

Melissa Grant (SBN 205633)
Melissa.Grant@CapstoneLawyers.com
Robert J. Drexler, Jr. (SBN 119119)
Robert.Drexler@CapstoneLawyers.com
John Stobart (SBN 248741)
John.Stobart@CapstoneLawyers.com
Jonathan Lee (SBN 267146)
Jonathan.Lee@CapstoneLawyers.com
Capstone Law APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1860
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-4811
Facsimile: (310) 943-0396

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Randy Meirose and Antonio Arzate

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

TRADER JOE'S WAGE AND HOUR CASES

Case No.: JCCP 5196

Coordination Proceeding Special Title
(Cal. R. Ct. 3.550)

Assigned to the Hon. Mark A. McCannon; Dept. 2

Included Actions:

**DECLARATION OF RAUL PEREZ IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Bartlett, et al. v. Trader Joe's Company,
San Francisco County Superior Court,
Case No. CGC-20-588293

Date: March 12, 2026
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Courtroom K

Bartlett, et al. v. Trader Joe's Company,
San Francisco County Superior Court,
Case No. CGC-21-589761

FAC Filed: June 25, 2021

Silicani, et al. v. Trader Joe's Company,
San Mateo County Superior Court,
Case No. 20CIV00668

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

2.

3
4
5
6
7

8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
0
1
2
3
4
5

6
7
8

Joe's employees, alleging multiple wage-and-hour violations of the California Labor Code, including minimum wage, overtime, meal and rest periods, wage statements, paid sick leave, reimbursement of work-related expenses, and derivative violations of Labor Code sections 201 and 204. On February 16, 2021, the same plaintiffs filed *Bartlett et al. v. Trader Joe's Company*, No. CGC-21-589761 ("*Bartlett II*") as a representative PAGA action based on the same alleged Labor Code violations.

5. *Silicani, Bartlett I, and Bartlett II* were ultimately coordinated and consolidated. On October 29, 2024, Plaintiffs moved for class certification, which the Court granted in part and denied in part on June 13, 2025.

6. On September 5, 2025, the parties participated in an all-day mediation presided over by Jeffrey Fuchsman, Esq., a respected mediator of wage and hour representative and class actions. Following the mediation, each side, represented by its respective counsel, was able to agree to settle the Action based upon a mediator's proposal which was memorialized in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding, and which is now memorialized in complete and final form in the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement. It is my opinion that the Settlement constitutes a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the claims at issue. This opinion is informed by my experience litigating and settling wage and hour actions, and my firm's thorough investigation into the factual and legal issues implicated by Plaintiffs' claims and Defendant's defenses.

CAPSTONE LAW APC FIRM PROFILE

7. Since its founding in 2012, Capstone has emerged as a major force in aggregate litigation, making law on cutting-edge issues.

8. In February, 2015, Ryan H. Wu and I were honored with the *California Lawyer* Attorney of the Year (CLAY) award in labor and employment for our work in the landmark case *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014), which preserved the right of California workers to bring representative actions under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") notwithstanding a representative action waiver in an arbitration agreement.

9. Recognized as a leading firm in the prosecution of PAGA enforcement actions, Capstone is responsible for some of the most important decisions in this area. In *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshalls of Calif.)*, 3 Cal.5th 531 (2017), Capstone attorneys achieved a watershed decision

1 before the California Supreme Court as to the broad scope of discovery in PAGA actions. In *Baumann v.*
2 *Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), a case of first impression, Capstone successfully
3 argued that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the Class Action Fairness Act.

4 10. Capstone has made important contributions to consumer protection law. In *McGill v.*
5 *Citibank N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), Capstone represented plaintiffs in a major decision holding that the
6 right to seek public injunctive relief under the state’s consumer protection laws cannot be waived and
7 that consumers need not satisfy class certification requirements to enjoin unfair business practices on
8 behalf of the public. In *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 726 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), Capstone attorneys reversed
9 a denial of class certification, making law that clarified the use of “benefit of the bargain” damages
10 models in consumer class actions.

11 11. Capstone served as class counsel in a number of significant wage and hour settlements,
12 including \$12 million on behalf of a nationwide class of in *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case
13 No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.), over \$10 million on behalf of non-exempt hourly workers in *Zamora v.*
14 *Balboa Life & Casualty LLC*, Case No. BC360026 (L.A. Super. Ct.); and \$9 million on behalf of
15 pharmacists in *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.). In *Vorise v. 24 Hour*
16 *Fitness USA, Inc.*, No. C 15-02051 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.), Capstone and co-counsel negotiated an
17 \$11 million PAGA settlement on behalf of over 36,000 employees for Labor Code violations.

18 12. Capstone has an established practice in automotive defect class actions and is currently
19 appointed sole class counsel, following contested class certification, in *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No.
20 16-1617-GPC, 2019 WL 5268670 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2019) and *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A.,*
21 *Inc.*, No. 15-8629-FMO, 2019 WL 1940619 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2019).

22 13. Capstone has settled over 100 high-stakes class and representative actions. Capstone’s
23 settlements have directly compensated hundreds of thousands of California workers and consumers.
24 Capstone’s actions have also forced employers to modify their policies for the benefit of employees,
25 including changing the compensation structure for commissioned employees and changing practices to
26 ensure that workers will be able to take timely rest and meal breaks. A leader in prosecuting PAGA
27 enforcement actions, Capstone has secured millions of dollars in civil penalties for the State of
28 California.

14. The following is a representative sample of Capstone's settlements:

- a. *Navarro v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, No. BC592098 (LA County Superior Court): gross settlement of \$16.5 million on behalf of approximately 180,000 non-exempt employees for wage and hour violations;
- b. *Hightower et al v. Washington Mutual Bank*, No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG-PLA (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$12 million on behalf of approximately 150,000 personal bankers, tellers, sales associates, and assistant branch manager trainees for wage and hour violations;
- c. *Vargas v. Ford Motor Co.*, 12-08388-AB (C.D. Cal.): providing cash payments and unique buyback program for nearly 2 million consumers;
- d. *Moore v. Petsmart, Inc.*, No. 5:12-cv-03577-EJD (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$10 million on behalf of over 19,000 non-exempt PetSmart employees for wage and hour violations;
- e. *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$9 million on behalf of approximately 1,200 pharmacists for wage and hour violations;
- f. *Perrin v. Nabors Well Services Co.*, No. 56-2007-00288718 (Ventura Super. Ct.): gross settlement of over \$6.5 million on behalf of oil rig workers for sleep time and other wage violations;
- g. *Cook v. United Insurance Co.*, No. C 10-00425 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.7 million on behalf of approximately 650 sales representatives;
- h. *Alvarez v. MAC Cosmetics, Inc.*, No. CIVDS1513177 (San Bernardino Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.5 million for approximately 5,500 non-exempt employees.
- i. *Aceves v. AutoZone, Inc.*, No. 14-2032 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5.4 million in a case alleging FCRA violations;

- j. *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of over 12,000 nonexempt employees;
- k. *The Children's Place Retail Stores Wage & Hour Cases*, No. JCCP 4790: gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of 15,000 non-exempt employees;
- l. *York v. Starbucks Corp.*, Case No. 08-07919 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of over 100,000 non-exempt workers for meal break and wage statement claims;
- m. *Rodriguez v. Swissport USA*, No. BC 441173 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of 2,700 non-exempt employees following contested certification;
- n. *Asghari v. Volkswagen Group of North America*, Case No. 13-02529 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complementary repairs of oil consumption defect, reimbursement for repairs, and extended warranty coverage of certain Audi vehicles valued at over \$20 million;
- o. *Klee v. Nissan of North America*, Case No. 12-08238 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complimentary electric vehicle charging cards and extending warranty coverage for the electric battery on the Nissan Leaf valued at over \$10 million.

15. Attached as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of Capstone's firm resume.

16. Attached collective as **Exhibit 2** are Randy Meirose's and Antonio Arzate's respective notice letters to the California LWDA.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 12th day of February, 2026, at Los Angeles, California.



Raul Perez

Exhibit 1

FIRM PROFILE

Capstone Law APC is one of California's largest plaintiff-only labor and consumer law firms. Since its founding in 2012, Capstone has emerged as a major force in aggregate litigation, making law on cutting-edge issues and obtaining over five hundred million dollars in recovery for employees and consumers:

- In February, 2015, Capstone attorneys Raul Perez and Ryan H. Wu were honored with the *California Lawyer* Attorney of the Year (CLAY) award in labor and employment for their work in the landmark case *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal.4th 348 (2014), which preserved the right of California workers to bring representative actions under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") notwithstanding a representative action waiver in an arbitration agreement.
- Recognized as a leading firm in the prosecution of PAGA enforcement actions, Capstone is responsible for some of the most important decisions in this area. In *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshall's of Calif.)*, 3 Cal.5th 531 (2017), Capstone attorneys achieved a watershed decision before the California Supreme Court as to the broad scope of discovery in PAGA actions. In *Baumann v. Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), a case of first impression, Capstone successfully argued that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the Class Action Fairness Act.
- Capstone has made important contributions to consumer protection law. In *McGill v. Citibank N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), Capstone represented plaintiffs in a major decision holding that the right to seek public injunctive relief under the state's consumer protection laws cannot be waived and that consumers need not satisfy class certification requirements to enjoin unfair business practices on behalf of the public. In *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 726 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), Capstone attorneys reversed a denial of class certification, making law that clarified the use of "benefit of the bargain" damages models in consumer class actions.
- Capstone served as class counsel in a number of significant wage and hour settlements, including \$16.5 million on behalf of a California class in *Navarro v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, BC592098 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.), \$12 million on behalf of a nationwide class of in *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.), over \$10 million on behalf of non-exempt hourly workers in *Zamora v. Balboa Life & Casualty LLC*, Case No. BC360026 (L.A. Super. Ct.); and \$9 million on behalf of pharmacists in *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.). In *Vorise v. 24 Hour Fitness USA, Inc.*, No. C 15-02051 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.), Capstone and co-counsel negotiated an \$11 million PAGA settlement on behalf of over 36,000 employees for Labor Code violations.
- Capstone has an established practice in automotive defect class actions and is currently appointed sole class counsel, following contested class certification, in *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 16-1617-GPC, 2019 WL 5268670 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2019) and *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 15-8629-FMO, 2019 WL 1940619 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2019). Capstone was also lead counsel in *Vargas v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 12-08388-AB, 2020 WL 1164066 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2020), which delivered over \$100 million to the Class.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT SETTLEMENTS

Since its founding, Capstone has settled over 500 high-stakes class and representative actions totaling well over \$500 million dollars. Capstone's settlements have directly compensated hundreds of thousands of California workers and consumers. Capstone's actions have also forced employers to modify their policies for the benefit of employees, including changing the compensation structure for commissioned employees and changing practices to ensure that workers will be able to take timely rest and meal breaks. A leader in prosecuting PAGA enforcement actions, Capstone has secured millions of dollars in civil penalties for the State of California.

The following is a representative sample of Capstone's settlements:

- *Vargas v. Ford Motor Co.*, 12-08388-AB (C.D. Cal.): providing cash payments and unique buyback program that will pay out more than \$100 million to class members;
- *Navarro et al v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, No. BC592098 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$16.5 million on behalf of approximately 180,000 non-exempt employees;
- *Hightower et al v. Washington Mutual Bank*, No. 2:11-cv-01802-PSG-PLA (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$12 million on behalf of approximately 150,000 personal bankers, tellers, sales associates, and assistant branch manager trainees for wage and hour violations;
- *Moore v. PetSmart, Inc.*, No. 5:12-cv-03577-EJD (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$10 million on behalf of over 19,000 non-exempt PetSmart employees for wage and hour violations;
- *Dittmar v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 14-1156 (S.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$9 million on behalf of approximately 1,200 pharmacists for wage and hour violations;
- *Perrin v. Nabors Well Services Co.*, No. 56-2007-00288718 (Ventura Super. Ct.): gross settlement of over \$6.5 million on behalf of oil rig workers for sleep time and other wage violations;
- *Cook v. United Insurance Co.*, No. C 10-00425 (Contra Costa Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.7 million on behalf of approximately 650 sales representatives;
- *Alvarez v. MAC Cosmetics, Inc.*, No. CIVDS1513177 (San Bernardino Super. Ct.): gross settlement of \$5.5 million for approximately 5,500 non-exempt employees.
- *Aceves v. AutoZone, Inc.*, No. 14-2032 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5.4 million in a case alleging FCRA violations;
- *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.): gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of over 12,000 nonexempt employees;
- *The Children's Place Retail Stores Wage & Hour Cases*, No. JCCP 4790: gross settlement of \$5 million on behalf of 15,000 nonexempt employees;
- *York v. Starbucks Corp.*, Case No. 08-07919 (C.D. Cal.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of over 100,000 non-exempt workers for meal break and wage statement claims;
- *Rodriguez v. Swissport USA*, No. BC 441173 (Los Angeles Super. Ct.): gross settlement of nearly \$5 million on behalf of 2,700 non-exempt employees following contested certification;
- *Asghari v. Volkswagen Group of North America*, Case No. 13-02529 (C.D. Cal.): Settlement providing complementary repairs of oil consumption defect, reimbursement for repairs, and extended warranty coverage of certain Audi vehicles valued at over \$20 million.

