West, Danielle@Labor

From: Robert Crowther <bob.crowther@greatclips.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2026 6:27 PM
To: West, Danielle@Labor
Subject: Comments on Modified Proposed PAGA Regulations – OAL Notice File No. Z2026-0121-03

THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM OUTSIDE OF YOUR ORGANIZATION
DO NOT click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and/or trust the SENDER.

To: Danielle.West@labor.ca.gov

Dear Ms. West,

I am submitting these comments on behalf of my business, a California employer operating in the personal services industry, in response to the LWDA's August 3, 2026 modifications to the proposed PAGA regulations. I have personally experienced the cost of a meritless PAGA claim: a former employee terminated for cause filed a PAGA notice that ultimately cost my business $150,000 in settlement and $50,000 in attorneys' fees, despite the underlying termination being fully justified. My comments reflect that experience.

1. Support for enhanced notice specificity. I strongly support the requirement that claimants identify the specific Labor Code sections at issue and flag Cal/OSHA allegations directly, rather than relying on vague, boilerplate language. This change will give employers a fair opportunity to evaluate real exposure early and pursue cure in good faith, rather than guessing at the scope of an ambiguous notice.

2. Support for attorney identification and high-frequency filer oversight. I support requiring claimant's counsel to disclose their name, State Bar number, and contact information, and I support widening the "high-frequency filer" threshold to capture attorneys and firms who file large volumes of notices. I would urge the LWDA to go further and ensure the "non-compliant filer" standard carries real, enforceable consequences — including mandatory additional review of notices from filers with a documented history of deficient filings — rather than a standard that is narrower in practice than the "vexatious filer" language it replaces.

3. Retaliation screening for post-termination claims. I urge the LWDA to add a mechanism requiring that any PAGA notice filed by, or on behalf of, an individual terminated for documented cause within 30 days before the notice is filed be flagged and independently evaluated for retaliatory motive against the employer before the claim is permitted to proceed. Claims filed in the immediate aftermath of a for-cause termination carry a materially higher risk of being retaliatory rather than a good-faith effort to remedy a genuine Labor Code violation, and the current framework has no mechanism to screen for that risk at the notice stage.

4. Fee-shifting for claims resulting in no confirmed violation. I urge the LWDA to adopt a rule requiring that where the cure or investigation process concludes with no Labor Code violation being substantiated, the claimant's attorney — rather than the employer — bear the employer's reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in responding to the notice. Employers currently bear the full cost of defending

against notices regardless of merit, which creates a financial incentive for speculative filings. Shifting that cost when a claim proves meritless would meaningfully deter shakedown litigation while preserving full recourse for employees with legitimate claims.

5. Settlement notice provisions should be narrowed. The proposed requirement that a settling plaintiff notify all other parties with pending PAGA actions against the same employer, coupled with a 21-day comment period, will in practice increase objections from competing plaintiffs' firms, prolong resolution, and drive up defense costs without a corresponding benefit to employees. I urge the agency to narrow this requirement or impose a shorter, fixed comment window to prevent it from becoming a tool for extracting additional fees rather than protecting employee interests.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues further before the regulations are finalized.

Respectfully submitted,

.

Bob Crowther
MB Holding, Inc
Great Clips Franchisee
951-775-4883

DISCLAIMER: This email is being sent on behalf of an independently owned and operated Great Clips ® salon. Great Clips, Inc. is not responsible or liable for the contents of this email.