

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
CHANCELLOR D. NOBLES (SBN 330081)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Merced Superior Court
2/9/2022 12:00 PM
Amanda Toste
Clerk of the Superior Court
By: Tawn Saepanh, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF MERCED

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

Plaintiff,

v.

GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC, a
Colorado limited liability company; and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 22CV-00393

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 204 (Wages Not Timely Paid During Employment);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (8) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);
- (9) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (Private Attorneys General Act of 2004);
- (10) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff ALFREDO SALAS (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the superior court “original jurisdiction in all other causes” except those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of Merced. The acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took place in the State of California, County of Merced. Defendants employed Plaintiff within the State of California. Labor Workforce Development Agency and the State of California has jurisdiction over all counties in which to enforce California’s labor laws, which makes this venue proper as well.

///

///

///

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff ALFREDO SALAS is an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Defendant GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC., at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Colorado limited liability company and operating in the State of California, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Merced.

7. At all relevant times, Defendant GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and was the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC., and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

10. Defendants GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

///

///

12. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

All current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants (including those hired directly by Defendant or through staffing/temporary agencies) within the State of California at any time during the period from June 14, 2017 to final judgment.

15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in
gation:

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members' claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.

///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.
 - d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members is impractical.
 - e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.
16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:
- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
 - b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff and the other class members;
- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- g. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members during their employment;
- h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including, inter alia, section 226;
- i. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- j. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- k. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- l. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- m. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

17. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

1 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid non-
2 exempt employee during the statutory period in the State of California.

3 19. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and the other class
4 members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and other class members'
5 employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

6 20. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
7 Plaintiff and other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and
8 the other class members.

9 21. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and the other
10 class members.

11 22. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
12 State of California.

13 23. Plaintiff and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or
14 forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

15 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid
17 or non-exempt employees within the State of California. This scheme involved, inter alia,
18 failing to pay them for all hours worked, missed meal periods, and missed rest breaks in
19 violation of California law.

20 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
21 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
22 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiff and the other class members were
23 not receiving wages for overtime compensation.

24 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
25 failed to provide Plaintiff and the other class members the required rest and meal periods
26 during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
27 Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

28 ///

1 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 all timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's
4 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
5 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive all timely and proper
6 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
7 period was missed.

8 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
9 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
10 timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff
11 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, late or
12 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive all rest periods or
13 payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was
14 missed.

15 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
17 at least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiff and the other class members were
18 not receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

19 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
20 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
21 the wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum
22 wages and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiff and the other class members did
23 not, in fact, receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

24 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
25 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
26 wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiff and the other class members did not
27 receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and meal and rest
28 period premiums, within the time permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

1 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact,
4 Plaintiff and the other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements
5 from Defendants. The deficiencies included, inter alia, the failure to include the total number
6 of hours worked by Plaintiff and the other class members.

7 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to
9 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

10 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
11 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
12 for Plaintiff and the other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did
13 not keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and the other class members.

14 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
15 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and the other class
16 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
17 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
18 represented to Plaintiff and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all
19 in order to increase Defendants' profits.

20 36. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
21 overtime wages to Plaintiff and the other class members for all hours worked. Plaintiff and
22 other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40)
23 hours per week without overtime compensation.

24 37. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide the
25 requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class
26 members.

27 38. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay
28 Plaintiff and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

46. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

///

///

1 47. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
2 were required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members employed by Defendants, who
3 work(ed) more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at
4 the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more
5 than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

6 48. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
7 required to pay Plaintiff and the other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two
8 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

9 49. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation
10 at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours
11 in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh
12 day of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in
13 excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day
14 of work.

15 50. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class
16 members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in
17 a week.

18 51. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and
19 willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and the other class members.

20 52. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the unpaid
21 balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of
22 California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

23 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and the other class
24 members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and
25 attorneys' fees.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

54. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 53 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

55. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

57. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

58. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, 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.

///

///

///

59. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

60. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

61. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

62. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

63. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

64. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

65. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

///

66. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest period is not provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

67. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 66, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

68. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

69. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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.

70. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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 (3 ½) hours.

71. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

///

///

///

72. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

73. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

74. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

75. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

76. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 75 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

77. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

78. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197.

///

///

///

80. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

81. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 80, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

82. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits 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 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.

83. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

///

///

///

85. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

86. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to the thirty (30) day maximum as provided by Labor Code section 203.

(Violation of California Labor Code § 204)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

87. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 86, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

88. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section 204 provides that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and 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 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.

89. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section 204 provides 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 10th day of the following month.

///

///

1 90. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
2 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid
3 no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

4 91. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and
5 willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members all wages due to them, within the
6 time period permissible under California Labor Code section 204.

7 92. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover all remedies
8 available for violations of California Labor Code section 204.

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))**

11 **(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

12 93. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
13 through 92, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
14 forth herein.

15 94. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
16 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate
17 itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the
18 employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the
19 employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made
20 on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages
21 earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of
22 the employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal
23 entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period
24 and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The
25 deductions made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form,
26 properly dated, showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of
27 the deductions shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of
28 employment or at a central location within the State of California.

8 97. More specifically, Plaintiff and the other class members have been injured by
9 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because
10 they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving,
11 accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

12 98. Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the
13 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor
14 Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per
15 employee.

99. Plaintiff and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)

(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)

21 100. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
22 through 99, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
23 forth herein.

101. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

28 |||

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

7

8

9

10
11
12

13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25

26

27

1 106. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved
2 employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current and
3 former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of Defendants within the State of California
4 who worked for Defendants at any time during the period from September 12, 2020¹ to the
5 present, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

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

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

11 108. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other
12 aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all
13 minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

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

15 109. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, Defendants
16 were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-minute rest
17 break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further required to
18 provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours
19 worked.

20 110. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the other
21 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks
22 and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

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

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

26
27 ¹ Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial
28 Council’s Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of
action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Therefore, the
one (1) year statute of limitations for Mr. Salas’s PAGA cause of action is tolled.

1 112. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other
2 aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required
3 time period.

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

5 113. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees
6 all wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor
7 Code §§ 201 to 204.

8 114. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants
9 failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to
10 Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code
11 § 203.

12 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements and Records**

13 115. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to provide complete and
14 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the other aggrieved current and former employees
15 in accordance with California Labor Code § 226.

16 116. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep complete and
17 *accurate* records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code
18 §§ 1174 and 1776.

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses

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

119. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other aggrieved current and former employees for all business expenses incurred and owing them within the required time period.

Penalties

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

- a. Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;
- c. Penalties under California Labor Code § 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

///

- 1 d. Penalties under Labor Code § 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars
2 (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation,
3 and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay
4 period for each subsequent violation;
- 5 e. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other
6 statutes; and
- 7 f. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 1194, and 2699,
8 and any other applicable statute.

9 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

11 **(Against GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

12 121. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
13 through 120, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully
14 set forth herein.

15 122. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair,
16 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, the other class members, to the general public, and
17 Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting
18 the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

19 123. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
20 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business &
21 Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

13 126. Plaintiff and the other class members have been personally injured by
14 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not
15 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

21 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

24 PRAYER FOR RELIEF

28 |||

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as representative of the Class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

As to the First Cause of Action

5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and the other class members;
6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;
7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing from the date such amounts were due;
8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and
9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members;
11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;
12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;
13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

1 14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
2 due;

3 15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

4 16. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

5 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

6 17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
7 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
8 rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members;

9 18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one
10 (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest
11 period was not provided;

12 19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
13 proof;

14 20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

15 21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
16 due; and

17 22. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

18 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

19 23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
20 Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff
21 and the other class members;

22 24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
23 appropriate;

24 25. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
25 amounts were due;

26 26. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

28 27. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

3 29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
4 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at
5 the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and the other class members no longer
6 employed by Defendants;

7 30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
8 proof;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

11 32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
12 amounts were due; and

13 33. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

15 34. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
16 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all
17 compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff
18 and the other class members no longer employed by Defendants;

19 35. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
20 proof;

21 36. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
22 the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

23 37. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
24 amounts were due; and

25 For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

26 |||

27 || |||

28 |||

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

38. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

39. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

40. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

///

41. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g); and

42. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

43. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

44. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

45. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

46. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

47. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

48. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

49. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the PAGA, for civil penalties pursuant to Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;

50. Upon the Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code Sections 210, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

51. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Tenth Cause of Action

52. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and the other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202.

53. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and other class members and all pre-judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

54. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

55. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

56. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

57. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Dated: February 9, 2022

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 
 Douglas Han
 Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
 Chancellor D. Nobles
 Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

March 9, 2021

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: GOLDEN SPECIALTY FOODS, LLC

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Alfredo Salas against Golden Specialty Foods, LLC (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "GSF").

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

Golden Specialty Foods, LLC is a Colorado limited liability company located at 14605 Best Avenue, Norwalk, California 90650.

GSF employed Mr. Salas as an hourly-paid non-exempt employee within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about July of 2020²) in the State of California. GSF directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees' employment, including direction, hiring, retention, supervision and termination.

///

¹ Mr. Salas does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Salas will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Salas is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Salas and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

² Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial Council's Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Therefore, the one (1) year statute of limitations for Mr. Salas's PAGA cause of action is tolled.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Salas may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through staffing agencies or labor contractors) of GSF within the State of California.

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

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

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

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

///

///

///

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, GSF routinely required Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with GSF policies and expectations and meet production goals and deadlines. GSF also failed to adequately staff its facilities and provide coverage to Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees so they may be relieved of all work duties and take legally compliant meal and rest breaks. Additionally, GSF required aggrieved employees to don and doff their uniforms during their meal and rest breaks to maximize production and ensure employees were at their workstations ready to work immediately after the end of their breaks. Moreover, GSF failed to authorize and permit Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, GSF failed to compensate Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed.

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

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, GSF failed to pay Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work, unpaid overtime premiums and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

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

///

///

///

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

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

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, GSF did not provide Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, answering work related telephone calls, donning and doffing uniforms and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Salas and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by GSF, including for using their personal cellular phones to communicate with coworkers and management regarding scheduling and work in general, and purchasing gear they were required to wear as part of their uniform while working.

///

///

LWDA
March 9, 2021
Page 6 of 7

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

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

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

Mr. Salas will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of GSF within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

///

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

LWDA
March 9, 2021
Page 7 of 7

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Han', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

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

Nancy L. Pisciotta
c/o Golden Specialty Foods, LLC
14605 Best Avenue
Norwalk, California 90650
Agent for Service of Process for Golden Specialty Foods, LLC

CC: (By Electronic Mail Only):

Greg Stephen Labate
glabate@sheppardmullin.com
Lauren J. Blaes
lblaes@sheppardmullin.com
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

- 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

PROOF OF SERVICE