77			•	· ,	· ·
Ĭ			•		ſ
				•	· ,
	1	DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENI			
	1	Department of Industrial Relations			
1	2	State of California By: Johanna Y. Hsu, SBN 164247	• •		• · · ·
	3	605 W. Santa Ana Blvd. Bldg, 28, Room 625	•		-
	4	Santa Ana, California 92701			
	5	(714) 558-4914		· · .	• .
		Attorneys for the State Labor Commissioner	,		
	6	Automicy's for the State Labor Commissioner			1
	7		, .		
	8	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT	OF INDUSTRIAL RE	LATIONS	
	· 9	<b>DIVISION OF LABOR STA</b>	NDARDS ENFORCE	MENT	
	10	STATE LABOR	COMMISSIONER		
	11.				
,	12	In re the DEBARMENT	Case No. SAC 5492		
·	13	proceeding against:	Assigned for All Purpo	ses to the	
•	• 14	SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA	Honorable Edna Garcia	a Earley, Hearing	· .
	15	MOHAMMEDI, an Individual,		·.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
		Descendents	Decision and ORDER		
-	16	Respondents.	of Respondents from Projects	Fublic Works	
•	17		[Labor Code set	ction 1777.1]	, ,
	18				
	19		· .		· ·
	20				
,	21	The attached Proposed Statement of D	ecision of Hearing Office	r Edna Garcia Earley.	
-	22	DEBARRING Respondents SOUTHLAND C		•	
	23	an Individual, from bidding, being awarded or			
	24		Pollonning and none on	paone (, cris projects	
4	5				
•	25				
	26			· · ·	
	27		•.	· · ·	
	28				
		X	1.	·	
		Decision and ORDER of DEBARMENT	······································	Recycled Paper	
		ll · · · ·	· · ·		
1					

Ċ.		
. · . Il		
-		
]	in the State of California for THREE YEARS, is hereby adopted in full by the Division of	· .
2	Labor Standards Enforcement as the FINAL <i>Decision</i> in the above-captioned matter.	
.3		
4	This <i>Decision</i> shall become effective 45 days from the execution of the <i>Order</i> below.	
. 5		-
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	-
7		
. 8	Dated: Aug. 25, 2014 DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT	
9	Dated: Aug. <u>25</u> , 2014 DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT Department of Industrial Relations	۰
10	State of California	
11	By: Aulie for	
12	By: JULIE A. SU	
13	State Labor Commissioner	
14		
. 15		· 、
- 16		•
17.		
.18		. ·
19		
20		
. 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
·26		
. 27		۰.
28	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
• *	2	
	Decision and ORDER of DEBARMENT Recycled Paper	

C		
j* . 4 .		
	1	PROOF OF SERVICE
	2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
	3	I, Tina Provencio declare and state as follows:
	4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California; I am over the age of 18
	5    <sup>y</sup>	ears old and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 300 Oceangate, Suite 850, ong Beach, CA 90802.
~~ <sup>*</sup>	7 . P	On August 25, 2014, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: Decision and ORDER OF DEBARMENT of Respondents from Public Works Projects, on the interested arties to this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as
	8	ollows:
	9   S	.eza MohamediReza Mohamediouthland ConstructionSouthland Construction.O. Box 605923943 Irvine Boulevard #405
		vine, CA 92620 Irvine, CA 92602
•		David Cross, Esq. tate of California
	12    Ľ	0ept. of Industrial Relations/DLSE 031 Howe Avenue, Suite 100
		acramento, CA 95825
l.	14∥ ⊄	(BY MAIL) I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. This
	15	correspondence shall be deposited with the United States Postal Service this same day in the ordinary course of business at our office address in Los Angeles, California. Service
	16	made pursuant to this paragraph, upon motion of a party served, shall be presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date of postage meter date on the envelope is more than
	17	one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in this affidavit.
	18	BY FACSIMILE) I caused the above-referenced document to be transmitted to the interested parties via facsimile transmission to the fax number(s) as stated on the attached service list.
•.	19    20    -	(STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of
	20    <sup>L</sup>	California that the above is true and correct.
	21	Executed this 25 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2014, at Long Beach, California.
	22	
	23	
	24	Line Francisco
	25	Tina Provencio Declarant
	26	
	27    28	Proof of Service
	∠o	1

