorded and without compensation at
2 the applicable rates. DEFENDANT's policy and practice not to pay PLAINTIFF and the
3 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for all time worked, is evidenced by DEFENDANT's business
4 records.

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

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

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

1 a meal break. Further, DEFENDANT from time to time failed to provide PLAINTIFF and
2 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with a second off-duty meal period for some workdays in
3 which these employees were required by DEFENDANT to work ten (10) hours of work.
4 DEFENDANT also engaged in the practice of rounding the meal period times to avoid
5 paying penalties to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. PLAINTIFF and the
6 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES therefore forfeit meal breaks without additional compensation
7 and in accordance with DEFENDANT's corporate policy and practice.

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

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

16 18. From time to time, DEFENDANT also failed to provide PLAINTIFF and the
17 AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with complete and accurate wage statements which failed to
18 show, among other things, the correct gross and net wages earned. Cal. Lab. Code § 226
19 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees with an accurate
20 itemized wage statement in writing showing, among other things, gross wages earned and all
21 applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding amount of time
22 worked at each hourly rate. PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were paid on
23 an hourly basis. As such, the wage statements should reflect all applicable hourly rates
24 during the pay period and the total hours worked, and the applicable pay period in which the
25 wages were earned pursuant to California Labor Code Section 226(a). The wage statements
26 DEFENDANT provided to PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES failed to
27 identify such information. More specifically, the wage statements failed to identify the
28 accurate total hours worked each pay period. When the hours shown on the wage statements

1 were added up, they did not equal the actual total hours worked during the pay period in
2 violation of Cal. Lab. Code 226(a)(2). Aside, from the violations listed above in this
3 paragraph, DEFENDANT failed to issue to PLAINTIFF an itemized wage statement that
4 lists all the requirements under California Labor Code 226. As a result, DEFENDANT from
5 time to time provided PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES with wage
6 statements which violated Cal. Lab. Code § 226.

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

11 in [I]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided
12 this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in
13 Sections. . . 204. . . shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial
14 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.

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

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

26 22. Cal. Lab. Code Section 246(1)(2) requires that paid sick time for nonexempt
27
28

1 employees be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime
2 premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90
3 days of employment.

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

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

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

26 26. In the course of their employment PLAINTIFF and the AGGRIEVED
27 EMPLOYEES as a business expense, were required by DEFENDANT to use their own
28 personal cellular phones as a result of and in furtherance of their job duties as employees for

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

9 27. The employment of PLAINTIFF and some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES has
10 terminated and DEFENDANT has not tendered payment of all wages owed as required by
11 law.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

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

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

20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

22 **[Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698]**

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

24 30. PLAINTIFF realleges and incorporates by this reference, as though fully set
25 forth herein, the prior paragraphs of this Complaint.

26 31. PAGA is a mechanism by which the State of California itself can enforce state
27 labor laws through the employee suing under the PAGA who do so as the proxy or agent of
28

1 the state's labor law enforcement agencies. An action to recover civil penalties under
2 PAGA is fundamentally a law enforcement action designed to protect the public and not to
3 benefit private parties. The purpose of the PAGA is not to recover damages or restitution,
4 but to create a means of "deputizing" citizens as private attorneys general to enforce the
5 Labor Code. In enacting PAGA, the California Legislature specified that "it was ... in the
6 public interest to allow aggrieved employees, acting as private attorneys general to recover
7 civil penalties for Labor Code violations ..." Stats. 2003, ch. 906, § 1. Accordingly, PAGA
8 claims cannot be subject to arbitration.

9 32. PLAINTIFF, and such persons that may be added from time to time who
10 satisfy the requirements and exhaust the administrative procedures under the Private
11 Attorney General Act, brings this Representative Action on behalf of the State of California
12 with respect to all individuals who are or previously were employed by DEFENDANT in
13 California, including any employees staffed with DEFENDANT by a third party, and
14 classified as non-exempt employees ("AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") during the time
15 period of March 19, 2025 until a date as determined by the Court (the "PAGA PERIOD").