PROFESSIONAL BIOGRAPHIES

Partners

Rebecca Labat. Rebecca Labat is co-managing partner of Capstone Law APC, supervising the litigation for all of the firm's cases. She also manages the firm's co-counsel relationships and assists the firm's other partners and senior counsel with case management and litigation strategy. Under Ms. Labat's leadership, Capstone has successfully settled over 100 cases, delivering hundreds millions of dollars to California employees and consumers while earning statewide recognition for its cutting-edge work in developing new law.

Ms. Labat's career accomplishments representing consumers and employees in class actions include the certification of a class of approximately 3,200 current and former automobile technicians and shop employees for the miscalculation of the regular rate for purposes of paying premiums for missed meal and rest breaks.

Before her work representing plaintiffs in class and representative actions, Ms. Labat was an attorney with Wilson Elser and represented life, health, and disability insurers in litigation throughout California in both state and federal courts. She graduated from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2002, where she was a member of the Hastings Civil Justice Clinic, served as a mediator in Small Claims Court for the City and County of San Francisco, and received the CALI Award for Excellence in Alternative Dispute Resolution. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California, Los Angeles. Ms. Labat is a member of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA), the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA), and the Beverly Hills Bar Association.

Raul Perez. Raul Perez is co-managing partner at Capstone, and has focused exclusively on wage and hour and consumer class litigation since 2011. Mr. Perez is the lead negotiator on numerous large settlements that have resulted in hundreds of millions to low-wage workers across California, including many of the most valuable settlements reached by Capstone.

During his career, Mr. Perez has successfully certified by way of contested motion and/or been appointed Lead Counsel or Interim Lead Counsel in several cases, including: *Lopes v. Kohl's Department Stores, Inc.*, Case No. RG08380189 (Alameda Super. Ct.); *Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank*, Case No. 11-01802 (C.D. Cal.); *Tameifuna v. Sunrise Senior Living Managements, Inc.*, Case No. 13-02171 (C.D. Cal.) (certified class of over 10,000 hourly-paid employees); and *Berry v. Urban Outfitters Wholesale, Inc.*, Case No. 13-02628 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed lead counsel in a class action involving over 10,000 non-exempt employees). As the lead trial attorney in *Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles*, 59 Cal. 4th 348 (2014), Mr. Perez, along with Mr. Wu, received the 2015 CLAY Award in labor and employment.

Mr. Perez received both his undergraduate degree and his law degree from Harvard University and was admitted to the California Bar in December 1994. Earlier in his career, Mr. Perez handled a variety of complex litigation matters, including wrongful termination and other employment related actions, for corporate clients while employed by some of the more established law firms in the State of California, including Morgan, Lewis & Bockius; Manatt Phelps & Phillips; and Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld. Before Capstone, Mr. Perez was a partner at another large plaintiff's firm, helping to deliver millions of dollars in relief to California workers.

Melissa Grant. Melissa Grant is a partner and lead trial attorney at Capstone. Ms. Grant is responsible for litigating many of the firm's most contentious and high-stakes class actions and PAGA cases. The author of

numerous successful motions for class certification, Ms. Grant is the lead or co-lead attorney on numerous certified class actions currently on track for trial, representing over hundreds of thousands of California employees in pursuit of their wage and hour claims. She is also at the forefront in developing the law on the California Labor Code's Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA), including administrative exhaustion, the scope of discovery, manageability, and PAGA trial plans. Recently, Ms. Grant has taken two PAGA cases to trial and worked on several key PAGA appellate decisions, including *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshall's of CA LLC)*, 3 Cal.5th 531 (2017). Ms. Grant also represented the plaintiff in *Davidson v. Seterus, Inc.*, 21 Cal. App. 5th 283 (2018), which, in a case of first impression, found that the Defendant, a mortgage servicer, was a debt collector under California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. The case led to enactment of legislation that expressly includes "mortgage debt" within the Rosenthal Act's definition of "consumer credit" and amends the Rosenthal Act to expressly apply to debt collection activities involving residential mortgage loans.

Ms. Grant began her legal career as a law clerk for the Honorable Harry Pregerson, Justice, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Thereafter, she was an associate with Sidley Austin LLP, where she represented Fortune 500 companies in commercial litigation and consumer class actions. Before joining Capstone, Ms. Grant was a Senior Associate with Quinn Emanuel Trial Attorneys, where she was on the trial team that prosecuted *Mattel v. Bratz (I)*, and a staff attorney in the Enforcement Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission, investigating ongoing violations of federal securities regulations and statutes. Ms. Grant graduated summa cum laude and first in her class from Southwestern Law School in 1999, where she served as editor-in-chief of the Law Review. She earned her undergraduate degree from Cornell University's College of Arts & Sciences, where she received the JFK Public Service Award and the Outstanding Senior Award (graduating class of 4,000 students). Ms. Grant has been a panelist and speaker on PAGA actions and wage-and-hour class actions at various annual and biannual California Bar Association, California Law Association, and Bridgeport Continuing Education conferences. Her published articles include: Los Angeles Lawyer: A PAGA Rollercoaster (September 2023), Battling for ERISA Benefits in the Ninth Circuit: Overcoming Abuse of Discretion Review, 28 Sw. U. L. Rev. 93 (1998), and CLE Class Actions Conference (SF) CAFA: Early Decisions on Commencement and Removal of Actions (2006).

Ms. Grant is a member of the Los Angeles County Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles, the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles (CAALA), and the Consumer Attorneys of California. She was recently named a 2024 Worker Health & Safety Hero by Worksafe for her work in advancing workplace safety and justice. She also currently serves on the Los Angeles County Bar Association's President's Commission on Women in the Legal Profession, the Subcommittee on Gender Bias and Civility, and the Amicus Subcommittee, and is a member of the Executive Board of Los Angeles Lawyer magazine. Ms. Grant was recognized by the Daily Journal as a Top Employment & Labor Attorney in 2023 and has been selected as one of Southern California's "Super Lawyers" in 2022, 2023, and 2024.

Ryan H. Wu. Ryan H. Wu is a partner at Capstone and is primarily responsible for complex motion work and supervising court approval of class action settlements. Mr. Wu handles many of the most challenging legal issues facing Capstone's clients, including the scope and operation of PAGA, contested attorneys' fees motions, responding to objectors, and high-impact appeals. Mr. Wu is responsible for the merits briefing in *McGill v. Citibank, N.A.*, 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017), where the California Supreme Court unanimously held that consumers' right to pursue public injunctive relief cannot be impeded by a contractual waiver or class certification requirements. He briefed the closely-watched *Williams v. Superior Court (Marshall's of CA LLC)*, 3 Cal.5th 531(2017), an important pro-employee ruling that broadened the scope of discovery in PAGA actions

and resolved a longstanding conflict regarding third-party constitutional privacy rights. He also authored the briefs in *Baumann v. Chase Inv. Servs. Corp.*, 747 F.3d 1117 (9th Cir. 2014), where, on an issue of first impression, the Ninth Circuit sided with Plaintiffs in holding that PAGA actions are state enforcement actions not covered by the CAFA. In February 2015, Mr. Wu, along with Mr. Perez, received the prestigious CLAY award for his successful appellate work, including briefing to the California Supreme Court, in *Iskanian*. Mr. Wu recently achieved an important consumer victory in *Nguyen v. Nissan N.A.*, 932 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2019), which clarified the use of “benefit of the bargain” damages models in consumer class actions. He also oversees the firm’s high-stakes fee disputes and settlement approval, with a highlight being his central role in achieving the highly publicized Ford transmission settlement, valued at over \$100 million.

Mr. Wu graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 2001, where he was an associate editor of the *Michigan Journal of Law Reform* and contributor to the law school newspaper. He received his undergraduate degree in political science with honors from the University of California, Berkeley. He is a State Bar-certified Specialist in Appellate Law, and currently serves on the Committee for Appellate Courts for the California Lawyers Association (CLA) and the Los Angeles County Bar’s State Appellate Judicial Evaluation Committee. He is an editor of CLA’s monthly *Litigation Update*, and his work has been published by the *California Litigation Review*, *California Labor & Employment Review*, *Daily Journal*, and the *Los Angeles Lawyer*. He is a contributor to Continuing Education of the Bar (CEB) and is regularly invited to speak at professional conferences. He was named a Southern California Super Lawyer for 2023, 2024, 2025 and the 2024 Worker Health & Safety Hero by Worksafe for his work in advancing workplace safety and justice.

Robert Drexler. Robert Drexler is a partner with Capstone Law where he leads one of the firm’s litigation teams prosecuting wage-and-hour class actions. He has more than 25 years of experience representing clients in wage-and-hour and consumer rights class actions and other complex litigation in state and federal courts. Over the course of his career, Mr. Drexler has successfully certified dozens of employee classes for claims such as misclassification, meal and rest breaks, and off-the-clock work, ultimately resulting in multi-million dollar settlements. He has also arbitrated and tried wage-and-hour and complex insurance cases. Mr. Drexler has been selected as one of Southern California’s “Super Lawyers” in 2009 and every year from 2001 through 2024.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Drexler was head of the Class Action Work Group at Khorrami Boucher, LLP and led the class action team at The Quisenberry Law Firm. Mr. Drexler graduated from Case Western Reserve University School of Law, where he served as Managing Editor of the *Case Western Reserve Law Review* and authored *Defective Prosthetic Devices: Strict Tort Liability for the Hospital?* 32 CASE W. RES. L. REV. 929 (1982). He received his undergraduate degree in Finance at The Ohio State University where he graduated *cum laude*. Mr. Drexler has been a member of Consumer Attorneys of California (CAOC) and Consumer Attorneys of Los Angeles (CAALA). He has been a featured speaker at class action and employment litigation seminars, and has published articles in CAOC’s *Forum Magazine* and *The Daily Journal*.

Jamie Greene. Jamie Greene is a partner with Capstone Law, where she leads the firm’s business development and case generation team. Ms. Greene is responsible for evaluating all potential new cases and referrals, developing new claims, and managing the firm’s client and cocounseling relationships. She also supervises the pre-litigation phase for all cases, including investigation, analysis, and client consultation.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Greene began her legal career at Makarem & Associates representing clients in a wide array of cases ranging from wrongful death, insurance bad faith, employment, personal injury,

construction defect, consumer protection, and privacy law. Ms. Greene is a graduate of the University of Southern California Gould School of Law and earned her bachelor's degree from Scripps College in Claremont, California.

Bevin Allen Pike. Bevin Allen Pike is a partner with Capstone Law, where she focuses primarily on wage-and-hour class actions. Ms. Pike has spent her entire legal career representing employees and consumers in wage-and-hour and consumer rights class actions. Over the course of her career, Ms. Pike has successfully certified dozens of employee and consumer classes for claims such as meal and rest breaks, unpaid overtime, off-the-clock work, and false advertising.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Pike's experience included class and representative action work on behalf of employees and consumers at some of the leading plaintiffs' firms in California. Ms. Pike graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, where she was an Editor for the International and Comparative Law Review. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of Southern California. Ms. Pike has been selected as one of Southern California's "Super Lawyers – Rising Stars" every year from 2012 through 2015.

Senior Counsel

Theresa Carroll. Theresa Carroll is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. Her practice is devoted to the Appeals & Complex Motions team, working on various settlement and approval projects.

Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Carroll was an associate with Parker Stanbury, LLP, advising small business owners on various employment matters and worked as an associate attorney for O'Donnell & Mandell litigating employment discrimination and sexual harassment cases. In 1995, she graduated from Southwestern University School of Law where she was on the trial advocacy team and was awarded the prestigious Trial Advocate of the Year award sponsored by the American Board of Trial Advocates (ABOTA) for Southwestern University School of Law. Ms. Carroll received her Bachelor of Science degree in speech with an emphasis in theatre from Iowa State University.

Liana Carter. Liana Carter is a senior counsel with Capstone Law APC, specializing in complex motions, writs, and appeals. Her work on recent appeals has included reversing a denial of class certification decision in *Brown v. Cinemark USA, Inc.*, No. 16-15377, 2017 WL 6047613 (9th Cir. Dec. 7, 2017), affirming a denial of a motion to compel arbitration in *Jacoby v. Islands Rests., L.P.*, 2014 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 4366 (2014) and reversal of a dismissal of class claims in *Rivers v. Cedars-Sinai Med. Care Found.*, 2015 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 287 (Jan. 13, 2015). Ms. Carter was responsible for drafting the successful petition for review in *McGill v. Citibank N.A.*, as well as the petition for review and briefing on the merits in *Williams v. Superior Court*, 2017 WL 2980258. Ms. Carter also has extensive prior experience in overseeing settlement negotiations and obtaining court approval of class action settlements.

Ms. Carter was admitted to the California bar in 1999 after graduating from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law, where she was an Articles Editor on the board of the *Southern California Law Review*. She received her undergraduate degree with honors from the University of California, Irvine.

Anthony Castillo. Anthony Castillo is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on analyzing and developing pre-litigation wage-and-hour and consumer claims, including PAGA representative actions and class actions for failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, meal and rest period violations, and claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Investigative Consumer Reporting Agency Act. Prior to joining Capstone, he was an associate at a California bankruptcy practice, where he represented individual and

business debtors in liquidations and re-organizations as well as various debt and foreclosure defense-related issues.

Mr. Castillo graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2009, where he volunteered with the Disability Rights Legal Center. He attended Stanford University for his undergraduate degree, majoring in Political Science and minoring in History. Anthony is admitted to practice law in California and Washington and before the United States District Court for the Central and Southern Districts of California.

Abigail Gertner. Abigail Gertner is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. Ms. Gertner pursues automotive defect and other consumer class action litigation, with a focus on defective products. Her efforts have contributed to the successful resolution of numerous cases, including *Weckwerth v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, No. 18-00588 (M.D. Tenn.) (providing a \$407 to \$547 million-dollar benefit to a class of nearly 3 million consumers); *Hickman v. Subaru of America, Inc.*, No. 21-02100 (D.N.J.) (providing reimbursements transmission repairs and warranty extensions to approximately 160,000 consumers); *Rieger v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, No. 21-10546 (D.N.J.) (providing reimbursements for engine repairs and warranty extensions to over 300,000 consumers); and *Gioffe v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, No. 22-00193 (D.N.J.) (providing 100% reimbursement for repairs or replacement of gateway control modules damaged by water intrusion).

Prior to joining Capstone Law, Ms. Gertner accumulated over two decades of litigation experience as a class action attorney, working in consumer protection, ERISA, healthcare, securities, and antitrust litigation at several nationally recognized law firms. During her time at Santa Clara University School of Law, she interned at the Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office in the Child and Elder Abuse unit. Prior to that, she graduated from Tulane University with a Bachelor of Science in Psychology and a Bachelor of Arts in Classical Studies.

Helga Hakimi. Helga Hakimi is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. Her practice primarily involves employment law class action litigation, namely wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, provide meal and rest breaks, and provide compensation for off-the-clock work, and related employer violations under the Fair Labor Standards Act and California Labor Code.

Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Hakimi was a partner at a civil litigation firm in West Los Angeles, where she handled mainly real estate litigation, business litigation, and defense of some employment law matters; prior to that, she worked as a civil litigation attorney handling complex personal injury litigation. Ms. Hakimi's interest in advocating for employee rights began in law school, where she volunteered for the Workers' Rights Clinic and assisted low-income community members in Northern California's greater Bay Area region with employment-related legal issues. Upon graduating from law school, Ms. Hakimi worked as an associate for a municipal law firm, and thereafter at the local City Attorney's Office, where she advised municipalities and cities in civil matters involving land use, environmental law, development issues, Constitutional law, and First Amendment rights. Ms. Hakimi graduated from Berkeley Law (Boalt Hall School of Law), where she earned her Juris Doctorate and was awarded the Prosser Award in Remedies. Ms. Hakimi received her Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science with a minor in Education Studies from the University of California, Los Angeles, and graduated summa cum laude and with Departmental Highest Honors.

Majdi Hijazin. Majdi Hijazin is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily focuses on representing consumers in complex litigation matters. Currently, Mr. Hijazin prosecutes automotive defect and other consumer class action lawsuits throughout the United States. Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Hijazin

led a national team of six attorneys in bringing claims under the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA), where he and his team routinely obtained high-value settlements for their clients.

Mr. Hijazin has prosecuted many individual and class action lawsuits under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), and the Illinois Consumer Fraud Act (ICFA). On behalf of aggrieved homeowners, Mr. Hijazin was part of a trial team where his efforts were instrumental in securing two multi-million-dollar jury verdicts. See *Hammer v. Residential Credit Solutions, Inc.*, No. 13 C 6397 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 3, 2015), and *Saccameno v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, 372 F. Supp. 3d 609 (N.D. Ill. 2019). Most recently, in late 2023, Mr. Hijazin's work was vital in securing a seven-digit settlement on the third day of trial. Mr. Hijazin graduated from the University of Illinois Chicago School of Law.

Daniel Jonathan. Daniel Jonathan is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Jonathan began his career as an associate at Kirkland & Ellis representing Fortune 500 clients in high-stakes litigation in various matters, including class action defense and plaintiff's actions for accounting fraud. Following that, he was a senior counsel at a boutique litigation firm where he successfully first-chaired several trials. Mr. Jonathan graduated from the Northwestern University School of Law. He received his undergraduate degree in Accounting from the University of Southern California, where he graduated cum laude. He has passed the CPA examination and worked as an auditor at Deloitte before attending law school.

Jonathan Lee. A senior counsel with Capstone, Jonathan Lee primarily litigates employment class actions. At Capstone, Mr. Lee has worked on several major successful class certification motions, and his work has contributed to multi-million dollar class settlements against various employers, including restaurant chains, retail stores, airport staffing companies, and hospitals. Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Lee defended employers and insurance companies in workers' compensation actions throughout California.

Mr. Lee graduated in 2009 from Pepperdine University School of Law, where he served as an editor for the Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and the Law; he received his undergraduate degree from UCLA.

Shealene Mancuso. Shealene Mancuso is a senior counsel with Capstone, specializing in employment class action litigation. Her practice is devoted to wage-and-hour class actions and Private Attorneys General Act litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, failure to provide compensation for off-the-clock work, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Prior to joining Capstone Law, Ms. Mancuso was a Partner at a California maritime law firm, representing employers in federal claims brought by domestic and foreign civilian employees for benefits for injuries sustained while working on U.S. military bases for government contractors. She also has extensive litigation experience representing individuals in federal vaccine injury, personal injury, and family law matters. She served on the Board of Directors of a Philadelphia domestic violence organization and as a pro bono attorney assisting low-income families with custody and grandparent's rights matters. In 2020, she was recognized as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers.

Ms. Mancuso graduated from Temple University, Beasley School of Law in 2014, where she was a Fellow in the Rubin Public Interest Law Honor Society, served as the Volunteer Chair of the Women's Law Caucus, Women's Rights Chair of the National Lawyers Guild, Membership Coordinator of the American Constitution Society, and board member of the School to Prison Pipeline, and volunteered with the Domestic Violence Assistant Project. She began to develop her litigation skills through the Integrated Trial Advocacy Program at Temple Law, as a certified law clerk with the Ventura County District Attorney's Office, and through internships with non-profit organizations. She received her undergraduate degree from the University of California, Riverside, where she majored in Sociology: Law and Society.

Trisha Monesi. Trisha Monesi is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Prior to practicing wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation, Ms. Monesi prosecuted consumer class actions in state and federal court, focusing on automotive and consumer product defects, data breaches, and false advertising. Ms. Monesi graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2014, where she served as an editor of the Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Review and was a certified law clerk at the Center for Juvenile Law and Policy. She earned her undergraduate degree from Boston University in 2011, where she majored in Political Science and International Relations.

Robert Myong. Robert Myong is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice focuses on helping employees recover their unpaid wages, overtime, and penalties in class actions and PAGA representative actions in state and federal court.

Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Myong managed a team of attorneys that recovered millions of dollars on behalf of employees for their unpaid wages, discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and wrongful termination claims. Robert is a graduate of Whittier Law School and earned his bachelor's degree in economics from the University of Southern California.

Cody Padgett. Cody Padgett is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. Mr. Padgett prosecutes automotive defect and other consumer class action lawsuits during all stages of litigation. His work has been integral to achieving contested class certification in several automotive defect cases, including *Falco v. Nissan N. Am. Inc.*, No. 13-00686 (C.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Nissan vehicles), *Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 15-08629 (C.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Toyota vehicles), and *Victorino v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 16-01617 (S.D. Cal.) (certifying a class of owners/lessees of Dodge Dart vehicles). Mr. Padgett's efforts have also contributed to major settlements of automotive defect and consumer cases, providing substantial monetary relief to millions of class members, valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars. See, e.g., *Weckwerth v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, No. 18-00588 (M.D. Tenn.) (providing a \$407 to \$547 million-dollar benefit to a class of nearly 3 million consumers).

Prior to joining Capstone Law, Mr. Padgett assisted with the defense of major felony cases at the San Diego County Public Defender's Office. During law school, Mr. Padgett served as a judicial extern to the Honorable C. Leroy Hansen, United States District Court for the District of New Mexico. He graduated from California Western School of Law in the top 10% of his class and received his undergraduate degree from the University of Southern California, where he graduated *cum laude*. Mr. Padgett is admitted to practice in California, before

the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and before United States District Court for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Shahin Rezvani. Shahin Rezvani is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. His practice involves litigating consumer class action lawsuits. Mr. Rezvani has significant experience in high-stakes trials. He played a pivotal role in the *Freedom Wireless v. Boston Communications* five-month patent infringement jury trial, securing a then-monumental \$128 million verdict. Equally significant was his role in the *Rambus v. Micron* antitrust jury trial, defeating a \$4 billion claim, and the *Micron v. Rambus* spoliation trial resulting in Rambus's SDRAM and DDR SDRAM patents being rendered unenforceable. Mr. Rezvani's impact extends beyond big cases as well, including securing a favorable verdict for an executive in the entertainment industry and successfully defending against claims for breach of contract and fraud in the electronics sector. He has also obtained judgments as a matter of law on post-trial motions and secured summary judgments, such as a victory in an early cybersquatting suit for the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Prior to Capstone, Mr. Rezvani was a senior attorney at a plaintiff's class action firm, where he handled wage & hour, consumer fraud, data breach, and other class actions. While there, he helped achieve the second largest settlement in the nation for an ADA class action case against Hyatt Corporation. With over two decades of legal expertise in antitrust, class action, consumer fraud, copyright, employment, patent, securities, and trademark disputes, his skills and accomplishments span a wide range of practice areas. Mr. Rezvani has previously represented both plaintiffs and defendants in antitrust, ERISA, employment and other matters. Mr. Rezvani graduated from UC Berkeley School of Law, and earned his Bachelor of Arts from University of California, Los Angeles.

Eduardo Santos. Eduardo Santos is a senior counsel at Capstone Law, and concentrates his practice on managing and obtaining court approval of many of Capstone's wage-and-hour, consumer, and PAGA settlements, from the initial contract drafting phase to motion practice, including contested motion practice on attorneys' fees. Over the course of his career, Mr. Santos has helped to secure court approval of over one hundred high-stakes class and representative action settlements totaling over \$100 million.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Santos began his career at a prominent plaintiff's firm in Los Angeles specializing in mass torts litigation, with a focus on complex pharmaceutical cases. Most notably, he was involved in the national Vioxx settlement, which secured a total of \$4.85 billion for thousands of individuals with claims of injuries caused by taking Vioxx. Mr. Santos graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, where he was a recipient of a full-tuition scholarship awarded in recognition of academic excellence. While in law school, Mr. Santos served as an extern for the Honorable Thomas L. Willhite, Jr. of the California Court of Appeal. He graduated magna cum laude from UCLA and was a recipient of the Ralph J. Bunche Scholarship for academic achievement.

