

July 25, 2025

VIA ON-LINE SUBMISSION ONLY TO:

<https://dir.tfaforms.net/128> (copy by certified mail to all Defendants)

Private Attorneys General Act
Attn. PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

ROLLING FRITO-LAY SALES LP
7701 Legacy Drive
Plano, TX 75024
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 8111 0549 5807 253410

AMANDA GARCIA
Designated Agent for Service for: ROLLING FRITO-LAY SALES LP
FRITO-LAY, 7701 Legacy Drive
Plano, TX 75024
Certified Mail Tracking Number: 9414 811105495807 2544 00

LWDA No.:

**Re: Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* Penalties – PAGA Notice Letter to the LWDA
*Stacy Martin v. Rolling Frito-Law Sales LP, et al.***

Gentlepersons:

This office represents Plaintiff Stacy Martin (“Plaintiff”) and other similarly aggrieved employees employed as non-exempt, hourly employees (collectively “the Aggrieved Employees”) for, *inter alia*, violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 221, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2698, and 2699, *et seq.*; provisions of the Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) Wage Order(s); and California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

The purpose of this letter is to comply with the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2698 *et. seq.* (“the Act”). Plaintiffs wish to bring a representative action, pursuant to the Act, on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, against ROLLING FRITO-LAY SALES, LP, a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive (all defendants being referred to herein collectively as “Defendants”).

Additionally, this correspondence will serve to satisfy the notice requirements under the Act.



We also set forth herein the facts and theories and the California Labor Code violations which Defendants engaged in with respect to Plaintiffs and all of their Aggrieved Employees in California. The attached Class Action Complaint provides the details of Plaintiffs class-wide claims and claims under the Act, and the applicable California law governing them. It, along with this Notice Letter, addresses in detail numerous violations that subject Defendants to civil and statutory penalties under the Act.

Relevant Facts

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt, hourly employee based out of Defendants' location in California. Aggrieved Employees include all non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants within the state of California from one year prior to the date of this letter and continuing through the present. Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees are collectively referred to herein as "Aggrieved Employees." Aggrieved Employees consistently worked at Defendants' behest and under their control and subject to their policies and practices without being paid all wages due. Plaintiffs are also informed and believes that there are other Aggrieved Employees employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees within the state of California within the statutory time period who suffer or suffered from the same wage and hour violations outlined below.

Defendants had a common policy and/or practice of failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. Aggrieved Employees were either not paid by Defendants for all hours worked or were not paid at the appropriate minimum, regular and overtime rates. failing to incorporate non-discretionary bonuses and/or commissions into the regular rate of pay used to calculate and pay for overtime Plaintiffs also contends that Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing, including by requiring off the clock work, failing to provide meal and rest breaks, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, failing to timely pay wages including final wages, failing to maintain accurate records, and failing to reimburse for necessary business expenses all in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

During the course of Aggrieved Employees' employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform pre-shift and post-shift off the clock work which they were not compensated for despite being subject to Defendants' control. For instance, Defendant would detrimentally round time Class Members worked off the beginning and end of their shifts. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to work during their meal breaks. Finally, on Aggrieved Employees' days off, they were required to attend trainings and meetings which was not compensated. Aggrieved Employees were also required to message supervisors the day of a potential shift to confirm whether they were scheduled or not, but this time was not compensated.

Defendants also failed, at times, to pay Aggrieved Employees , or some of them, all wages due and owing because Defendants failed to incorporate non-discretionary, performance-based



bonuses and/or cash awards into the regular rate of pay. Contrary to the requirements of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders under California law, Defendants did not incorporate these non-discretionary bonuses and/or cash awards paid to the Aggrieved Employees into the regular rate of pay Defendants used to calculate and pay for overtime pay, double time pay, sick pay, PTO pay, and meal and rest break premiums.