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

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

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

9
10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

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

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

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

19 Dated: August 7, 2026 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP
20

21 By: /s/ Nicholas J. De Blouw
22 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
23 Nicholas J. De Blouw

24 **CENTURION TRIAL ATTORNEYS, APC**
25 Ryan Stygar (State Bar #332764)
26 8880 Rio San Diego Dr., Suite 800
27 San Diego, CA 92108

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

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

EXHIBIT 1

BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK DE BLOUW LLP

**2255 CALLE CLARA
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92037**

Web Site: www.bamlawca.com

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

Phone: (858) 551-1223

Fax: (858) 551-1232

**WRITERS E-MAIL:
nick@bamlawca.com**

**WRITERS EXT:
1004**

**March 19, 2026
CA3850**

VIA ONLINE FILING TO LWDA AND CERTIFIED MAIL TO DEFENDANT

**Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Online Filing**

**Wells Fargo Bank, National Association
Certified Mail #9589071052703709152978
CSC - LAWYERS INCORPORATING
SERVICE
BECKY DEGEORGE
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE, Suite
150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833**

Re: Notice Of Violations Of California Labor Code Sections §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226(a), 246, 226.7, 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 Braeden Palmer (“Plaintiff”) and all other Aggrieved Employees of Wells Fargo Bank, National Association (“Defendant”). “Aggrieved Employees” refers to all individuals who are or previously were employed by Defendant in California, including any employees staffed with Defendant by a third party, and classified as non-exempt employees during the time period of March 19, 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 August of 2015 to November of 2025. Plaintiff was 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 at all times. 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.

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

Specifically, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a non-exempt relationship banker from August of 2015 to November of 2025 working at Defendant's location at 21323 Hawthorne Blvd. Torrance, CA 90503. Plaintiff performed his job duties that consisted of seeing customers who came into Defendant's location for set appointments or as walk ins, managing business accounts for clients, providing support for branch operations, and consulting with clients over the phone. Due to the laborious nature of Plaintiff's job duties, Plaintiff was subjected to California Labor Code violations during his employment with Defendant.

First, Plaintiff was periodically unable to take rest breaks and took some 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. On top of the set appointments Plaintiff had throughout the day, he also met with several walk-ins who met with Plaintiff for a variety of needs, such as, opening an account, applying for a credit card, sending a wire transfer, to name a few. These meetings, along with Plaintiff's other daily operational tasks at Defendant's location, forced Plaintiff from time to time to either take his rest and meal breaks late, miss them all together, or caused these breaks to be interrupted during the PAGA period. Though Defendant compensated Plaintiff for some of the missed meal and rest breaks, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff for all his meal and rest break violations during the PAGA Period.

Further, Defendant failed to include all non-discretionary incentive wages into Plaintiff's regular rate for purposes of calculating Plaintiff's correct overtime, meal and rest break premium pay, and sick pay during certain pay periods. Plaintiff's pay stubs show how Defendant paid Plaintiff non-discretionary incentive wages, including but not limited to, "Nonroutine Event" "Recognition Imputed" "Incentive Formulaic" and "Inc Award Flat Sum" during the PAGA Period and during pay periods where Plaintiff also worked overtime and/or was paid sick pay/PTO wages. However, Defendant failed to calculate these wages into Plaintiff's regular rate and 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.

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to provide accurate wage statements to him, 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 which the pay stubs did not.

Further, there were some instances Plaintiff would have to continue with his job duties while clocked out for a meal break. Some customers would arrive late for their

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

appointment. Instead of rescheduling or telling them to wait, Plaintiff would hold the appointment while clocked out for his meal break. Further, from time to time Plaintiff would also start work prior to clocking in to prepare the branch for opening and start his other job duties. However, Plaintiff was not compensated for 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, 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, 210, 226(a), 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.

Plaintiff was also not reimbursed for business related expenses that he 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 co-workers during the work day. Yet, Plaintiff was not reimbursed for the expenses incurred.

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.