Mao Shiokura. Mao Shiokura is a senior counsel with Capstone. Her practice focuses on identifying, evaluating, and developing new claims, including PAGA representative actions and class actions for wage-and-hour violations and consumer actions under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, False Advertising Law, Unfair Competition Law, and other consumer protection statutes. Prior to joining Capstone, Ms. Shiokura was an associate at a California lemon law firm, where she represented consumers in Song-Beverly, Magnuson-Moss, and fraud actions against automobile manufacturers and dealerships.

Ms. Shiokura graduated from Loyola Law School, Los Angeles in 2009, where she served as a staff member of Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review. She earned her undergraduate degree from the University of Southern

California, where she was a Presidential Scholar and majored in Business Administration, with an emphasis in Cinema-Television and Finance.

John Stobart. John Stobart is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. He focuses on appellate issues in state and federal courts and contributes to the firm's amicus curiae efforts to protect and expand the legal rights of California employees and consumers. Mr. Stobart has significant appellate experience having drafted over two dozen writs, appeals and petitions, and having argued before the Second, Fourth, and Fifth Districts of the California Court of Appeal.

Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Stobart was a law and motion attorney who defended against civil liability in catastrophic injury and wrongful death cases brought against his clients, which included the railroad, public schools, small businesses, and commercial and residential landowners. He has drafted and argued scores of dispositive motions at the trial court level and had success in upholding judgments and verdicts on appeal. He graduated cum laude from Thomas Jefferson School of Law where he was on the mock trial competition team and earned his undergraduate degree from the Ohio State University.

Roxanna Tabatabaee pour. Roxanna Tabatabaee pour is a senior counsel with Capstone Law. Her practice primarily involves representing employees in class actions and representative actions for various violations of the California Labor Code.

Before joining Capstone, Ms. Tabatabaee pour's experience included representing workers in single-plaintiff and class/representative action lawsuits regarding wage-and-hour violations, as well as individual claims for discrimination, retaliation, failure to accommodate, harassment, and wrongful termination, under both California and federal laws. Ms. Tabatabaee pour received her undergraduate degrees from the University of California San Diego. She subsequently graduated from the American University, Washington College of Law, where she was a Marshall-Brennan Constitutional Literacy Fellow and taught Constitutional Literacy to teens in marginalized communities.

Ryan Tish. Ryan Tish is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative actions on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, failure to reimburse necessary business expenses, and other claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act and California Labor Code.

Before joining Capstone, Mr. Tish was an associate at a civil litigation firm in Los Angeles, handling a variety of matters, including commercial contracts, real estate, and employment law. Mr. Tish has represented both employers and employees in actions ranging from individual claims of discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and wrongful termination, to class and representative actions for wage-and-hour and privacy law violations. Mr. Tish is a graduate of the University of Southern California Gould School of Law and earned his bachelor's degree in civil and environmental engineering from the University of California, Los Angeles. Mr. Tish is admitted to practice law in California and before the United States District Court for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Orlando Villalba. Orlando Villalba is a senior counsel at Capstone Law. His practice primarily involves wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA litigation on behalf of employees for the failure to pay overtime and minimum wages, failure to provide meal and rest breaks, claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and other California Labor Code violations.

Mr. Villalba began his career at Kirkland & Ellis where he handled a wide range of business litigation matters, including transnational contract disputes, insurance-related tort claims, developer litigation, and civil rights actions. He also has extensive plaintiff-side experience representing government agencies and note-holders in the pursuit of mortgage and other fraud losses. Mr. Villalba graduated from Stanford Law School, where he served as an articles editor on the Stanford Journal of Law, Business & Finance. After law school, he clerked for the Honorable Warren Matthews of the Alaska Supreme Court. Orlando received his bachelor's degree in International Business from the University of Southern California.

Associates

Tyler Anderson. Tyler Anderson is an associate with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on complex motions, writs, and appeals. Before joining Capstone, Mr. Anderson was Co-Director of the Los Angeles Center for Community Law and Action (“LACCLA”), a nonprofit law firm that represents tenant unions and union organizers. While there, Mr. Anderson tried a disparate impact federal Fair Housing Act case that resulted in a jury verdict of over \$1,000,000. He also frequently used California Anti-SLAPP laws to block attempts to silence tenant union organizers. Prior to working at LACCLA, Mr. Anderson clerked for the Honorable Martha Vazquez, a federal district court judge for the District of New Mexico who, at the time, sat on the Executive Committee of the Federal Judiciary. Before that, Mr. Anderson was a litigation associate at the international law firm Jenner & Block LLP. Mr. Anderson graduated from Harvard Law School, where he was the Executive Articles Editor of the Harvard Journal on Legislation as well as President of one of the largest student-run pro bono organizations at Harvard University, Project No One Leaves. He graduated with several “Dean’s Scholar” prizes for receiving top grades in his constitutional law courses.

Afife Bicakci. Afife Bicakci is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on prosecuting wage-and-hour class actions and representative actions under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) on behalf of employees. Before joining Capstone, she also represented employees in actions brought under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”) involving discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims. Earlier in her career, in Turkey, she litigated employment disputes from the defense side. Ms. Bicakci earned her Bachelor of Laws (J.D. equivalent) from Baskent University in Ankara, Turkey, and her LL.M. from Lincoln Law School of San Jose.

Sairah Budhwani. Sairah Budhwani is an associate with Capstone Law. Her practice focuses on evaluating and analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including claims for violations of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work violations. Previously, Ms. Budhwani litigated employment discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims, and also represented incarcerated individuals contesting the conditions of their confinement. Ms. Budhwani graduated from UCLA School of Law in 2019 and received an undergraduate degree in Urban Studies from University of California, Irvine in 2012. Ms. Budhwani is admitted to practice law in California. She is fluent in Urdu.

Richard J. Hogan. Richard J. Hogan is an associate with Capstone Law. Mr. Hogan represents employees and consumers in complex litigation, primarily wage-and-hour class actions and PAGA representative actions. Mr. Hogan focuses on matters proceeding to trial, arbitration, and mediation. Over the course of his career, Mr. Hogan has argued over 40 combined jury and bench trials in the criminal, family, and general civil law arenas. Prior to joining Capstone, Mr. Hogan advocated for clients in a wide range of cases including complex product liability, professional negligence, and homicide. Mr. Hogan graduated from University of California, Hastings College of the Law, where he was an editor on the Hastings Business Law Journal.

Jeffrey “Jeff” Jimenez. Jeffrey “Jeff” Jimenez is an associate with Capstone. His practice focuses on prosecuting wage-and-hour class actions and Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) representative actions on behalf of employees. Before joining Capstone, Mr. Jimenez was an associate at a plaintiff’s law firm where he represented employees in class and PAGA actions, and Fair Employment Housing Act (“FEHA”) actions for discrimination, harassment, and retaliation claims. Mr. Jimenez graduated from Southwestern School of Law. He obtained his undergraduate degree from the University of California, Irvine, where he majored in History. Prior to transitioning to law, Mr. Jimenez worked as a special education teacher in southern California.

Ninel Kocharyan. Ninel Kocharyan is an associate with Capstone. Her practice focuses on evaluating and analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including claims for violation of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work violations. Ms. Kocharyan began her career in entertainment law reviewing, drafting, and negotiating contracts for talent and ensuring FTC compliance. She immigrated to the United States from Russia at the age of 15 with a passion to pursue a career in law. Ms. Kocharyan graduated from Thomas Jefferson School of Law in 2014 and received her undergraduate degree from University of California, Los Angeles where she majored in Political Science. Ms. Kocharyan is admitted to practice law in California.

Chase Laurent. Chase Laurent is an associate with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on evaluating and analyzing pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including claims for violation of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, off-the-clock work violations, and unpaid business expenses. Previously, he litigated individual employment actions on behalf of plaintiffs, including discrimination, harassment, retaliation, wrongful termination, and wage-and-hour claims. Mr. Laurent graduated from University of San Francisco School of Law, where he served as the Technical Editor for the USF Law Review and twice competed on the USF Moot Court Competition Team. He earned his undergraduate degree at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, where he majored in Psychology, with a double-minor in Child Development and Law & Society.

Alexander Lima. Alexander Lima is an associate with Capstone Law. His practice focuses on evaluating pre-litigation wage-and-hour claims, including potential violations of overtime and minimum wage law, meal and rest period requirements, and off-the-clock work issues, as well as consumer protection claims. Previously, Mr. Lima was an associate at a California civil litigation practice representing individuals and entities in real estate disputes. Mr. Lima graduated from Santa Clara University, School of Law in 2018, where he served as an Executive Board Member of the Honors Moot Court and was selected as a regional finalist for the American Bar Association Negotiation Competition. He received his undergraduate degree from the University of California, Riverside in 2014.

Alexander Wallin. Alexander Wallin is an associate at Capstone Law. He is a passionate litigator who has successfully represented employees against corporate injustice. Mr. Wallin has recovered millions of dollars in numerous wage-and-hour class actions, PAGA actions, and individual discrimination lawsuits. He has a particular interest in representing economically disadvantaged employees who cannot afford legal representation on a retainer-fee basis. Mr. Wallin is a member of the Los Angeles County Bar Association’s Employment Law Section and stays up-to-date with the rapidly evolving areas of wage-and-hour protections. He graduated from Loyola Law School in 2017 and is admitted to practice law in California, as well as before the United States District Court for Central and Northern Districts of California. He has been selected as a Southern California “Super Lawyers – Rising Star” in 2022 and 2023.

Exhibit 2

MAO SHIOKURA
310.712.8030 Direct
Mao.Shiokura@capstonelawyers.com

September 20, 2019

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
(<https://dir.tfaforms.net/207>)

Subject: *Randy Meirose v. Trader Joe's Company, et al.*

Dear PAGA Administrator:

This office represents Randy Meirose in connection with his claims under the California Labor Code. Mr. Meirose was an employee of TRADER JOE'S COMPANY and/or TRADER JOE'S EAST INC. For the purpose of this letter, Mr. Meirose collectively refers to these entities as "TJC."

The employers may be contacted directly at the addresses below:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
711 ATLANTIC AVENUE, FL3
BOSTON MA 02111

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
800 S. SHAMROCK AVE
MONROVIA CA 91016

Mr. Meirose intends to seek civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and other available relief for violations of the California Labor Code, which are recoverable under sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"). Mr. Meirose seeks relief on behalf of himself, the State of California, and other persons who are or were employed by TJC in California as a non-exempt, hourly paid employee and who received at least one wage statement ("aggrieved employees"). This letter is sent in compliance with the notice and reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

TJC employed Mr. Meirose as a non-exempt, hourly paid Crew Member and Store Clerk from approximately November 2009 to December 2018. Mr. Meirose worked for TJC at its store location

in Palo Alto, California. He typically worked eight (8) hours per day and five (5) days per week. At the time his employment ended, Mr. Meirose was compensated approximately \$19.75 per hour. His job duties included ordering products for the store, breaking down pallets, organizing and stocking merchandise, providing customer service, and operating the cash registers.

TJC has committed one or more of the following Labor Code violations against Mr. Meirose, the facts and theories of which follow, making him an “aggrieved employee” pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(c):¹

TJC’s Company-Wide and Uniform Payroll and HR Practices

TRADER JOE’S COMPANY and TRADER JOE’S EAST INC. are a California corporation and a Massachusetts corporation, respectively, and are a popular discount grocery chain. TJC has at least 184 store locations in California. Upon information and belief, TJC maintains a single, centralized Human Resources (HR) department at its corporate headquarters in Monrovia, California, for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for TJC in California, including Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees. At all relevant times, TJC issued and maintained uniform, standardized scheduling and timekeeping practices and procedures for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees in California, including Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees, regardless of their location or position.

Upon information and belief, TJC maintains a centralized Payroll department at its corporate headquarters in Monrovia, California, which processes payroll for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for TJC in California, including Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees. Further, TJC issues the same formatted wage statements in the same manner for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working in California, including Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees, irrespective of their location, position, or manner in which each employee’s employment ended. In other words, TJC utilized the same methods and formulas when calculating wages due to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees in California.