{	
1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	Department of Industrial Relations Division of Labor Standards Enforcement EDNA GARCIA RARLEY State Der No. 105661
3	EDNA GARCIA EARLEY, State Bar No. 195661 300 Oceangate, Suite 850
4	Long Beach, California 90802 Tel.:(562) 590-5461 Fax: (562) 499-6438 <u>eearley@dir.ca.gov</u>
5	eearley@dir.ca.gov
6	Atterner for the Lehen Commission of
7	Attorney for the Labor Commissioner
8	BEFORE THE DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT
9	
10	DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
11	FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12	
13	In the matter of the ) Case No.: SAC 5492 Debarment Proceeding Against: )
14	) PROPOSED STATEMENT OF
15	) DECISION RE DEBARMENT OF ) RESPONDENTS FROM PUBLIC
16	SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA ) WORKS PROJECTS
17	MOHAMMEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL, ) [Labor Code §1777.1]
18	Respondents.
19	
20	
21	
22	Debarment proceedings pursuant to Labor Code §1777.1 were initiated by the
23	Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, State Labor Commissioner (hereinafter,
24	"DLSE"), by the filing of a Statement of Alleged Violations against the following named
25	Respondents: SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA MOHAMMEDI, AN
26	
27	INDIVIDUAL, (hereinafter, collectively referred to as "Respondents").
28	

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 1

·

Respondents were duly served with the Notice of Hearing and Statement of Alleged Violations on September 10, 2013. Respondent MOHAMMEDI responded to the Notice of Hearing by submitting a letter dated October 13, 2013 to the Assigned Hearing Officer, Edna Garcia Earley, informing her Respondent SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION went out of business two years prior and had quit public works and construction for good.

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

The hearing on the alleged violations was held on November 20, 2013 in Los Angeles, California before Edna Garcia Earley, Hearing Officer for the Labor Commissioner. David Cross appeared on behalf of Complainant, the Labor Commissioner, Chief of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, Department of Industrial Relations, State of California. There were no appearances by Respondents. Present as a witness for Complainant was Deputy Labor Commissioner Elsa Jenabi.

The hearing was tape recorded. The witness took the oath and evidence was received. At the conclusion of the hearing, the matter was taken under submission.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION was at all relevant times mentioned, a contractor licensed by the Contractors State License Board under license number 663784.

2. Respondent REZA MOHAMMEDI was at all relevant times mentioned, listed as Sole Owner of SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION with the Contractors' State License Board.

### Tracks at Brea Improvements, Orange County, CA Project

3. During the period of July 11, 2010 to August 8, 2011, Respondents served as the Prime Contractor on the Tracks at Brea Improvements project, ("Brea Project") in Orange County, California. The City of Brea served as the Awarding Body for this project.

4. Deputy Labor Commissioner Elsa Jenabi, ("Deputy Jenabi") testified she investigated and subsequently issued a Civil Wage and Penalty Assessment ("CWPA") to Respondents for \$25,903.47 in unpaid wages, \$278.64 in training fund contributions, \$11,700.00 in Labor Code §1775 penalties and \$575.00 in Labor Code §1813 penalties for a total amount of \$38,457.28 due and owing. The case was eventually settled and Respondents paid the assessed penalties.

5. Deputy Jenabi testified about the various Labor Code violations committed by Respondents on this project. In particular, Deputy Jenabi's investigation, including her interviews of 5 workers on the project, revealed the certified payroll records did not accurately reflect the hours worked. Hours and rate of pay appeared to be adjusted to match the gross amount of the checks issued to the workers. And, the certified payroll records did not include any of the overtime worked by the workers despite all five workers telling Deputy Jenabi they regularly worked overtime. One such worker, Felix Salazar, provided Deputy Jenabi with his affidavit which states he was paid \$130 per day regardless of the hours worked. Mr. Salazar regularly worked 10.5 hours per day, often worked on Saturdays and sometimes worked on Sundays. On the occasion he was paid more than \$130, he was told to cash the check and pay the amount over \$130 to another worker or use the overage to purchase materials for the project.

6. In addition to underpayment on the job, Deputy Jenabi testified her review of the Inspector Logs for this project revealed Respondents were regularly misclassifying workers at lower paying classifications. Based on the various descriptions of work performed on the project, as noted on the Inspector Logs, Deputy Jenabi concluded workers were misclassified as Laborers when they were actually performing work as Operating Engineers or Teamsters, both higher paying classifications.

7. Additionally, Statements of Compliance on certified payroll records were signed under penalty of perjury by Respondent MOHAMMEDI despite the certified payroll records containing inaccurate hours worked and wrong classifications for the work actually performed.

## Hiltscher Trails Improvements Project, Orange County, CA

Respondents also served as the Prime Contractor on the Hiltscher Trails
Improvements project in Orange County, California ("Hiltscher project") from July 17,
2011 through December 18, 2011.

9. Deputy Jenabi issued a CWPA against Respondents for work performed on this project in the amount of \$78,178.24 in unpaid wages and \$15,400 in penalties under Labor Code §1775 and §1813. DLSE amended the amount on the CWPA to reflect \$67,076.48 in unpaid wages, \$847.12 in training fund contributions and \$12,200 in Labor Code §1775 penalties for a total of \$80,123.60 due and owing based on information

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 4

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

provided by Respondents. Judgment was subsequently entered on the amended assessment on August 22, 2013.