Moreover, Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of unlawfully rounding hours worked to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees. Rather than paying Aggrieved Employees for all hours and minutes they actually worked, Defendants followed a uniform policy and practice of rounding all time entries to the nearest quarter-hour or half-hour (i.e. to the nearest 15-minute or 30-minute time increment). Generally, rounding was to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees, and Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and resulted, over time, in the systematic under-compensation of the Aggrieved Employees. Rather than reflecting the actual hours worked by Aggrieved Employees, the time entries were rounded and reduced to reflect the scheduled work time rather than the actual hours worked. These unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created.

By implementing policies, programs, practices, procedures and protocols which resulted in off the clock work, Defendants' willful actions resulted in the systematic underpayment of wages and overtime pay to Aggrieved Employees. For example, the off the clock work addressed above caused Aggrieved Employees to begin receiving overtime pay later than they should have.

As a result of the above-described requirements to work off the clock, Aggrieved Employees were not properly paid all wages earned and all wages owed to them by Defendants, including when working more than eight (8) hours in any given day and/or more than forty (40) hours in any given week. Moreover, the uncompensated time, discussed above, was worked by Aggrieved Employees in excess of 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours a week, further entitling Aggrieved Employees overtime wages which they were consistently denied, all in violation of Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders.

Additionally, Defendants failed to provide all the legally required unpaid, off-duty meal periods and all the legally required paid, off-duty rest periods to Aggrieved Employees, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform work as ordered by Defendants for more than five (5) hours during a shift but were often required to do so without receiving a lawful and timely meal break. In addition to untimely meal periods, Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to respond to work demands. Defendants placed their needs over Aggrieved Employees' lawful meal and rest breaks and this resulted in Aggrieved Employees often having to work through their scheduled meal and/or rest breaks, or otherwise taking shortened ones, because the demands of the job would not avail them the opportunity to take a lawfully uninterrupted and off duty meal and/or rest break. Employees were required to carry and monitor phones at all times meaning that no break was off-duty. To the extent Aggrieved Employees were able to take meal breaks, they were restricted from leaving the premises and were required to carry their cell phones on them and respond to work demands.



On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees worked over 10 hours in a shift, Defendants also failed to provide them with a second, uninterrupted, timely and duty-free meal period. As a result, Defendants' failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with all legally required off-duty, unpaid meal periods and all the legally required off-duty, paid rest periods is and will be evidenced by Defendants' business records, or lack thereof. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay, including their earned commission, for each meal period or rest break that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Therefore, Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five (5) hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes, and shifts in excess of (10) hours without providing them with second meal periods of not less than thirty minutes; nor did Defendants pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective hourly rate of pay, including their earned commission, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided.

Aggrieved Employees were also not authorized and permitted to take lawful rest periods, were systematically required by Defendants to work through or during breaks and were not provided with one (1) hour's wages in lieu thereof. To the extent Aggrieved Employees were able to take rest breaks, they were restricted from leaving the premises and were required to carry their cell phones on them and respond to work demands. Aggrieved Employees were restricted in their ability to take their full ten (10) minutes net rest time or were otherwise not provided with duty-free rest periods. Therefore, Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours; or major fraction thereof, nor did Defendant pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided.

Defendants also consistently failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226(a). the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees, or some of them, failed to incorporate non-discretionary bonuses and/or cash awards into the regular rate of pay used to calculate and pay overtime compensation, double time pay, sick pay, PTO pay, and meal and rest break premiums. Thus, the wage statements do not provide accurate hourly rates for overtime and the statements do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(9). Additionally, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees or some of them, failed to accurately list the amount of total hours worked or the rate at which things were paid and therefore the statements do not comply with Labor Code § 226(a)(2). Specifically, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for unpaid wages and overtime because Defendants had unlawfully rounded time entries to the detriment of the Aggrieved Employees and their actual hours worked were under-reported due to off the clock work. Additionally, the wage statements given to Aggrieved Employees failed to accurately account for premium pay for deficiently provided meal periods and rest breaks.