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 – Unpaid Overtime

California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order require employers to pay employees working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that employers are required to pay employees working more than twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay. An employee’s regular rate of pay includes all remuneration

¹ These facts, theories, and claims are based on Mr. Meirose’s experience and counsel’s review of those records currently available relating to Mr. Meirose’s employment. Discovery conducted in litigation of wage and hour claims such as these often reveals additional claims that the aggrieved employee was not initially aware of (because the aggrieved employee was not aware of the law’s requirements, the employer misinformed its employee of the law’s requirements, or because the employer effectively hid the violations). Thus, Mr. Meirose reserves the right to supplement this letter with additional facts, theories, and claims if he becomes aware of them subsequent to the submission of this letter.

for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee, including nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive pay.

TJC willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees. During the relevant time period, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime premiums for all of the hours they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, because all hours that they worked were not recorded.

First, during the relevant time period, TJC had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of improperly rounding employee clock-in and clock-out duration times to the nearest 1/10 of the hour (6-minute increments) in its timekeeping system. TJC's rounding policy resulted in the failure to compensate Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees fully for all hours worked, causing Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees to not be paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours they actually worked. Upon information and belief, TJC's rounding policy is, and continues to be, unfair and has, over time, resulted in the underpayment of wages to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees. To the extent TJC's rounding policy has taken away time worked that was eligible for overtime, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were denied overtime pay for all hours worked.

Second, TJC had, and continues to have, a loss prevention policy requiring Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees to undergo security checks at the end of their shifts before leaving the store premises. After clocking out at the end of their shifts, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were required to wait off-the-clock for a supervisory employee to become available to perform a security check before they could leave. As a result, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were subject to TJC's control until being released by an employee performing the security check, but were not compensated for this time.

Third, on information and belief, TJC had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of staffing its store locations strictly based on a labor budget set by the corporate office. TJC's use of a labor budget resulted in chronic understaffing, such that there were too few employees on duty to handle the workload and provide uninterrupted meal period coverage. Thus, other aggrieved employees were not provided adequate meal period coverage to allow them to be relieved of their duties for compliant meal periods. As a result, other aggrieved employees missed meal periods and/or had their meal periods interrupted, but were not compensated for this time.

TJC knew or should have known that, as a result of these company-wide practices and/or policies, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were performing their assigned duties off-the-clock, and were suffered or permitted to perform work for which they were not paid. TJC also knew, or should have known, that it did not compensate Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees applicable overtime rates of pay for overtime hours that they worked.

Because Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees regularly worked shifts of eight (8) hours a day or more or forty (40) hours a week or more, some of this off-the-clock work qualified for overtime premium pay. Therefore, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours they actually worked. TJC's failure to pay Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees the balance of overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

Furthermore, TJC did not pay other aggrieved employees the correct overtime rates for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In addition to an hourly wage, TJC paid other aggrieved employees incentive pay and/or nondiscretionary bonuses. However, in violation of the California Labor Code, TJC failed to incorporate all remunerations, including incentive pay and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rates. Therefore, during times when other aggrieved employees worked overtime and received these other forms of pay, TJC failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1194, and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 – Unpaid Minimum Wages

California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 require employers to pay employees the minimum wage fixed by the IWC. The payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Compensable work time is defined in Wage Order No. 7 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.” Cal. Code. Regs. tit. 8, § 11070(2)(G) (defining “Hours Worked”).

As set forth above, TJC had a policy of rounding Mr. Meirose's and other aggrieved employees' hourly clock-in and clock-out duration times to the 1/10 of an hour in its timekeeping system, resulting in the failure to compensate Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees fully for all hours worked. As also described above, TJC had a company-wide policy and practice requiring Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees to submit to off-the-clock security checks. However, TJC did not compensate Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees for the time they spent waiting to undergo security checks and the time undergoing security checks. Additionally, as stated above, due to TJC's uniform practice of labor budgeting and subsequent understaffing and lack of meal period coverage, other aggrieved employees were forced to forego meal periods and/or had their meal periods interrupted by work.

Moreover, TJC maintained and implemented a company-wide policy of requiring employees to travel to a medical facility on their own time and using their own personal vehicles to undergo mandatory drug testing and/or physical examinations. At all times, TJC was in control of scheduling the date and time for the testing, selecting the provider or facility where the testing was to take place, and determining the scope of the exam. However, TJC did not compensate other aggrieved employees for the time they spent traveling to and undergoing the mandatory drug testing and/or physical examinations.

Thus, TJC did not pay minimum wages for all hours worked by Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees. To the extent that these off-the-clock hours did not qualify for overtime premium payment, TJC did not pay at least minimum wages for those hours worked off-the-clock in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198. Accordingly, TJC regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees for all of the hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1197.1 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), and 1198 – Failure to Provide Meal Periods

California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to provide meal and rest breaks and to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order, an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Under California law, first meal periods must start after no more than five hours. *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1041-1042 (Cal. 2012). Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order also require employers to provide a second meal break of not less than thirty (30) minutes if an employee works over ten (10) hours per day or to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

As stated, TJC has, and continues to have, a uniform policy and/or practice of understaffing locations due to labor budgeting, which resulted in a lack of meal period coverage and prevented other aggrieved employees from taking all timely, uninterrupted meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of TJC's practices and/or policies, other aggrieved employees were forced to work in excess of five (5) hours before taking a meal period and, at times, had their meal periods interrupted, and/or had to forgo their meal periods altogether. Furthermore, TJC did not provide other aggrieved employees with second 30-minute meal periods on days that they worked in excess of ten (10) hours in one day. Other aggrieved employees did not sign valid meal period waivers on days that they were entitled to meal periods and were not relieved of all duties.

TJC knew or should have known that as a result of its policies, other aggrieved employees were not actually relieved of all duties to take timely, uninterrupted meal periods. TJC further knew or should have known that it did not pay other aggrieved employees meal period premium wages when meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted.

TJC also has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying meal period premiums owed when compliant meal periods are not provided. Because of this practice and/or policy, other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for missed meal periods. Alternatively, to the extent that TJC did pay meal period premium wages to other aggrieved employees, it did so at the incorrect rates. Because TJC did not properly calculate other aggrieved employees' regular rates of pay by including all remunerations, such as incentive pay and/or nondiscretionary bonuses, any premiums paid for meal period violations were also paid at an incorrect rate and resulted in an underpayment of meal period premium wages.

Accordingly, TJC failed to provide all meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198. Other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1198 – Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

To comply with its obligation to authorize and permit rest periods under California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order, an employer must “relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time, and relieve their employees of all duties—including the obligation that an employee remain on call. A rest period, in short, must be a period of rest.” *Augustus, et al. v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269-270 (2016).

As with meal periods, TJC's company-wide policy and practice of understaffing, heavy workload, and resultant lack of rest period coverage, prevented Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees from being relieved of all duty to take compliant rest periods. Additionally, upon information and belief, TJC maintained and implemented a company-wide on-premises rest period policy, which mandated that Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees remain on TJC's premises during their rest periods. Upon information and belief, TJC's company-wide on-premises rest period policy prevented Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees from being relieved of all duties for rest periods and caused them to perform work during rest periods.

As a result, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were prevented from being relieved of all duty in order to take compliant rest periods and instead would be required to continue working. As a result of TJC's practices and policies, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees worked shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, in excess of 6 hours, and/or in excess of 10 hours without receiving all uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods to which they were entitled. Throughout his employment, Mr. Meirose was not always authorized or permitted to take full and complete 10-minute rest periods. For example, Mr. Meirose missed his rest periods due to the heavy workload approximately eight (8) times per week, and sometimes would have his rest periods interrupted or cut short due to his manager asking about work-related issues and pressure to return to work.

TJC also has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying all rest period premiums owed when compliant rest periods are not authorized or permitted. Because of this practice and/or policy, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for all missed rest periods. Alternatively, to the extent that TJC did pay rest period premium wages to other aggrieved employees, it did so at the incorrect rates. Because TJC did not properly calculate other aggrieved employees' regular rates of pay by including all forms of compensation, such as incentive pay, nondiscretionary bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration, any premiums paid for rest period violations were also paid at an incorrect rate and resulted in an underpayment of rest period premium wages.

Accordingly, TJC failed to authorize and permit all rest periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198 – Non-Compliant Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires employers to make, keep and provide true, accurate, and complete employment records. TJC has not provided Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees with properly itemized wage statements. Labor Code section 226(e) provides that if an employer fails to comply with providing an employee with properly itemized wages statements as set forth in 226(a), then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed \$4,000. Further, Labor Code section 226.3 provides that any employer who violates section 226(a) shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of \$250 per employee per violation in an initial citation and \$1,000 per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage statement or fails to keep the required records pursuant to Section 226(a).

During the relevant time period, TJC has knowingly and intentionally provided Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees with uniform, incomplete, and inaccurate wage statements. For example, TJC issued uniform wage statements to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees that fail to correctly list: gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, including overtime rates of pay, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Because TJC did not record the time Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees spent working off-the-clock and improperly rounded Mr. Meirose's and other aggrieved employees' clock-in and clock-out duration times, TJC did not list the correct amount of gross wages and net wages earned by Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees, in compliance with section 226(a)(1) and 226(a)(5), respectively. For the same reason, TJC failed to accurately list the total number of the hours worked by Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees, in violation of section 226(a)(2), and failed to list the applicable hourly rates of pay in effect during the pay period and the corresponding accurate number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of section 226(a)(9).

Further, because TJC did not calculate other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay correctly for purposes of paying overtime wages, TJC did not list the correct amount of gross wages earned by other aggrieved employees in compliance with section 226(a)(1) and did not list the correct amount of net wages earned by other aggrieved employees in violation of section 226(a)(5). TJC also failed to correctly list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, namely, correct overtime rates of pay and correct rates of pay for premium wages, in violation of section 226(a)(9).

The wage statement deficiencies also include, without limitation, failing to list the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; failing to list all deductions; failing to list the name of the 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; failing to list the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; failing to list the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees were paid; and/or failing to state all hours worked as a result of not recording or stating hours worked off-the-clock.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) provides that “[e]very person employing labor in this state shall ... [k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors” and “[k]eep, 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...” Labor Code section 1174.5 provides that employers are subject to a \$500 civil penalty if they fail to maintain accurate and complete records as required by section 1174(d). During the relevant time period, and in violation of Labor Code section 1174(d), TJC willfully failed to maintain accurate payroll records for Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees showing the daily hours they worked and the wages paid thereto as a result of failing to record the off-the-clock hours that they worked and improperly rounding Mr. Meirose’s and other aggrieved employees’ clock-in and clock-out duration times.

California Labor Code section 1198 provides that the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor shall be those fixed by the Labor Commissioner and as set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Section 1198 further provides that “[t]he employment of any employees for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.” Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, employers are required to keep accurate time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period and meal period. At all relevant times, as stated, TJC engaged in company-wide practices and/or policies of failing to record actual hours worked, and thereby failed to keep accurate records of shift start and end times for Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees in violation of section 1198. Furthermore, in light of TJC’s failure to provide other aggrieved employees with first and second 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled, TJC kept no records of meal start and end times for first and second meal periods.

Because TJC failed to provide the correct net and gross wages earned, applicable rates of pay, and number of total hours worked on wage statements, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees have been prevented from verifying, solely from information on the wage statements themselves, that they were paid correctly and in full. Instead, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees have had to look to sources outside of the wage statements themselves and reconstruct time records to determine whether in fact they were paid correctly and the extent of underpayment, thereby causing them injury.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 204 – Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

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. Alternatively, California Labor Code section 204 provides that the requirements of this section are deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

During the relevant time period, TJC failed to pay Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premium wages, within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 – Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages Upon Termination

California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

On information and belief, TJC has a company-wide practice or policy of paying departing employees their final wages on the next regular pay cycle, instead of adhering to the time requirements set forth in Labor Code sections 201 and 202. For example, Mr. Meirose was terminated on or about December 28, 2018. However, TJC did not provide him with his final paycheck until two (2) weeks later. Thus, TJC failed to pay Mr. Meirose his final wages immediately, in violation of Labor Code section 201.

Additionally, TJC willfully failed to pay Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees who are no longer employed by TJC all their earned wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premium wages, either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving TJC's employ in violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 256 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 222.5 – Failure to Pay for Costs of Mandatory Physical Exams and/or Drug Testing

At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 222.5 requires employers to pay for the costs an employee incurs for obtaining any required medical or physical examination.