10. Labor Code violations on this project included underpayment of prevailing wages and under-reporting of hours worked on certified payroll records. Deputy Jenabi testified the amount of unpaid wages was calculated by relying on Inspector Daily Reports. Notably, hours listed as worked on the Inspector Daily Reports differed vastly from information contained in the certified payroll records.

11. As in the Brea project, Respondent MOHAMMEDI signed Statements of Compliance under penalty of perjury each time he submitted certified payroll records for this project.

12. Evidence was also submitted showing Respondent MOHAMMEDI pled guilty to numerous counts of violating Labor Code §1778 (wage theft)<sup>1</sup>, in connection with the CWPA issued against Respondents on this project.

13. Lastly, evidence produced showed Respondents have worked on public works projects for a number of years and have had various CWPAs issued against them by

DLSE.

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

27

<sup>1</sup> Labor Code § 1778 provides: "Every person, who individually or as a representative of 26 an awarding or public body or officer, or as a contractor or subcontractor doing public work, or agent or officer thereof, who takes, receives, or conspires with another to take or receive, for his own use or the use of any other person any portion of the wages of any 28 workman or working subcontractor, in connection with services rendered upon any public work is guilty of a felony."

#### LEGAL ANALYSIS

1. DLSE seeks to debar Respondents SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION and REZA MOHAMMEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL for a period of three (3) years based on its position Respondents "willfully" violated the public works laws with "intent to defraud" on both projects.

Labor Code §1777.1 provides:

(a)

(b)

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

Whenever a contractor or subcontractor performing a public works project pursuant to this chapter is found by the Labor Commissioner to be in violation of this chapter **with intent to defraud**, except Section 1777.5, the contractor or subcontractor or a firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which the contractor or subcontractor has any interest is ineligible for a period of not less than one year or more than three years to do either of the following:

(1) Bid on or be awarded a contract for a public works project.

(2) Perform work as a subcontractor on a public works project.

Whenever a contractor or subcontractor performing a public works project pursuant to this chapter is found by the Labor Commissioner to have committed two or more separate **willful violations** of this chapter, except Section 1777.5, within a three-year period, the contractor or subcontractor or a firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which the contractor or subcontractor has any interest is ineligible for a period up to three years to do either of the following:

(1) Bid on or be awarded a contract for a public works project.

(2) Perform work as a subcontractor on a public works project.

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 6

Whenever a contractor or subcontractor performing a public works project has failed to provide a timely response to a request by the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, the Division of Apprenticeship Standards, or the awarding body to produce certified payroll records pursuant to Section 1776, the Labor Commissioner shall notify the contractor or subcontractor that, in addition to any other penalties provided by law, the contractor or subcontractor will be subject to debarment under this section if the certified payroll records are not produced within 30 days after receipt of the written notice. If the commissioner finds that the contractor or subcontractor has failed to comply with Section 1776 by that deadline, unless the commissioner finds that the failure to comply was due to circumstances outside the contractor's or subcontractor's control, the contractor or subcontractor or a firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which the contractor or subcontractor has any interest is ineligible for a period of not less than one year and not more than three years to do either of the following:

(1) Bid on or be awarded a contract for public works project.

Perform work as a subcontractor on a public works project.

## Intent to Defraud – Labor Code §1777.1(a)

(2)

(c)

California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 16800 defines "Intent to Defraud" as "the intent to deceive another person or entity, as defined in this article, and to induce such other person or entity, in reliance upon such deception, to assume, create, transfer, alter or terminate a right, obligation or power with reference to property of any kind." An intent to deceive or defraud can be inferred from the facts. *People v. Kiperman* 

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 7

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

. 7

8

9

10

(1977) 69 Cal.App.Supp.25. An unlawful intent can be inferred from the doing of an unlawful act. *People v. McLaughlin, supra*.

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

The uncontested evidence established Respondents intended to defraud workers and the DLSE on both projects. On the Brea project, Respondents intentionally misclassified workers and failed to pay for all hours worked, including overtime hours. Respondents also paid wages to workers and then made them pay a portion of their pay to other workers on the job or made them purchase building materials for the project. In an attempt to cover up these Labor Code violations, Respondents falsified certified payroll records by making it seem like they were properly paying their workers. Respondents intentionally adjusted hours and rates of pay reported on certified payroll records to match the gross amount of the checks issued to the workers knowing this information was false.

Likewise, on the Hiltscher project, Respondents continued to violate prevailing wage laws by failing to pay for all hours worked. Deputy Jenabi testified she relied on Inspector Daily Reports to calculate the amount of underpayment as the certified payroll records submitted by Respondents appeared to be falsified.

