



COPY

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
PHILLIP SONG (SBN 326572)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

AUG 06 2020

M SALAS

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

YESSICA SALAZAR, individually, and on
behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the
Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA");

Plaintiff,

v.

SOUTH COAST WINERY, INC., a California
corporation; CARTER ESTATE WINERY
AND RESORT, LLC, a California limited
liability company; SPRUCE GROVE, INC., a
California corporation; CARTER
HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC, a Florida
limited liability company; JEFFREY R.
CARTER, an individual; and DOES 1 through
100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: *mcc 2001498*

**COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
§ 2698 et seq. (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

1 Plaintiff YESSICA SALAZAR (“Plaintiff”) hereby submits her Complaint against
2 Defendants SOUTH COAST WINERY, INC.; CARTER ESTATE WINERY AND RESORT,
3 LLC; SPRUCE GROVE, INC.; CARTER HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC; JEFFREY R.
4 CARTER; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive; (collectively, “Defendants”), on behalf of herself
5 and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants for penalties as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This representative action brought pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*
8 (the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”)) for Defendants’ violations of Labor Code
9 §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197,
10 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

11 2. This Complaint challenges Defendants’ systemic illegal employment
12 practices resulting in violations of the stated provisions of the Labor Code against the identified
13 group of employees.

14 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants jointly
15 and severally acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious disregard to the
16 rights of all employees in (1) failing to pay all meal period wages and rest break wages, (2)
17 failing to properly calculate and pay all minimum and overtime wages, (3) failing to provide
18 accurate wage statements, (4) failing to pay all wages due and owing during employment and
19 upon termination of employment, and (5) failing to reimburse all necessary business expenses.

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21 4. This action is brought pursuant to PAGA. The civil penalties sought by
22 Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established
23 according to proof at trial.

24 5. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California
25 Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all
26 causes except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is
27 brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

28 ///

6. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of PAGA and Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

7. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of California law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

8. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the named Defendants transact business and/or have offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county. Moreover, this action is brought on behalf of the State of California as a private attorney general and has jurisdiction in this venue.

PARTIES

9. Plaintiff Yessica Salazar is an individual residing in the State of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory time period.

10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are licensed to do business and are actually doing business in the State of California, and at all times herein mentioned, controlled the wages, hours, and working conditions of the aggrieved employees' employment and directly supervised their work.

11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

/ / /

///

12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and that all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

13. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to PAGA and Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF PAGA

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS BY PLAINTIFF)

14. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 13 as though fully set forth herein.

15. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

16. On May 4, 2020, Plaintiff provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contends were violated, and the theories supporting her contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference is a copy of the written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that on or about July 8, 2020, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiff has exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

1 **17.** Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees and
2 misclassified salaried or exempt managers are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California
3 Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees, regardless of whether
4 they were hired directly or through staffing agencies, of Defendants who worked for Defendants
5 at any time during the period from May 4, 2019 to the present, and one or more of the alleged
6 violations were committed against them.

7 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

8 **18.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their
9 non-exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
10 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
11 mandate of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

12 **19.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and
13 other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay
14 all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

15 **20.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants misclassified Plaintiff and other
16 salaried or exempt managers and failed to compensate them for all hours worked, resulting in a
17 failure to pay all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

18 **21.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and
19 other current and former aggrieved employees for off-the-clock work and failed to properly
20 calculate the regular rate of pay for overtime purposes by failing to factor in non-discretionary
21 bonuses and incentives into the regular rate.

22 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

23 **22.** In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
24 Defendants were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-
25 minute rest break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further
26 required to provide their non-exemt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5)
27 hours worked.

28 ///

1 **23.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other
2 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks and
3 failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

4 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

5 **24.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their
6 employees within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code § 204.

7 **25.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
8 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time
9 period.

10 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

11 **26.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their
12 employees all wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California
13 Labor Code §§ 201 to 204.

14 **27.** As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above,
15 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages
16 pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to
17 Labor Code § 203.

18 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

19 **28.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate*
20 records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 226 and
21 1174.

22 **29.** As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants
23 failed to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former
24 employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate
25 records regarding Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages
26 earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and
27 the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

28 ///

1 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

2 **30.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its
3 employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
4 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§
5 2800 and 2802.

6 **31.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
7 aggrieved current and former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them within
8 the required time period.

9 **Penalties**

10 **32.** Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on
11 behalf of other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from
12 Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant,
13 including but not limited to:

14 **33.** Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of a hundred
15 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two
16 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
17 violation;

18 **34.** Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 in the
19 amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation,
20 and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
21 violation;

22 **35.** Penalties under California Labor Code § 210 in addition to, and entirely
23 independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the
24 amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial
25 violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each
26 subsequent violation;

27 ///

28 ///

EXHIBIT 1

May 4, 2020

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: SOUTH COAST WINERY, INC., CARTER ESTATE WINERY AND RESORT, LLC, SPRUCE GROVE, INC., CARTER HOSPITALITY GROUP, LLC, AND JEFFREY R. CARTER

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Yessica Salazar against South Coast Winery, Inc., Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC, Spruce Grove Inc. and Carter Hospitality Group, LLC (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), Jeffrey R. Carter as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 1-10¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "CARTER").