During the relevant time period, TJC implemented, on a company-wide basis, an employer-imposed requirement that other aggrieved employees undergo mandatory drug tests and/or physical examinations, but required them to do so at their own expense. As stated, TJC had a company-wide policy requiring that all employees, including other aggrieved employees, travel to a specified medical clinic on their own time and use their own means of transportation to undergo drug testing. At all times, TJC was in control of scheduling the date and time for the drug testing, selecting the provider/facility where the drug testing was to take place, and determining the scope of the drug test and/or physical examination.

TJC did not compensate other aggrieved employees for the time they spent traveling to and from their drug tests and/or physical examinations, or for the time they spent undergoing the testing and/or examinations, or reimburse them for the travel expenses they incurred getting to and from the medical clinics. TJC's policy and/or practice of not paying for all costs other aggrieved employees incurred obtaining mandatory drug tests and/or physical examinations violates California Labor Code section 222.5.

Other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 11070 Subdivision 4(C) – Failure to Pay Split-Shift Premiums

California Labor Code section 1198 provides that no employer may employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable IWC wage order. California Labor Code section 1198 further requires that “. . . the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(4)(C) provides that “When an employee works a split shift, one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage shall be paid in addition to the minimum wage for that workday, except when the employee resides at the place of employment.” California Code of Regulations, Title 8, defines a split shift as “a work schedule, which is interrupted by non-paid non-working periods established by the employer, other than bona fide rest or meal periods.”

TJC willfully violated California Labor Code section 1198 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(4)(C), because TJC failed to pay other aggrieved employees a split-shift premium when they returned to work for an additional shift in the same day, after having been clocked out for more than an hour. TJC sometimes scheduled other aggrieved employees to work double-shifts that were separated by more than one (1) hour of time, but failed to pay them one (1) hour's pay at the minimum wage in addition to the minimum wage for that workday. Accordingly, TJC required other aggrieved employees to work split shifts but failed to pay them an additional hour at minimum wage in violation of California Labor Code section 1198.

TJC's failure to provide other aggrieved employees with split-shift pay when they returned to work for an additional shift in the same day, after having been clocked out for more than an hour, violates California Labor Code section 1198 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 11070(4)(C). Other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties pursuant to sections 1194 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 – Failure to Provide Suitable Seating

California Labor Code section 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order. California Labor Code section 1198 requires that “. . . the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the . . . standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.” California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(A) provides that “[a]ll working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work

reasonably permits the use of seats.” California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(B) provides that “[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties.”

“The ‘nature of the work’ refers to an employee’s tasks performed at a given location for which a right to a suitable seat is claimed, rather than a ‘holistic’ consideration of the entire range of an employee’s duties anywhere on the jobsite during a complete shift. If the tasks being performed at a given location reasonably permit sitting, and provision of a seat would not interfere with performance of any other tasks that may require standing, a seat is called for.” *Kilby v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, 368 P.3d 554, 558 (Cal. 2016). “Whether the nature of the work reasonably permits sitting is a question to be determined objectively based on the totality of the circumstances. An employer’s business judgment and the physical layout of the workplace are relevant but not dispositive factors. The inquiry focuses on the nature of the work, not an individual employee’s characteristics.” *Id.* The burden of proof to show suitable seating is not available is on the employer. *Id.* at 568. In other words, the employer must show that compliance is “infeasible because no suitable seating exists.” *See id.*

TJC’s California retail stores are generally similar in their layout and design and there was, and continues to be, ample space behind each cash wrap to allow for the presence and use of a seat or stool by Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees during the performance of their work duties. TJC could provide aggrieved employees with a seat or stool at its cash wraps, with reasonable or no modification to these work areas, but instead denies them seating and forces aggrieved employees to stand throughout the day.

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees spent a substantial portion of their day behind these cash wraps. The nature of the work of an employee performing cashier duties can reasonably be accomplished from a seated position. However, as set forth herein, TJC systematically, and on a company-wide basis, does not provide seats or stools at or near each cash register, forcing employees, including Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees, to stand throughout their work shifts.

TJC violated California Labor Code section 1198 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(A)-(B) because Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were not allowed to sit, even when it would not have interfered with the performance of their duties, nor were they provided with suitable seats. A substantial portion of Mr. Meirose’s and other aggrieved employees’ duties were performed from and connected to a cash wrap and could have been performed from a seated position. Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees could have handled transactions at the cash register and provided customer service while seated without interference to their ability to complete these duties. Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were required to stand the entire time when at a cash register because TJC did not provide seats or stools behind the cash register.

In addition, TJC did not provide Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees with seats or stools in reasonable proximity to cash wraps to allow them to use seats when it would not interfere with the performance of their duties for times when they were not engaged in active duties that require standing. In other words, to the extent Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees engaged in duties in which the nature of the work required standing, TJC denied them the use of seats nearby during lulls in their work duties. Even though the store layout of areas adjacent to cash wraps could

accommodate seats or stools with reasonable or no modification to these work areas, TJC has, on a company-wide basis, denied Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees suitable seating altogether.

Moreover, TJC did not inform Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees of their rights to a seat or stool under California law. As a result of TJC's company-wide policy and/or practice of prohibiting all employees from sitting at any time, even when they were not engaged in active duties requiring standing, and company-wide failure to provide seats in reasonable proximity to their work areas, Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees were forced to stand during shifts and denied seats. TJC's failure to provide suitable seating to Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees violates California Labor Code section 1198 and IWC Wage Order 7-2001, Section 14(A)-(B).

Mr. Meirose and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring TJC into compliance with California's seating requirements, pursuant to Labor Code section 1194.5 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 2802 – Unreimbursed Business Expenses

California Labor Code section 2802 requires employers to pay for all necessary expenditures and losses incurred by the employee in the performance of his or her job. The purpose of Labor Code section 2802 is to prevent employers from passing off their cost of doing business and operating expenses on to their employees. *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.*, 228 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1144 (2014). The applicable wage order provides that: "[w]hen tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft."

During the relevant time period, TJC had a company-wide policy and/or practice of requiring other aggrieved employees to travel in their own personal vehicles to medical facilities to undergo mandatory drug testing and/or physical examinations, but did not reimburse them for their travel expenses. Other aggrieved employees followed TJC's instructions, traveled in their personal vehicles, and underwent drug testing. Although TJC required other aggrieved employees to undergo drug testing and/or physical examinations, TJC failed to reimburse them for these expenses.

TJC could have provided other aggrieved employees with the actual tools for use on the job, such as company vehicles, or could have reimbursed employees for their mileage and travel expenses. Instead, TJC passed these operating costs off onto other aggrieved employees.

Thus, TJC had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of not reimbursing employees for expenses necessarily incurred in violation of California Labor Code section 2802. Other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C) – Failure to Provide Notice of Material Terms of Employment

California's Wage Theft Prevention Act was enacted to ensure that employers provide employees with basic information material to their employment relationship at the time of hiring, and to ensure that employees are given written and timely notice of any changes to basic information material to their employment. Codified at California Labor Code section 2810.5, the Wage Theft Prevention Act provides that at the time of hiring, an employer must provide written notice to employees of the rate(s) of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or otherwise, including any rates for overtime, the regular payday designated by the employer, and any allowances claims as part of the minimum wage, including meal or lodging allowances. Effective January 1, 2015, an employer's written notice pursuant to section 2810.5 must also include a statement that the employee may accrue and use sick leave; has a right to request and use accrued paid sick leave; may not be terminated or retaliated against for using or requesting the use of accrued paid sick leave; and has the right to file a complaint against an employer who retaliates.

TJC failed to provide other aggrieved employees written notice that lists all the requisite information set forth in Labor Code section 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C).

Other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), (f)-(g).

California Labor Code § 558(a)

California Labor Code section 558(a) provides "[a]ny 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 . . . (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid" Labor Code section 558(c) provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty provided by law." TJC, at all relevant times, was an employer or person acting on behalf of an employer(s) who violated Mr. Meirose's and other aggrieved employees' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code.

Accordingly, Mr. Meirose seeks the remedies set forth in Labor Code section 558 for himself, the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees. Specifically, pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 1194.5, 2699(a), 2699.3(a) and 2699.3(c), 2699.5, and 558, Mr. Meirose, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties and injunctive relief for himself, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California against TJC for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 222.5, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1174(d), 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, and 2810.5.

Therefore, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, Mr. Meirose seeks all applicable penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Mao Shiokura
Capstone Law APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 556-4811

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mao Shiokura", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mao Shiokura

Copy: TRADER JOE'S COMPANY (via U.S. Certified Mail); TRADER JOE'S EAST INC. (via U.S. Certified Mail)

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
\$007.720
02 1P
0000666553 SEP 20 2019
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 90067



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 4882 9032 7231 56

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 0700 0001 7649 4719

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

- ☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Adult Signature | ☐ Priority Mail Express® |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | ☐ Registered Mail™ |
| ☒ Certified Mail® | ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation™ |
| ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery | ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery |
| ☐ Insured Mail | |
| ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (per \$500) | |

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

CERTIFIED MAIL



7019 0700 0001 7649 4719

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT**
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$ 3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ☒ Return Receipt (hardcopy) | \$ 2.80 |
| ☐ Return Receipt (electronic) | \$ |
| ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery | \$ |
| ☐ Adult Signature Required | \$ |
| ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | \$ |

Postage

\$ 1.42

Total Postage and Fees

\$ 7.72

Sent To

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047

Postmark
Here

Meirase V. Trader Ja
Company

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY

800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE

MONROVIA CA 91016

See Reverse for Instructions

ne

W APC

Park East, Ste 1000
CA 90067

7019 0700 0001 7649 4719

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
\$007.72
02 1P
0000666553 SEP 20 2019
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 90067



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
711 ATLANTIC AVENUE, FL3
BOSTON MA 02111



9590 9402 4882 9032 7231 63

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 0700 0001 7649 4696

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

- ☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
☒ Certified Mail®
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery
☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
☐ Insured Mail
☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
☐ Registered Mail™
☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
☐ Signature Confirmation™
☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

CERTIFIED MAIL



7019 0700 0001 7649 4696

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
711 ATLANTIC AVENUE, FL3
BOSTON MA 02111

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only**

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$ 3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

- ☒ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$ 2.80
☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$
☐ Adult Signature Required \$
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postage

\$ 1.42

Total Postage and Fees

\$ 7.72

Sent To

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.

711 ATLANTIC AVENUE, FL3

City, State, ZIP+4®

BOSTON MA 02111

Postmark
Here

Meirose V. Trader
Joe's East Inc.

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-0047

See Reverse for Instructions

one
AW APC
Park East, Ste 1000
CA 90067

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
\$007.720
02 1P
000066553 SEP 20 2019
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 90067



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
800 S. SHAMROCK AVE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 4882 9032 7231 70

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 0700 0001 7649 4702

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)
- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

CERTIFIED MAIL



7019 0700 0001 7649 4702

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
800 S. SHAMROCK AVE
MONROVIA CA 91016

one
AW APC
Park East, Ste 1000
CA 90067

**U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT**
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

- ☒ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$2.80
- ☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Required \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postage

\$1.42

Total Postage and Fees

\$7.72

Sent To

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.
800 S. SHAMROCK AVE
City, State, ZIP+4®
MONROVIA CA 91016

Postmark
Here

Meinrose v. Trader
Joe's East Inc.

7019 0700 0001 7649 4702

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 4882 9032 7231 56

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 0700 0001 7649 4719

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

June Berlin 9/23

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ YesIf YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery☒ Certified Mail®☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery☐ Insured Mail☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery
(over \$500)☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted
Delivery☐ Return Receipt for
Merchandise☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation
Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S EAST INC.
800 S. SHAMROCK AVE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 4882 9032 7231 70

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 0700 0001 7649 4702

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

Julie Benn 8/23

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

☐ Adult Signature☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery☒ Certified Mail®☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery☐ Insured Mail☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery
(over \$500)☐ Priority Mail Express®☐ Registered Mail™☐ Registered Mail Restricted
Delivery☐ Return Receipt for
Merchandise☐ Signature Confirmation™☐ Signature Confirmation
Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt



1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, California 90067
310.556.4811 Main | 310.943.0396 Fax

MAO SHIOKURA
310.712.8030 Direct
Mao.Shiokura@capstonelawyers.com

February 16, 2021

VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION

California Labor & Workforce Development Agency
ATTN: PAGA Administrator
(<https://dir.tfaforms.net/308>)

Subject: *Antonio Arzate v. Trader Joe's Company*

Dear PAGA Administrator:

This office represents Antonio Arzate in connection with his claims under the California Labor Code. Mr. Arzate was an employee of TRADER JOE'S COMPANY ("TJC").