Respondents' "intent to deceive and defraud" the DLSE, the awarding body and workers by knowingly underpaying workers and then submitting false certified payroll records, under penalty of perjury, on both projects, is a basis for debarment under Labor Code §1777.1(a).

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 8

"Willful" Violation of the Public Works Laws - Labor Code §1777.1(b) and (d)

Under Labor Code §1777.1(d), "a willful violation occurs when the contractor or subcontractor knew or reasonably should have known of his or her obligations under the public works law and deliberately fails or refuses to comply with its provisions." Moreover, a person's knowledge of the law is imputed to him and an unlawful intent may be inferred from the doing of an unlawful act. *People v. McLaughlin* (1952) 111 Cal.App.2d 781. 245 P.2d 1076.

The uncontested evidence presented by the Division established Respondents "willfully" violated the public works laws by failing to pay proper prevailing wages, failing to pay overtime, misclassifying workers and submitting false certified payroll records to the DLSE. Respondents are experienced public works contractors who repeatedly violate the prevailing wage laws of this state with complete disregard for the welfare of workers on their projects.

Significantly, Respondent MOHAMMEDI pled guilty to numerous counts of violating Labor Code §1778 in connection with this particular public works project. Consequently, he has been sentenced to 2 years in State Prison.

Accordingly, debarment is also proper under these facts and under Labor Code §1777.1(b).

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, we find Respondents violated the public works laws with an "intent to defraud" and "willfully" by not paying prevailing wages and overtime, under-reporting hours and workers, misclassifying workers and

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 9

1

.2

3

4

5

submitting false certified payroll records on a continuous basis on the Tracks at Brea Improvements project and the Hiltscher Trails Improvements Job, both in Orange County, California. "Although debarment can have a severe economic impact on contractors, it 'is not intended as punishment. It is instead, a necessary means to enable the contracting governmental agency to deal with irresponsible bidders and contractors, and to administer its duties with efficiency." *Southern California Underground Contractors, Inc. v. City of San Diego* (2003) 108 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 533, 542. Accordingly, we debar Respondents for a period of <u>three (3)</u> years, as requested by the Division.

# ORDER OF DEBARMENT

In accordance with the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that Respondents SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA MOHAMMEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL, shall be ineligible to, and shall not bid on or be awarded a contract for a public works project, and shall not perform work as a subcontractor on a public work as defined by Labor Code §§1720, 1720.2 and 1720.3, for a period of three (3) years, effective immediately upon issuance of this decision by the Labor Commissioner.

A three year period is appropriate under these circumstances where Respondents SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA MOHAMMEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL "willfully" violated the public works laws by misclassifying workers, under-reporting hours, and submitting false certified payroll records with an "intent to defraud."

This debarment shall also apply to any other contractor or subcontractor in which Respondents SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTION; REZA MOHAMMEDI, AN INDIVIDUAL have any interest or for which respondents act as a responsible managing

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT - 10

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

employee, responsible managing officer, general partner, manager, supervisor, owner, partner, officer, employee, agent, consultant, or representative. "Any interest" includes, but is not limited to, all instances where respondents receive payments, whether in cash or in another form of compensation, from the entity bidding or performing works on the public works project, or enters into any contract or agreement with the entity bidding or performing work on the public works project for services performed or to be assigned or sublet, or for vehicles, tools, equipment or supplies that have been or will be sold, rented or leased during the period of debarment.

[Proposed] DECISION RE DEBARMENT

- 11

Dated: August 13, 2014

Ż

TATIC

Hearing Officer

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
3	I, Tina Provencio declare and state as follows:
4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California; I am over the age of 18
5	years old and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 300 Oceangate, Suite 850, Long Beach, CA 90802.
6	On August 25, 2014, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: Proposed Statement of Decision Re Debarment of Respondents from Public Works Projects, on the interested parties to this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes
Ì	addressed as follows:
8	Reza Mohamedi
9	Southland ConstructionSouthland ConstructionP.O. Box 605923943 Irvine Boulevard #405Irvine, CA 92620Irvine, CA 92602
1	David Cross, Esq.
2	State of California Dept. of Industrial Relations/DLSE
3	2031 Howe Avenue, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95825
4	(BY MAIL) I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and processing
5	of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. This correspondence shall be deposited with the United States Postal Service this same day in the ordinary course of business at our office address in Los Angeles, California. Service
.6 .7	made pursuant to this paragraph, upon motion of a party served, shall be presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date of postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in this affidavit.
8	(BY FACSIMILE) I caused the above-referenced document to be transmitted to the interested parties via facsimile transmission to the fax number(s) as stated on the attached service list.
9	(STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of
0	California that the above is true and correct.
1	Executed this 25 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2014, at Long Beach, California.
2	
3	
4	Jim Thomas
5	Tina Provencio Declarant
6	
27	
	Proof of Service