**OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION**
**5743 Corsa Ave, Suite 123**
**Westlake Village, CA 91362**
**Tel.: 818-293-5623**
**Fax: 888-850-1310**

<u>September 9, 2025</u>

**<u>VIA ELECTRONIC FILING</u>**
Labor & Workforce Development Agency

**<u>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL</u>**
John Stewart Company
1388 Sutter Street, 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94109
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 6792

**<u>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL</u>**
Agent for Service of Process
Noah G Schwartz
1388 Sutter Street, 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94109
Agent certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 6792

**<u>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL</u>**
The John Stewart Company
1388 Sutter Street, 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94109
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 6792

**<u>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL</u>**
John Stewart Company
1919 Fruitdale Ave
San Jose, CA 95128
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 6815

**<u>VIA CERTIFIED MAIL</u>**
The Grove Apartments
1919 Fruitdale Ave
San Jose, CA 95128
Defendant certified mail # 7022 1670 0001 8569 6815

Re: ***Kyla Simmons v. John Stewart Company, The John Stewart Company, The Grove Apartments – Labor Code Violations of John Stewart Company – Compliance Letter of California Labor Code § 2698 – Private Attorneys General Act***

Dear Sir or Madam:

This office represents Kyla Simmons ("Plaintiff"), a former California employee of John Stewart Company, The John Stewart Company, The Grove Apartments ("Defendants"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Our client works for Defendant in Northern California. Herein we set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to our client and other of its California non-exempt employees.

Plaintiff began working for Defendants on or about December 13, 2023. While working for Defendant as a Property Manager, Plaintiff was earning ($35.00) dollars per hour.

Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were routinely unable, and not authorized to take their 10-minute rest periods and were also unable to take an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break for every shift they worked. Specifically, Plaintiff and other California employees were further forced to keep their work cell phone on during their meal and rest breaks in case of emergencies or to address the needs of Defendants' personnel. Because of this, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were unable to take their required meal and rest breaks. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay premium wages of one hour's pay for each missed meal and rest break to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees who were denied timely meal and rest breaks, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558, and IWC Order No. 5-2001, Section 12.

Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work off the clock for Defendant. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to work on the weekend for Defendant, such as answering phone calls and assisting residents for 2 hours per week, without being compensated for. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were also required to use their personal cell phone for work-related activities while off the clock, such as clocking in/out, receiving and responding to calls and text messages from supervisors, co-workers, vendors, and residents, without being compensated for it. It took Plaintiff on the average of 20-30 minutes to complete these tasks. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were required to be on-call or standby 24/7. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid waiting time or travel time. Defendant did not compensate Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees if these tasks were completed outside of his regular work hours. These excess hours were not recorded on our client's and Defendant's California employees wage statements. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees should have been compensated for that time, but she was not in violation of Labor Code Sections 510, 1194, and 1194.2. As a result, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay wages constitute violations of Labor Code § 510 and 1194.

Plaintiff also claims that Defendant has failed to pay all overtime wages due to non-exempt employees. As a result, employees are not properly compensated for work performance in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and work performed in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek at a rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. Employees of Defendant regularly work in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours per week and do not receive overtime compensation at a rate of one and one half of their regular rate. Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were forced to work overtime and were not paid for all hours worked including all straight time wages, and overtime wages. These failures to pay all overtime wages constitute violations of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1194.2.

Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees accurately itemized wage statements. As Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees with all wages due, as detailed above, their wage statements failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9), as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all overtime wages due. These violations also violate Labor Code §§ 226(e) and 226.3 with respect to Plaintiff and Defendants' California employees.

Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees timely, accurate, itemized wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226 and keep accurate records ad required by §1174(d). The statements provided to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees, and the records maintained by Defendants, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked, overtime, and meal/rest premiums, and total hour worked.

Our client further alleges that Defendants paid her and Defendant's California employees their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. As they were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment as a result of Defendants' failure to pay all premium wages as detailed above, at the time of their separation, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-203.

Defendant pays Plaintiff and it's California employees on a bi-weekly basis and has failed to comply with Labor Code § 204(a) which holds that wages earned on a bi-weekly basis must be paid no later than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period. Due to the violations described above, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees did not receive all of their wages earned in a timely manner as required by Labor Code § 204(a)(b) and 201.3.

Defendant failed to reimburse its California employees for using their personal cell phones for the benefit of Defendant. Defendant further failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees for the mileage they incurred performing certain tasks or running errands on behalf of Defendant. Labor Code section 2802 provides that "[a]n employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties." As such, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees have incurred reasonable and necessary expenses in the course of their job duties, which were not reimbursed by Defendant, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

Defendant violated Labor Code § 246 by failing to provide paid sick leave to the aggrieved employees, failing to comply with the accrual and carryover requirements for paid sick leave, failing to provide an employee with written notice each pay period stating the amount of paid sick leave available each pay period and otherwise wholly failing to participate in the Healthy Workplaces, Healthy Families Act of 2014. (Labor Code § 245, *et seq.*).\

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant failed to comply with Labor Code § 227.3, which states that unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to her as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time, shall apply the principles of equity and fairness, pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3. Defendant violated Labor Code § 227.3 because they failed to pay Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees wages for unused vested vacation time.

Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices herein. As a result of these practices, Plaintiff and Defendant's California employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month. Due to this failure, Defendants are liable under Labor Code § 210 for failure to pay wages as required by law.

We invite Defendants or its attorney(s) to contact our office to discuss this matter, including whether an early resolution of the claims can be reached.

Our office awaits your response.

Very truly yours,

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM

ROMAN OTKUPMAN