The employer may be contacted directly at the address below:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016

Mr. Arzate intends to seek civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and other available relief for violations of the California Labor Code, which are recoverable under sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"). Mr. Arzate seeks relief on behalf of himself, the State of California, and other persons who are or were employed by TJC as a non-exempt, hourly paid employee in California and who received at least one wage statement ("aggrieved employees"). This letter is sent in compliance with the notice and reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

TJC employed Mr. Arzate as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee from approximately November 2019 to October 2020. Mr. Arzate worked for TJC as a Crew Member at its store location in Walnut Creek, California. During his employment, Mr. Arzate typically worked five (5) to six (6) hours per day, and five (5) days per week. At the time Mr. Arzate's employment with TJC ended, he earned approximately \$17.75 per hour. His job duties included, without limitation, stocking product, unloading pallets of merchandise, operating the cash register, organizing shopping carts, and bagging groceries.

TJC committed one or more of the following Labor Code violations against Mr. Arzate, the facts and theories of which follow, making him an “aggrieved employee” pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(c):¹

TJC’s Company-Wide and Uniform Payroll and HR Practices

TRADER JOE’S COMPANY is a California corporation and a popular discount grocery chain. TJC has at least 184 store locations in California. Upon information and belief, TJC maintains a single, centralized Human Resources (HR) department at its corporate headquarters in Monrovia, California, for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for TJC in California, including Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees. At all relevant times, TJC issued and maintained uniform, standardized scheduling and timekeeping practices and procedures for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees in California, including Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees, regardless of its location or position.

Upon information and belief, TJC maintains a centralized Payroll department at its corporate headquarters in Monrovia, California, which processes payroll for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working for TJC in California, including Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees. Further, TJC issues the same formatted wage statements in the same manner for all non-exempt, hourly paid employees working in California, including Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees, irrespective of their location, position, or manner in which each employee’s employment ended. In other words, TJC utilized the same methods and formulas when calculating wages due to Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees in California.

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 – Unpaid Overtime

California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order require employers to pay employees working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of time-and-one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that employers are required to pay employees working more than twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay. An employee’s regular rate of pay includes all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee, including nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive pay.

TJC willfully failed to pay all overtime wages owed to other aggrieved employees. During the relevant time period, other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime premiums for all of the hours they worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, because all hours that they worked were not recorded.

¹ These facts, theories, and claims are based on Mr. Arzate’s experience and counsel’s review of those records currently available relating to Mr. Arzate’s employment. Discovery conducted in litigation of wage and hour claims such as these often reveals additional claims that the aggrieved employee was not initially aware of (because the aggrieved employee was not aware of the law’s requirements, the employer misinformed its employee of the law’s requirements, or because the employer effectively hid the violations). Thus, Mr. Arzate reserves the right to supplement this letter with additional facts, theories, and claims if he becomes aware of them subsequent to the submission of this letter.

First, during the relevant time period, TJC had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of improperly rounding employee clock-in and clock-out duration times to the nearest 1/10 of the hour (6-minute increments) in its timekeeping system. TJC's rounding policy resulted in the failure to compensate other aggrieved employees fully for all hours worked, causing other aggrieved employees to not be paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours they actually worked. Upon information and belief, TJC's rounding policy is, and continues to be, unfair and has, over time, resulted in the underpayment of wages to other aggrieved employees. To the extent TJC's rounding policy has taken away time worked that was eligible for overtime, other aggrieved employees were denied overtime pay for all hours worked.

Second, TJC had, and continues to have, a loss prevention policy requiring other aggrieved employees to undergo security checks at the end of their shifts before leaving the store premises. After clocking out at the end of their shifts, other aggrieved employees were required to wait off-the-clock for a supervisory employee to become available to perform a security check before they could leave. As a result, other aggrieved employees were subject to TJC's control until being released by an employee performing the security check, but were not compensated for this time.

Third, on information and belief, TJC had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy and/or practice of staffing its store locations strictly based on a labor budget set by the corporate office. TJC's use of a labor budget resulted in chronic understaffing, such that there were too few employees on duty to handle the workload and provide uninterrupted meal period coverage. Thus, other aggrieved employees were not provided adequate meal period coverage to allow them to be relieved of their duties for compliant meal periods. As a result, other aggrieved employees missed meal periods and/or had their meal periods interrupted, but were not compensated for this time.

TJC knew or should have known that as a result of these company-wide practices and/or policies, other aggrieved employees were performing their assigned duties off-the-clock, and were suffered or permitted to perform work for which they were not paid. Because other aggrieved employees worked shifts of eight (8) hours a day or more or forty (40) hours a week or more, some of this off-the-clock work qualified for overtime premium pay.

Furthermore, TJC did not pay other aggrieved employees the correct overtime rate for the recorded overtime hours that they generated. In addition to an hourly wage, TJC paid other aggrieved employees incentive pay, nondiscretionary bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration. However, in violation of the California Labor Code, TJC failed to incorporate all compensation, including incentive pay, nondiscretionary bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration, into the calculation of the regular rate of pay for purposes of calculating the overtime wage rate. Therefore, during times when other aggrieved employees worked overtime and received these other forms of pay, TJC failed to pay all overtime wages by paying a lower overtime rate than required.

Therefore, other aggrieved employees were not paid overtime wages for all of the overtime hours they actually worked, in violation of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 – Unpaid Minimum Wages

California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 require employers to pay employees the minimum wage fixed by the IWC. The payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. Compensable work time is defined in Wage Order No. 7 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.” Cal. Code. Regs. tit. 8, § 11070(2)(G) (defining “Hours Worked”).

As set forth above, TJC had a policy of rounding Mr. Arzate’s and other aggrieved employees’ hourly clock-in and clock-out duration times to the 1/10 of an hour in its timekeeping system, resulting in the failure to compensate Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees fully for all hours worked. As also described above, TJC had a company-wide policy and practice requiring other aggrieved employees to submit to off-the-clock security checks. However, TJC did not compensate other aggrieved employees for the time they spent waiting to undergo security checks and the time undergoing security checks. Additionally, as stated above, due to TJC’s uniform practice of labor budgeting and subsequent understaffing and lack of meal period coverage, Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees were forced to forego meal periods and/or had their meal periods interrupted by work.

Thus, TJC did not pay at least minimum wages for off-the-clock hours that qualified for overtime premium payment. Also, to the extent that these off-the-clock hours did not qualify for overtime premium payment, TJC did not pay at least minimum wages for those hours worked off-the-clock in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Accordingly, TJC regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees for all of the hours they worked in violation of California Labor Code sections 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1197.1 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198 – Failure to Provide Meal Periods

California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), 516, 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to provide meal periods and to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order, an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Under California law, first meal periods must start after no more than five hours. *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1041-1042 (Cal. 2012). Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order also require employers to provide a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes if an employee works over ten (10) hours per day or to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate, except that if the total hours worked is no more than

twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

As set forth above, during the relevant time period, TJC had, and continues to have, a uniform policy and/or practice of understaffing its locations due to labor budgeting, which resulted in a lack of meal period coverage and prevented Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees from taking all timely, uninterrupted meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of TJC's practices and/or policies, Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees were forced to work in excess of five (5) hours before taking a meal period and, at times, had their meal periods interrupted, and/or had to forgo their meal periods altogether. Furthermore, TJC did not provide other aggrieved employees with second 30-minute meal periods on days that they worked in excess of ten (10) hours in one day. Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees did not sign valid meal period waivers on days that they were entitled to meal periods and were not relieved of all duties.

TJC knew or should have known that as a result of its policies and practices, that Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees were not actually relieved of all duties to take timely, uninterrupted meal periods. TJC further knew or should have known that it did not pay Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees meal period premium wages when meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted.

Furthermore, TJC engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying all meal period premiums owed when compliant meal periods are not provided. Because of this practice and/or policy, Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for missed, interrupted, or late meal periods. Alternatively, to the extent that TJC did pay other aggrieved employees premium pay for missed, late, and interrupted meal periods, TJC did not pay other aggrieved employees at the correct rate of pay for premium wages because TJC systematically failed to include all forms of compensation, such as incentive pay, nondiscretionary bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration, in the regular rate of pay.

Accordingly, TJC failed to provide all meal periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198. Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees are entitled to civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 1198 – Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods

California Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to provide rest periods and to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided. California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC. The applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

To comply with its obligation to authorize and permit rest periods under California Labor Code section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order, an employer must “relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time, and relieve their employees of all duties—including the obligation that an employee remain on call. A rest period, in short, must be a period of rest.” *Augustus, et al. v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal. 5th 257, 269-270 (2016).

During the relevant time period, TJC regularly failed to authorize and permit Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees to take a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked or major fraction thereof. As with meal periods, TJC’s company-wide policy and practice of understaffing, assigning a heavy workload, and resultant lack of rest period coverage, prevented Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees from being relieved of all duty to take compliant rest periods. TJC also failed to schedule rest periods, which, coupled with TJC’s failure to provide adequate rest period coverage, further led to Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees not being authorized and permitted to take rest periods.

Furthermore, during the relevant time period, TJC maintained and implemented a company-wide on-premises rest period policy, which mandated that Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees remain on the work premises during their rest periods. Upon information and belief, TJC’s company-wide on-premises rest period policy prevented Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees from being relieved of all duties for rest periods and caused them to perform work during rest periods.

As a result, Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees would work shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, in excess of 6 hours, and/or in excess of 10 hours without being permitted and authorized to take all ten (10) minute rest periods to which they were entitled. Throughout his employment, Mr. Arzate was not always authorized or permitted to take full and complete 10-minute rest periods. For example, Mr. Arzate missed his rest periods several times during his employment and would cut his rest periods short twice per week, due to the heavy workload and understaffing.

TJC also has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying all rest period premiums owed when compliant rest periods are not authorized and permitted. Because of this practice and/or policy, Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for all missed rest periods. Alternatively, to the extent that TJC did pay other aggrieved employees one (1) additional hour of premium pay for missed rest periods, TJC did not pay other aggrieved employees at the correct rate of pay for premium wages because TJC failed to include all forms of compensation, such as incentive pay, nondiscretionary bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration, in the regular rate of pay.

Accordingly, TJC failed to authorize and permit all rest periods in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198. Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are entitled to civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198 – Non-Compliant Wage Statements and Failure to Maintain Accurate Payroll Records

California Labor Code section 226(a) requires employers to make, keep and provide true, accurate, and complete employment records. TJC has not provided Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with properly itemized wage statements. Labor Code section 226(e) provides that if an employer fails to comply with providing an employee with properly itemized wages statements as set forth in

226(a), then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50.00 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed \$4,000. Further, Labor Code section 226.3 provides that any employer who violates section 226(a) shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of \$250 per employee per violation in an initial citation and \$1,000 per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage statement or fails to keep the required records pursuant to Section 226(a).

During the relevant time period, TJC has knowingly and intentionally provided Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with uniform, incomplete, and inaccurate wage statements. For example, TJC issued uniform wage statements to Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees that fail to correctly list: gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, including overtime rates of pay, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Specifically, TJC violated sections 226(a)(1), 226(a)(2), 226(a)(5), and 226(a)(9).

Because TJC did not record the time Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees spent working off-the-clock and improperly rounded Mr. Arzate's and other aggrieved employees' clock-in and clock-out duration times, TJC did not list the correct amount of gross wages and net wages earned by Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees in compliance with section 226(a)(1) and section 226(a)(5), respectively. For the same reason, TJC failed to accurately list the total number of hours worked by Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees, in violation of section 226(a)(2), and failed to list the applicable hourly rates of pay in effect during the pay period and the corresponding accurate number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of section 226(a)(9).

Furthermore, because TJC did not calculate other aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay correctly for purposes of paying overtime, TJC did not list the correct amount of gross wages in compliance with section 226(a)(1). For the same reason, TJC also failed to list the correct amount of net wages in violation of section 226(a)(5). TJC also failed to correctly list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, namely, correct overtime rates of pay and correct rates of pay for meal and rest premium wages, in violation of section 226(a)(9).