Additionally, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all wages owed, as detailed above, at the time of their termination or within seventy-two (72) hours of their resignation, as required under Labor Code § 203. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were not provided their final pay until the next scheduled pay date, or later. Plaintiff never received payment of some benefits related to working six-days in a week which she is owed. Aggrieved Employees were not paid all regular and overtime wages because Defendants failed to pay for all hours worked by requiring off the clock work. Defendant failed to include all vacation time vested and owed upon termination. Additionally, Defendants, at times, failed to pay premium wages owed for unprovided meal periods and rest periods. Defendants' failure to pay said wages within the required time was willful within the meaning of Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to, on occasion, report for a scheduled work day to be told whether work was available for them or not, and when there was no work, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees would be sent home. On such days when Defendant required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to report to work only to be sent home because work was not available, they were not paid required reporting time wages for the hours they waited without receiving their regular hourly rate of pay for them.

Defendants also failed to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenses. Defendants have regularly required Plaintiffs to incur business expenses in the course of performing her required job duties for Defendants including for cell phone expenses, supplies and uniform maintenance. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees incurred similar costs. These expenses incurred by Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were necessary and required of them in performing their assigned job duties, but Defendants failed to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all such necessary expenditures, thus entitling them to reimbursement according to proof as required under Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders.

Additionally, pursuant to the Labor Code § 2751, when employees are compensated all or in part by a commission plan, the terms of the commission plan must be provided in writing to the employee. Aggrieved Employees were partially compensated according to a commission plan, but Defendants never provided Aggrieved Employees with the commission plan in writing.

PAGA Claim Details, Legal Bases for Violations and Penalties:

As addressed above and in further detail in the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees complain of the following violations committed by Defendants:

Failure to Pay Minimum Wages

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 1197, entitled "Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage" states, "[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful." The applicable minimum wages fixed by the commission for work during the relevant period is found in the Wage Orders.



In California, employees must be paid at least the then applicable state minimum wage for all hours worked, including under Labor Code § 1197, IWC Wage Order MW-2014, and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), and 4(A)-4(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Paragraph 2(H) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders defines “Hours Worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Additionally, pursuant to Labor Code § 204, other applicable laws and regulations, and public policy, an employer must timely pay its employees for all hours worked. Defendants failed to do so.

California Labor Code § 1197, entitled “Pay of Less Than Minimum Wage” states: “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” The minimum wage provisions of California Labor Code are enforceable by private civil action pursuant to Labor Code § 1194(a) which states: “Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs of suit.”

As described in California Labor Code §§ 1185 and 1194.2, any action for wages incorporates the applicable Wage Order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. Also, California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and those Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders entitle non-exempt employees to an amount equal to or greater than the minimum wage for all hours worked. All hours must be paid at the statutory or agreed rate, or at the minimum rate in the absence of a contractually agreed upon one. The underpayment of wages to Aggrieved Employees is and has been a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful compensation policies and practices, which applied uniformly to the Aggrieved Employees working at locations and work sites throughout California.

During the course of Aggrieved Employees’ employment with Defendants, they were not paid all wages they were owed, including for all work performed resulting in off the clock work. Aggrieved Employees were required to perform pre-shift and post-shift off the clock work which they were not compensated for despite being subject to Defendants’ control. For instance, Defendant would detrimentally round time Class Members worked off the beginning and end of their shifts. Additionally, Aggrieved Employees were required to work during their meal breaks. Finally, on Aggrieved Employees’ days off, they were required to attend trainings and meetings which was not compensated. Aggrieved Employees were also required to correspond with clients while off the clock, message supervisors the day of a potential shift to confirm whether they were scheduled or not, but this time was not compensated.

Moreover, Defendants had a consistent policy and practice of unlawfully rounding hours worked to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees. Rather than paying Aggrieved Employees for all hours and minutes they actually worked, Defendants followed a uniform policy and practice of



rounding all time entries to the nearest quarter-hour or half-hour (i.e. to the nearest 15-minute or 30- minute time increment). Generally, rounding was to the detriment of Aggrieved Employees, and Plaintiff contends this policy is not neutral and resulted, over time, in the systematic under-compensation of the Aggrieved Employees. Rather than reflecting the actual hours worked by Aggrieved Employees, the time entries were rounded and reduced to reflect the scheduled work time rather than the actual hours worked. These unlawfully rounded time entries were inputted into Defendants' payroll system from which wage statements and payroll checks were created.

Defendants, and each of them, have also intentionally and improperly imposed difficult to attain job and shift scheduling requirements on Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in off the clock work and underpayment of all wages owed to Employees over a period of time, while benefiting Defendants. During the relevant time period, Defendants thus regularly failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees, including by requiring systematic off the clock work. Defendants' uniform pattern of unlawful wage and hour practices manifested, without limitation, applicable to the Aggrieved Employees as a whole, as a result of implementing a uniform policy and practice that denied accurate compensation to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees as to minimum wage pay.

In light of the forgoing, the Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties. Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the unpaid minimum wages (including double minimum wages), liquidated damages in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid, interest thereon and reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a). Plaintiffs and the other Aggrieved Employees further request recovery of all unpaid wages, according to proof, interest, statutory costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory and civil penalties against Defendants, in a sum as provided by the California Labor Code and/or other applicable statutes, including pursuant to Labor Code § 558, and Wage Order provisions. To the extent minimum wage compensation is determined to be owed to the Aggrieved Employees who have terminated their employment, Defendants' conduct also violates Labor Code §§ 201 and/or 202, and therefore these individuals are also be entitled to waiting time penalties under California Labor Code § 203, which penalties are sought herein on behalf of these Aggrieved Employees. Defendants' failure to timely pay all wages owed also violated Labor Code § 204 and resulted in violations of Labor Code § 226 because they resulted in the issuance of inaccurate wage statements. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein was willful, intentional and not in good faith. Further, Plaintiffs and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to seek and recover statutory costs.

Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with their vested and owed vacation hours. Defendant had a policy allowing for the accrual of paid time off, however, upon termination, all remaining hours were not paid to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code § 227.3.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1,



1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime in Violation of Labor Code § 510

Defendants violated the law by failing to pay Aggrieved Employees earned wages and overtime and double time. Specifically, Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including hours at their required regular, overtime, and double-time rates, or of miscalculating them by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate of compensation. Defendants, and each of them, have intentionally and improperly caused Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock to avoid paying Aggrieved Employees all earned and owed straight time and overtime wages and other benefits.

Defendants have violated Labor Code § 1194 and Labor Code § 510 (and paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A) and 4(A)-4(B) of the relevant orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission) by failing to pay Employees: (a) time and one-half their regular hourly rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours in a workday or in excess of forty hours in any workweek or for the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek; or (b) twice their regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of twelve hours in any one day or for hours worked in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of work in a workweek. Defendants had a consistent policy of not paying Employees wages for all hours worked, including by requiring off the clock work as addressed above and by under-reporting actual hours worked. With work shifts generally requiring eight hours or more of work on a given day, this unpaid off the clock work resulted in Aggrieved Employees working past eight hours on a shift or more than forty hours in a week, which required that they be paid at the correct overtime rate of 1.5 times their regular rate.

When considered in combination with the other wage violations addressed above, Aggrieved Employees were not properly compensated, nor were they paid overtime and double time rates for hours worked in excess of eight hours or twelve hours in a given day, and/or forty hours in a given week. Defendants did not make available to Employees a reasonable protocol for correcting time records when Employees worked overtime hours or to fix incorrect time entries or those that Defendants unlawfully under-recorded to the Employee's detriment. Defendants have also violated these provisions by requiring Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Aggrieved Employees to work through meal periods when they were required to be clocked out or to otherwise work off the clock to complete their daily job duties.

In light of the forgoing, Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to the California Labor Code, including Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, 1199, and the relevant paragraphs of the IWC Wage Orders, including paragraphs 2(K), 2(S), 3(A), 4, and 20. Defendants are liable to Employees for the full amount of all their unpaid wages and overtime compensation, with interest, plus their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, and any additional sums as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes and Wage Order provisions.



Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Meal-Period Liability Under Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and Penalties

Defendants have regularly required Aggrieved Employees to work shifts in excess of five hours without providing them with uninterrupted meal periods of not less than thirty minutes as required under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and paragraph 11 of the applicable Wage Orders. Specifically, Aggrieved Employees were forced to incur shortened meal periods, were provided with breaks late and well after the fifth hour of work, could not be relieved to take breaks, or were required to remain on-duty at all times and were unable to take off-duty breaks or were otherwise not provided with the opportunity to take required breaks. To the extent Aggrieved Employees were able to take meal breaks, they were restricted from leaving the premises and were required to carry their cell phones on them and respond to work demands.

On the occasions when Aggrieved Employees were provided with a meal period, it was often untimely or interrupted by having to respond to work demands or remain under Defendant's control, in violation of the Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders. On shifts over ten hours, second meal periods were not provided. Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees "premium pay," i.e. one hour of wages at each Aggrieved Employee's effective regular rate of pay, for each meal period that Defendants failed to provide or deficiently provided, including by miscalculating any premium payments they did make. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 11 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each meal period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions. Defendants also miscalculated the rate at which they paid any meal period or rest period premiums when Defendant did attempt to pay them, resulting in further violations of section 226.7.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2) and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7 and Penalties

Defendants have consistently failed to provide Aggrieved Employees with paid rest breaks of not less than ten minutes for every work period of four or more consecutive hours, as required under Labor Code § 226.7. Specifically, Defendants provided rest periods untimely or for shortened durations, and Defendants' policies and procedures required Aggrieved Employees to remain under Defendants' control during breaks to respond to job requirements. To the extent Aggrieved



Employees were able to take rest breaks, they were restricted from leaving the premises and were required to carry their cell phones on them and respond to work demands.

Defendants also failed to pay Aggrieved Employees premium pay for each day on which requisite rest breaks were not provided or were deficiently provided, or miscalculated any premiums paid. Therefore, pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and paragraphs 12 and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to damages in an amount equal to one hour of wages at their correctly calculated regular rate of compensation for each rest period not provided or deficiently provided, as well as the assessment of any statutory penalties against the Defendants, and each of them, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code, including Labor Code § 558 and other applicable statutes and Wage Order provisions.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs are seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages as available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Issue Accurate and Itemized Wage Statements in Violation of Labor Code § 226

California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to furnish each employee with an accurate, itemized wage statements in writing. These statements must be appended to the detachable part of the check, draft, voucher, or whatever else serves to pay the employee's wages; or, if wages are paid by cash or personal check, these statements may be given to the employee separately from the payment of wages; in either case the employer must give the employee these statements twice a month or each time wages are paid. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 226(a), Aggrieved Employees suffered injuries, including among other things confusion over whether they received all wages owed them, the difficulty and expense involved in reconstructing pay records, and forcing them to make mathematical computations to analyze whether the wages paid in fact compensated them correctly for all hours worked.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in writing, as required by the Labor Code and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Any wage statements given to Employees by Defendants necessarily failed to accurately account for wages, overtime, and premium pay, including by failing to pay for all hours worked, failure to pay for all overtime hours worked or at the correct rate of pay and for providing deficient meal periods and rest breaks, all of which Defendants knew or reasonably should have known were owed to the Employees, as alleged above.

In light of these violations, and pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 226(e) and paragraphs 4(b), 7, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000). They are also entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.



Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ..."

Failure to Issue Semimonthly Payments in Violation of Labor Code § 204

In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees wages, overtime, premium pay, etc., and failing to provide them with checks and wage statements, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the meal and rest periods taken by Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and the applicable IWC wage orders.

Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to work hours off the clock for which they were not compensated, including during interrupted or otherwise on-duty meal and rest periods. Defendants also failed to pay all overtime premium wages owed for work conducted on a work shift and a workday, or miscalculated these premiums by not including all forms of remuneration in the regular rate, as addressed above. Therefore, when Aggrieved Employees received wage statements and pay checks, they did not compensate all hours worked on a timely basis, resulting in Defendants' systematic failure to pay all wages owed to Aggrieved Employees twice monthly in accordance with the requirements of Labor Code § 204. Additionally, by not providing wage statements as required under section 204, Defendants systematically violated Labor Code § 204 and § 226.

Given the above described off the clock work and deductions from hours worked perpetrated by Defendants' management, Plaintiffs were not paid at the correct overtime rate for all hours she worked after eight hours into a shift or over forty in a work week and that she was not paid all double time owed either. Defendants' uniformly applied payroll policies and practices thus resulted in further systematic and ongoing violations of the requirements of Labor Code § 204.

In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties, interest, fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201.3, 210, 218.5, 558, and 1194. In failing to pay Aggrieved Employees minimum wages and overtime, by requiring off the clock work, by not providing proper meal and rest periods, failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failing to pay Employees wages upon termination or timely upon resignation, all



discussed above, Defendants failed to timely pay Aggrieved Employees wages on a semimonthly basis as required under Labor Code § 204. Defendants also failed to maintain records showing accurate hours worked daily and the wages paid to Aggrieved Employees, as required by Labor Code § 1174 and paragraph 7 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, entitling Aggrieved Employees to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 203, 204, 2926, 2927, and 2699.5 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Keep Records In Accordance With Labor Code § 1174

Labor Code § 1174 requires employers to keep records showing payroll data and the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to employees. By failing to pay Aggrieved Employees proper wages, overtime, double time, premium pay, etc., and by not recording meal period start and end times, all discussed herein, Defendants failed to maintain proper employment records in accordance with Section 1174. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1174.5 and 2699, *et seq.* Defendants have also failed to comply with paragraph 7 of the applicable California IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods, wages earned pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, and total daily hours worked by itemizing in wage statements all deductions from payment of wages and accurately reporting total hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees, and they are entitled to recover penalties pursuant to paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs asserts PAGA claims for failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 1198, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Waiting Time Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 203

Some Aggrieved Employees no longer work for Defendants; they either resigned or were terminated from Defendants' employ. Based on the forgoing, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay all wages earned by and owed to Aggrieved Employees at the time of their termination of within seventy-two hours of their resignation, as required by California under Labor Code § 203. In light of the forgoing, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees seek to recover wages and penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and further specifically seek penalties



and wages under Labor Code § 203, which provides that an employee's wages shall continue until paid for up to thirty (30) days from the date they were due.

Under the PAGA, and following exhaustion of the notice period, Plaintiffs assert PAGA claims for failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), 2699.5, and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Failure to Reimburse for Necessary Business Expenditures in Violation of Labor Code § 2802

Defendants have regularly required Plaintiffs to incur business expenses in the course of performing her required job duties for Defendants including for cell phone expenses, supplies and uniform maintenance. Upon information and belief, Aggrieved Employees incurred similar costs. These expenses incurred by Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees were necessary and required of them in performing their assigned job duties, but Defendants failed to reimburse Aggrieved Employees for all such necessary expenditures, thus entitling them to reimbursement according to proof as required under Labor Code § 2802 and the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders.

Defendants systematically and uniformly failed to reimburse those lawful and necessary work related expenses or losses incurred in direct discharge of their job duties during employment with Defendants and at the direction of the Defendants pursuant to Labor Code § 2802(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, paragraph 9. Defendants are liable for PAGA penalties resulting from their failure to reimburse necessary business expenses incurred by the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover, and hereby seek through this Representative Action, all civil and statutory penalties authorized for violations of California Labor Code §§ 1198 and 2802, and Section 9(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Plaintiffs seek all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2), and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

Unfair Competition Under Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

Consequently, Defendants' conduct has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees and the general public in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

Plaintiffs' PAGA Claim under Labor Code § 2698 et seq. and Recovery Bases:

After complying with the notice procedures of Labor Code § 2699.3 and the running of the notice period after the filing of the attached Class Action Complaint, Plaintiffs will file an amended Complaint asserting, as a representative action on behalf of the California Attorney General and the other similarly Aggrieved Employees, a PAGA claim for violations of the above addressed underlying claims and seeking penalties as specified by the applicable corresponding provisions.



Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees seek penalties under Labor Code §§ 2698 and 2699 for Defendants' violation of Labor Code provisions included under Labor Code § 2699.5, including the penalty provisions, without limitation, based, *inter alia*, on the following California Labor Code sections: §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226(b), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 551, 552, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1185, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2698, 2699, *et seq.* and 2802, including as follows:

(a) Wage Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees all earned regular pay and minimum wages for regular hours worked and for failure to pay overtime premium wages for overtime hours worked under Labor Code §§ 510, 1194(a), 1197, and 1198, and paragraphs 2(K), 3(A), 4(A), 4(B) and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 510, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699(f)(2), and 2699.5, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(b) Meal and Rest Period Claims: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees off-duty, timely, and unpaid meal periods and failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take off-duty, timely, and paid rest periods, or pay one hour of regular pay in lieu thereof, under Labor Code §§ 512, 1198, and 226.7, and Sections 11, 12(A), and 12(B) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties available and applicable, including under paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and wages under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, including sections 558(a)(1)-(3), 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(c) Inaccurate Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Records: For failure to provide Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees with wage statements or with accurate, itemized wage statements and failure to maintain employment records for Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees under Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, and 1198.5, and Sections 7(A), 7(B), and 7(C) of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s) seeking all civil and statutory penalties and wages available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 226(e), 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1). More specifically, by providing inaccurate wage statements and failing to maintain records as required under Labor Code § 226(a), Defendants committed ongoing violations giving rise to civil penalties under Labor Code § 226.3, which in addition to other penalties provided by law, subjects Defendants to "a penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, ...";

(d) Failure to Timely Pay Wages: For failure to timely pay all wages owed, including at least semi-monthly and upon separation or termination, under Labor Code §§ 201, 201, 203, 204, 1197.5, 2926, and 2927 seeking all civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 210, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199 and 2699(f)(2), and paragraph 20 of the



applicable IWC Wage Orders, and also for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(e) Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses: For Defendants' failure to reimburse the necessary work related expenses incurred under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802, and Sections 2(K), 4, 9, and 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Order(s), seeking civil penalties available and applicable under Labor Code §§ 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, 2699.5, and 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 9 and 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, and also attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1);

(f) All Alleged Violations of the IWC Wage Orders: For any above addressed violation of the applicable provisions of the IWC Wage Orders constituting violations of Labor Code § 1198 and Labor Code § 2699.5, and seeking penalties available and applicable under Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) and paragraph 20 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and for attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).


We have been constrained to initially move forward with the filing of this Complaint, alleging the causes of action discussed herein, without the PAGA claim. Thus, any action by the LWDA would not resolve the entirety of the case, and the interest of judicial economy will be served by allowing the case to proceed as a cohesive whole.

This letter and the attached Complaint therefore provide the requisite notice under the Act to the LWDA and Defendants by setting forth the specific provisions of the Labor Code and related provisions Plaintiffs allege have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Rolling Frito-Lay Sales LP, a Delaware corporation; and any other named Defendants and joint employers. To prevent the violations described in the Complaint and herein from occurring, and to remedy past violations, Plaintiffs respectfully requests that the LWDA conduct an investigation into Defendants' employment practices in accordance with the Act.

Wherefore we request that you advise us, by certified mail within sixty days of the postmark on this letter, whether you intend to proceed with these claims or whether Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees should include them in an amended Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* claim under the Act in an amended Complaint.

Regards,

D.LAW, INC.



Natalie Haritonian

Cc: Rolling Frito-Lay Sales LP; by Certified Mail