Ms. Salazar is pursuing her California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Ms. Salazar may seek penalties and wages for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

South Coast Winery, Inc. is a California corporation headquartered at 3719 S. Plaza Drive, Santa Ana, California 92704. Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC is a California limited liability company headquartered at 3719 S. Plaza Drive, Santa Ana, California 92704. Spruce Grove, Inc. is a California corporation headquartered at 3719 S. Plaza Drive, Santa Ana, California 92704. Carter Hospitality Group, LLC is a Florida limited liability company headquartered at 4787 West Irlo Bronson Hwy US 192, Kissimmee, Florida 34745. Jeffrey R. Carter is the Chief Executive Officer of South Coast Winery, Inc. and Spruce Grove, Inc., and Manager of Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC and Carter Hospitality Group, LLC.

¹ Ms. Salazar does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Ms. Salazar will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Ms. Salazar is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Ms. Salazar and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

CARTER employed Ms. Salazar as a salaried exempt Guest Experience Manager within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about September of 2019) in the State of California. CARTER directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Ms. Salazar's employment. CARTER misclassified Ms. Salazar as "exempt" despite Ms. Salazar not performing managerial, *e.g.* hiring, firing, and supervising, duties.

The "aggrieved employees" that Ms. Salazar may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees and salaried or exempt managers of CARTER within the State of California, regardless whether hired directly or through staffing agencies.

CARTER failed to properly pay its non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

CARTER misclassified exempt employees and failed to properly pay them for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to provide complete and accurate wage statements, and failed to provide reimbursement of business expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Ms. Salazar has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at CARTER, regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a staffing agency or labor contractor.

CARTER has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

///

///

///

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. CARTER misclassified Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees and failed to compensate them for all hours worked. Moreover, CARTER failed to compensate non-exempt aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift and during meal breaks. CARTER also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in non-exempt aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, CARTER misclassified Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees and failed to provide them with legally mandated meal and rest breaks. During the relevant time period, CARTER routinely required non-exempt aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with CARTER policies and expectations. Additionally, CARTER failed to authorize and permit non-exempt aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, CARTER failed to compensate Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, CARTER misclassified Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees and failed to pay them all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203. During the relevant time period, CARTER failed to pay non-exempt aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, CARTER failed to pay Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, CARTER did not provide Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from CARTER were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, CARTER failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees.

///

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, CARTER misclassified Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees and did not provide them the minimum wages to which they were entitled. During the relevant time period, CARTER did not provide non-exempt aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Ms. Salazar and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by CARTER, including for the use of their personal cellular phones and vehicles for work purposes.

CARTER violated Labor Code section 226.8, in addition to the above Labor Code sections enumerated above, by willfully misclassifying Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees. Therefore, Ms. Salazar and other exempt aggrieved employees are entitled to penalties in the amount of not less than \$5,000.00 and not more than \$15,000.00 for each violation of Labor Code section 226.8, and a penalty not less than \$10,000.00 and not more than \$25,000.00 for each willful violation under Labor Code section 226.8.

We believe that Ms. Salazar and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees and salaried or exempt managers are entitled to penalties as allowed under California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 226.8, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Ms. Salazar will seek these penalties and wages on her own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees and salaried or exempt managers of CARTER within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION



Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only):

Jeffrey R. Carter
c/o South Coast Winery, Inc. and Spruce Grove, Inc.
3719 S. Plaza Drive
Santa Ana, California 92704
Agent for Service of Process for South Coast Winery, Inc. and Spruce Grove, Inc.

Richard S. Price II
c/o Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC
1235 N. Harbor Blvd., Suite 200
Fullerton, California 92832
Agent for Service of Process for Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC

Registered Agent Services Co.
c/o Carter Hospitality Group, LLC
2975 Bee Ridge Road, Suite C3
Sarasota, Florida 34239
Agent for Service of Process for Carter Hospitality Group, LLC

Jeffrey R. Carter
3719 S. Plaza Drive
Santa Ana, California 92704
Chief Executive Officer of South Coast Winery, Inc. and Spruce Grove, Inc.
Manager of Carter Estate Winery and Resort, LLC and Carter Hospitality Group, LLC

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

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101, Pasadena, CA 91103 and my electronic service address is ting@justicelawcorp.com

On August 26, 2020, I served the foregoing document described as

**COMPLAINT FOR PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.
(PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

for the following case: **Salazar v. South Coast Winery Inc., et al.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM-785449-20**
Court Case No.: MCC2001498
Riverside County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 26, 2020, at Pasadena, California.



YING TING XU