The wage statement deficiencies also include, among other things, failing to list the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; failing to list all deductions; failing to list the name of the 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; failing to list the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; failing to list the inclusive dates of the period for which aggrieved employees were paid; and/or failing to state all hours worked as a result of not recording or stating the hours they worked off-the-clock.

California Labor Code section 1174(d) provides that "[e]very person employing labor in this state shall . . . [k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors" and "[k]eep, 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. . . ." Labor Code section 1174.5 provides that employers are subject to a \$500 civil penalty if they fail to maintain accurate and complete records as required by section 1174(d). During the relevant time period, and in violation of Labor Code section 1174(d), TJC willfully failed to maintain accurate payroll records for Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved

employees showing the daily hours they worked and the wages paid thereto as a result of failing to record the off-the-clock hours that they worked and improperly rounding Mr. Arzate's and other aggrieved employees' clock-in and clock-out duration times.

California Labor Code section 1198 provides that the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor shall be those fixed by the Labor Commissioner and as set forth in the applicable IWC Wage Orders. Section 1198 further provides that "[t]he employment of any employees for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order, employers are required to keep accurate time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period and meal period. During the relevant time period, TJC failed, on a company-wide basis, to keep accurate records of work and meal period start and stop times for Mr. Arzate and/or other aggrieved employees, in violation of section 1198. Furthermore, in light of TJC's failure to provide other aggrieved employees with second 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled, TJC kept no records of meal start and end times for second meal periods.

Because TJC failed to provide the correct net and gross wages earned, applicable rates of pay, and number of total hours worked on wage statements, Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees have been prevented from verifying, solely from information on the wage statements themselves, that they were paid correctly and in full. Instead, Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees have had to look to sources outside of the wage statements themselves and reconstruct time records to determine whether in fact they were paid correctly and the extent of underpayment, thereby causing them injury.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 1174.5, and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 204 – Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

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. Alternatively, California Labor Code section 204 provides that the requirements of this section are deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

During the relevant time period, TJC failed to pay Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premium wages, within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 – Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages Upon Termination

California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

On information and belief, TJC has a company-wide practice or policy of paying departing employees their final wages on the next regular pay cycle, instead of adhering to the time requirements set forth in Labor Code sections 201 and 202. For example, Mr. Arzate was terminated on or about October 15, 2020. However, TJC did not provide him with his final paycheck until two (2) weeks later. Thus, TJC failed to pay Mr. Arzate his final wages immediately, in violation of Labor Code section 201.

Additionally, TJC willfully failed to pay Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees who are no longer employed by TJC all their earned wages, including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premium wages, either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving TJC's employ in violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 256 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 11070 Subdivision 14(A) – Failure to Provide Suitable Seating

California Labor Code section 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order. California Labor Code section 1198 requires that "... the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the ... standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(A) provides that "[a]ll working employees shall be provided with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats."

"The 'nature of the work' refers to an employee's tasks performed at a given location for which a right to a suitable seat is claimed, rather than a 'holistic' consideration of the entire range of an employee's duties anywhere on the jobsite during a complete shift. If the tasks being performed at a given location reasonably permit sitting, and provision of a seat would not interfere with performance of any other tasks that may require standing, a seat is called for." *Kilby v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, 368 P.3d 554, 558 (Cal. 2016). "Whether the nature of the work reasonably permits sitting is a question to be determined objectively based on the totality of the circumstances. An employer's business judgment and the physical layout of the workplace are relevant but not dispositive factors. The inquiry focuses on the nature of the work, not an individual employee's characteristics." *Id.* The burden of proof to show suitable seating is not available is on the employer. *Id.* at 568. In other words, the employer must show that compliance is "infeasible because no suitable seating exists." *See id.*

TJC's California grocery stores are generally similar in their layout and design and there was, and continues to be, space behind cash wraps and demo workstations/counters to allow for the presence and use of a seat or stool by Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees (with reasonable or no modification to these work areas) during the performance of their work duties. TJC could provide Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with a seat or stool at its cash wraps and demo workstations/counters, but instead denies employees seating and forces Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees to stand throughout the day.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees spent a substantial portion of their day behind or at these cash wraps and demo workstations/counters. The nature of the work of an employee performing cashier duties and staffing a demo workstation/counter can reasonably be accomplished from a seated position. However, as set forth herein, TJC systematically, and on a company-wide basis, does not provide seats or stools at or near cash wraps and demo workstations/counters, forcing Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees to stand throughout their work shifts.

TJC violated California Labor Code section 1198 and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(A) because Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees were not allowed to sit, even when it would not have interfered with the performance of their duties, nor were they provided with suitable seats. TJC's management did not inform Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees that they were allowed to sit down, provide any means for them to sit down, or mention any policy regarding sitting.

As a result of TJC's company-wide policy and/or practice of prohibiting employees from sitting during their shifts and company-wide failure to provide suitable seating, Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees were forced to stand during shifts and denied seats. TJC's failure to provide suitable seating to other aggrieved employees violates California Labor Code section 1198 and IWC Wage Order 7-2001, Section 14(A).

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring TJC into compliance with California's seating requirements, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194.5 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 1198 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 11070 Subdivision 14(B) – Failure to Provide Suitable Seating

California Labor Code section 1198 makes it illegal to employ an employee under conditions of labor that are prohibited by the applicable wage order. California Labor Code section 1198 requires that "... the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the ... standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful." California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11070(14)(B) provides that "[w]hen employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of the work requires standing, an adequate number of suitable seats shall be placed in reasonable proximity to the work area and employees shall be permitted to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties."

The IWC states that section 14(B) applies during "lulls in operation" when an employee, while still on the job, is not then actively engaged in any duties. *Kilby v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*, 368 P.3d 554, 565 (Cal. 2016), citing IWC, 1976 Wage Orders, Summary of Basic Provisions, Seats. When taken together, an employee is entitled to a seat under section 14(A) if his or her actual tasks at a discrete

location make seated work feasible, while working there. *Id.* However, if other job duties take the employee to a different location where he or she must perform tasks requiring standing, the employee would be entitled to a seat under section 14(B) during “lulls in operation.” *Id.*

As stated, TJC’s California grocery stores are generally similar in their layout and design and there was, and continues to be, space near its work areas (with reasonable or no modification to these work areas) to allow for the presence and use of a seat or stool by Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees during lulls in operation. TJC could provide Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with a seat or stool in its work areas, but instead denies employees seating and forces Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees to stand throughout the day.

TJC did not provide Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with seats or stools in reasonable proximity to their work areas to allow them to use seats when it would not interfere with the performance of their duties for times when they were not engaged in active duties that require standing. In other words, to the extent Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees engaged in duties in which the nature of the work required standing, TJC denied them the use of seats nearby during lulls in their work duties. Moreover, TJC did not inform Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees of their rights to a seat or stool under California law.

As a result of TJC’s company-wide policy and/or practice of prohibiting employees from sitting at any time, even when they were not engaged in active duties requiring standing, and company-wide failure to provide seats in reasonable proximity to their work areas, and Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees were forced to stand during shifts and denied seats. TJC’s failure to provide suitable seating to Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees violates California Labor Code section 1198 and IWC Wage Order 7-2001, Section 14(B).

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon, and seek injunctive relief to bring TJC into compliance with California’s seating requirements, pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194.5 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Violation of California Labor Code § 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C) – Failure to Provide Notice of Material Terms of Employment

California’s Wage Theft Prevention Act was enacted to ensure that employers provide employees with basic information material to their employment relationship at the time of hiring, and to ensure that employees are given written and timely notice of any changes to basic information material to their employment. Codified at California Labor Code section 2810.5, the Wage Theft Prevention Act provides that at the time of hiring, an employer must provide written notice to employees of the rate(s) of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or otherwise, including any rates for overtime, the regular payday designated by the employer, and any allowances claims as part of the minimum wage, including meal or lodging allowances. Effective January 1, 2015, an employer’s written notice pursuant to section 2810.5 must also include a statement that the employee may accrue and use sick leave; has a right to request and use accrued paid sick leave; may not be terminated or retaliated against for using or requesting the use of accrued paid sick leave; and has the right to file a complaint against an employer who retaliates.

TJC failed to provide Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees written notice that lists all the requisite information set forth in Labor Code section 2810.5(a)(1)(A)-(C). TJC’s failure to provide

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees with written notice of basic information regarding their employment with TJC is in violation of Labor Code section 2810.5.

Mr. Arzate and other aggrieved employees are therefore entitled to recover penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f)-(g).

California Labor Code § 558(a)

California Labor Code section 558(a) provides "[a]ny 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. . . . (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid. . . ." Labor Code section 558(c) provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in this section are in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty provided by law." TJC, at all relevant times, was an employer or person acting on behalf of an employer(s) who violated Mr. Arzate's and other aggrieved employees' rights by violating various sections of the California Labor Code.

Accordingly, Mr. Arzate seeks the remedies set forth in Labor Code section 558 for himself, the State of California, and all other aggrieved employees. Specifically, pursuant to PAGA, and in particular California Labor Code sections 1194.5, 2699(a), 2699.3(a) and 2699.3(c), 2699.5, and 558, Mr. Arzate, acting in the public interest as a private attorney general, seeks assessment and collection of civil penalties and injunctive relief for himself, all other aggrieved employees, and the State of California against TJC for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 516, 1174(d), 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2810.5.

Therefore, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, Mr. Arzate seeks all applicable civil penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Mao Shiokura
Capstone Law APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 556-4811

Best Regards,



Mao Shiokura

Copy: TRADER JOE'S COMPANY (via U.S. Certified Mail); Apalla U. Chopra, Esq., Andrew Lichtenstein, Esq., Marni F. Barta, Esq., O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP, 400 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899 (via U.S. Certified Mail)

one
LAW APC
ary Park East, Ste 1000
s, CA 90067



7020 1290 0001 8879 1296

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 1512 5362 2720 60

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 1290 0001 8879 1296

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

\$ 3.50

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

- ☒ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$ 2.80
- ☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Required \$
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

Postage

\$ 1.63

Total Postage and Fees

\$ 7.93

Sent To

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY

Street and Apt. No., P.O. Box No.

800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE

City, State, ZIP+4®

MONROVIA CA 91016

Postmark
Here

Arzate v. Trader
Joe's Company

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047

See Reverse for Instructions

CERTIFIED MAIL

one

LAW APC

1000
Park East, Ste 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90067



7020 1290 0001 8879 1340

Apalla U. Chopra, Esq., Andrew Lichtenstein, Esq.,
Marni F. Barta, Esq.
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Apalla U. Chopra, Esq., Andrew Lichtenstein, Esq.,
Marni F. Barta, Esq.,
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899



9590 9402 1512 5362 2720 53

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 1290 0001 8879 1340

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent
☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below:

☐ Yes
☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery over \$500

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee	\$ 3.50
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	
☒ Return Receipt (hardcopy)	\$ 2.80
☐ Return Receipt (electronic)	\$
☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery	\$
☐ Adult Signature Required	\$
☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery	\$

Postage
\$ 1.63

Total Postage and Fees
\$ 7.93

Sent To Apalla U. Chopra, Esq., Andrew Lichtenstein, Esq.,
Marni F. Barta, Esq.,
Street and Apt. No. O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
City, State, ZIP+4® 400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

Postmark
Here

Arzate v. Trader
Joe's Company

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047

See Reverse for Instructions

7020 1290 0001 8879 1340

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Apalla U. Chopra, Esq., Andrew Lichtenstein, Esq.,
Marni F. Barta, Esq.,
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899



9590 9402 1512 5362 2720 53

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 1290 0001 8879 1340

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X *[Handwritten Signature]*

- ☐ Agent
- ☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

[Handwritten: 1046]

C. Date of Delivery

[Handwritten: 2/18]

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? If YES, enter delivery address below:

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

[Handwritten: H]

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

TRADER JOE'S COMPANY
800 S. SHAMROCK AVENUE
MONROVIA CA 91016



9590 9402 1512 5362 2720 60

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7020 1290 0001 8879 1296

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature

X

☐ Agent☐ Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes
If YES, enter delivery address below: ☐ No

3. Service Type

- ☐ Adult Signature
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
- ☒ Certified Mail®
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery
- ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Insured Mail
- ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt