

Justin Lo, Esq. (SBN 280102)
Justin@caworklawyer.com
May T. To, Esq. (SBN 305268)
May@caworklawyer.com
WORK LAWYERS, PC
22939 Hawthorne Blvd., #202
Torrance, CA 90505
Phone: (424) 355-8535
Fax: (424) 355-8335

FILED
12/23/2021 5:18 PM
Nocona Soboleski, Clerk of Court
Superior Court of the State of California
County of Kings


Deputy
Elvira Perez

Attorneys for Plaintiff LUIS ORLANDO ORELLANA GARCIA, as representative of the State of California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and on behalf of himself and all other current and former similarly situated employees

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

LUIS ORLANDO ORELLANA GARCIA, on
behalf of himself and all others similarly
aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

PHILLIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY
FARMS, a California Limited Liability
Company; PHILIP VERWEY, an individual;
SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY
DAIRY, a California Limited Liability
Company; SHELLEY VERWAY, an
individual; PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., a
California Limited Liability Company, and
DOES 1- 50, Inclusive,

Defendants,

Case No. 21C-0411

COMPLAINT

1. **Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA)**

1 Plaintiff LUIS ORLANDO ORELLANA GARCIA, as a representative of the State of
2 California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and on behalf of himself
3 and all other current and former employees, complains and alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a representative action brought by Plaintiff, as a representative of the State
6 of California and the LWDA, and on behalf of Plaintiff and other similarly aggrieved employees,
7 to collect civil penalties for Defendant's Labor Code violations.

8 2. Defendants and Employers, PHILLIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY
9 FARMS, PHILIP VERWEY, SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY,
10 SHELLEY VERWAY, and PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC (collectively referred to as
11 "Defendants") violated numerous wage and hour laws with respect to Plaintiff and other
12 aggrieved employees by failing to provide, for example: accurate and itemized wages statements,
13 payment for all hours worked (including regular wages and overtime), failure to provide a
14 minimum wage lawful meal periods, lawful rest periods, timely payment during employment,
15 failure to reimburse for expenses incurred during the course and scope of employment, and
16 payment upon separation of employment.

17 **PARTIES**

18 **The Plaintiff**

19 3. Plaintiff LUIS ORLANDO ORELLANA GARCIA is, and at all times mentioned
20 herein, was a resident of the County of Kings in the State of California

21 **The Defendants**

22 4. Defendant PHILLIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS, is a California
23 Limited Liability Company which, at all relevant times mentioned herein, existing, doing business
24 and employing individuals in the County of Kings, State of California.

25 5. Defendant SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY is a California
26 Limited Liability Company which, at all relevant times mentioned herein, existing, doing business
27 and employing individuals in the County of Kings, State of California.
28

6. Defendant PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC. is a California Limited Liability Company which, at all relevant times mentioned herein, existing, doing business and employing individuals in the County of Kings, State of California.

7. Defendant PHILIP VERWEY ("PHILIP") is an individual over the age of 18 years, and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned herein in the County of San Diego, State of California.

8. Defendant SHELLEY VERWAY ("SHELLEY") is an individual over the age of 18 years, and based on information and belief, was residing at all times mentioned herein in the County of San Diego, State of California.

9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, exercised control over Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' wages, hours, or working conditions.

10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise of Defendants named herein as DOES 1-50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and therefore said Defendants are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants when the same become known to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that each of the fictitiously-named Defendants are responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein and is therefore liable to Plaintiff as alleged hereinafter.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that at all times relevant hereto, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, employees, managing agents, supervisors, conspirators, parent corporation, joint employers, alter ego, and/or joint ventures of the other Defendants, and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least in part within the course and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint employment, alter ego status, and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of the other Defendants.

12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that Defendants,

1 and each of them, including those Defendants named DOES 1-50, acted in concert with one
2 another to commit the wrongful acts alleged therein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled,
3 and/or coerced one another in the wrongful acts alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so.
4 Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that the Defendants, and
5 each of them, including those Defendants named as DOES 1-50, formed and executed a
6 conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they would commit the unlawful acts alleged
7 herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and pursuant to said conspiracy, intended
8 to and actually causing Plaintiff harm.

9 13. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or failure
10 to act by a defendant or co-defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to
11 mean the acts and/or failures to act by each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 14. Venue is proper in Kings County, because Defendant maintains its locations and
14 transacts business in this county, the obligations and liability primarily arise in this county, and
15 work was primarily performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in this county.

16 15. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this matter. The individual
17 claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollar (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for
18 federal court and PAGA penalties cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum jurisdictional
19 amount required for diversity removal. Further, there is no federal question at issue as the issues
20 herein are based solely on California statutes and law, including, but not limited to, the California
21 Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, California Code of Civil Procedure,
22 and California Rules of Court.

23 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 16. Defendant employed Plaintiff as a dairy milker from on or about 2014 to on or
25 about January 2021.

26 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendant employed Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
27 Employees as non-exempt employees. Aggrieved Employees mean and refer to all persons who
28

1 worked for Defendant as non-exempt employees at any time during the specified relevant time
2 period and were subject to the same wage and hour practices and policies as Plaintiff.

3 18. On many occasions, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would work more than
4 8 hours per day or 40 hours per week without overtime pay. Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved
5 Employees would not receive all compensable work time or their work time was illegally
6 rounded. Similarly Aggrieved Employees would be paid overtime at an illegally calculated rate.

7 19. Defendant regularly did not have enough employees to provide sufficient
8 coverage to maintain their business operations so Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees
9 could not take complete, timely and uninterrupted meal and rest breaks.

10 20. In an effort to curtail labor costs, Defendant regularly and consistently did not
11 have enough staff employees to provide sufficient coverage to both maintain their business
12 operations and provide legally mandated meal and rest periods, despite reasonably foreseeable
13 workload, so Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees could not take complete, timely and
14 uninterrupted meal and rest breaks because Defendant prioritized completion of daily duties
15 ahead of meal and rest period compliance.

16 21. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), any provision of the Labor
17 Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its
18 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code
19 may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on
20 behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures
21 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

22 22. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
23 specifically provided, Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f) imposes upon Defendants a
24 penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the
25 initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
26 for each subsequent pay period in which Defendant violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

27 23. Defendant's conduct during the PAGA period with respect to Plaintiff and the
28

Aggrieved Employees violates numerous Labor Code sections as detailed herein.

24. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant has engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

25. At all relevant times herein, Defendant employed Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees holding various positions and who experienced the violations set forth in this Complaint.

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive wages for all hours worked, including the applicable minimum, regular, and overtime wages, and that they were not receiving all wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' for all hours worked. Accordingly, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees all earned minimum, regular, and/or overtime compensation.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all required meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty meal period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant had a pattern, practice, and policy of not providing timely meal periods. Defendants failed to pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for late meal periods. As a result of Defendant's unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did not receive all meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted 30 minute off-duty meal period.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty rest

1 period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant had a pattern, practice,
2 and policy of not providing timely rest periods. Defendant failed to pay an additional hour of
3 pay to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for each rest period not provided or was interrupted.
4 As a result of Defendant's unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did
5 not receive all required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's
6 and Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted
7 10 minute off-duty rest period.

8 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
9 or should have known that Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees were entitled to timely
10 payment of wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff
11 and certain Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages due, within permissible
12 time periods, upon separation of employment.

13 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
14 or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive itemized
15 wage statements that accurately showed their actual hours worked, total hours worked, number
16 of hours worked at each hourly rate, gross and net wages earned, and correct employer
17 information in accordance with California law. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and
18 Aggrieved Employees were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements that accurately
19 reported their gross and net wages earned, total hours worked, each applicable rate of pay in
20 effect during the pay period with the corresponding number of hours worked, and the address of
21 the legal entity that is the employer, among other things.

22 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
23 should have known that Defendant was required to maintain accurate records of the hours
24 worked by Plaintiff and aggrieved employees. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendant failed
25 to maintain accurate records of hours worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees due to its
26 unfair rounding practices, among other things.
27
28

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act,**
3 **Labor Code § 2699 et seq., For Violations of the Labor Code)**

4 32. By this complaint, Plaintiff brings this case as a representative action seeking
5 penalties for himself, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California in a representative
6 capacity, as provided by the PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698 et seq. Plaintiff is an aggrieved
7 employee who was employed by Defendant and subject to at least one of the Labor Code
8 violations set forth in Labor Code section 2699.5. Plaintiff specifically alleged the following in
9 his notice to the LWDA and Defendants: violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204,
10 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198.

11 33. Under Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a), a plaintiff may bring a cause
12 of action under PAGA only after giving the LWDA and the employer notice of the Labor Code
13 sections alleged to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention
14 not to investigate, or after 65 days have passed without notice from the LWDA.

15 34. Prior to filing this complaint, on October 8, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice of
16 the specific provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
17 the alleged violations, as required by Labor Code section 2699.3. The written notice was given
18 via certified mail to Defendants, and the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the
19 Department of Industrial Relations website. Plaintiff was given an LWDA case number of
20 LWDA-CM-847935-21. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's notice to the LWDA and
21 Defendant(s), dated October 8, 2021, is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

22 35. The LWDA has not provided Plaintiff with any notice that it intends to investigate
23 the violations as alleged in Plaintiff's October 8, 2021 notice, and more than 65 calendar days
24 have elapsed since the postmark date on the notice.

25 36. California Labor Code §§2698-2699.5, in relevant part provides, "any provision
26 of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and
27 Workforce Development Agency...for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be
28

1 recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
2 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
3 2699.3.”

4 37. As an aggrieved employee, Plaintiff brings this civil action to recover civil
5 penalties for Defendant’s Labor Code violations.

6 **FIRST VIOLATION**

7 **(Failure to Provide Meal Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 512)**

8 38. Under California Labor Code §512(a), “An employer may not employ an
9 employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee
10 with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the
11 employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both
12 the employer and employee.”

13 39. Defendant violated Labor Code § 512 by failing to provide Plaintiff, and other
14 qualifying employees who worked shifts of greater than five hours, meal periods within the first
15 five hours of the shifts worked. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff one hour’s pay at Plaintiff’s
16 regular rate of pay for each day Defendant failed to provide a meal period in compliance with
17 section 512.

18 **SECOND VIOLATION**

19 **(Failure to Provide Rest Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7)**

20 40. Under California Labor Code §226.7(b), “An employer shall not require an
21 employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable
22 statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission”

23 41. Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) provides, “Every employer shall authorize
24 and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle
25 of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked
26 daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.”

27 42. Defendant failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and other employee to take rest
28

periods and mandated by the Wage Order.

43. Under §226.7(c), an employer who violates §226.7(b), "...shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided."

44. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other employees who were not provided rest periods one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay.

THIRD VIOLATION

(Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements, in Violation of Labor Code Section 226)

45. Under California Labor Code §226(a), an employer is legally obligated to provide its employees, semi-monthly or at the time of payment of wages, "an accurate itemized statement in writing..."

46. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under Labor Code § 2699.

FOURTH VIOLATION

(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)

47. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and IWC Wage Orders, an employer is required to compensate employees for all overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday, with double time for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in any workweek.

48. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under Labor Code § 2699.

1 **FIFTH VIOLATION**

2 **(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages)**

3 49. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and IWC Wage Orders,
4 payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a
5 payroll period is unlawful.

6 50. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
7 for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
8 Labor Code § 2699.

9 **SIXTH VIOLATION**

10 **(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment)**

11 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
12 and 15th days of any calendar month, an employer is required to pay its employees between the
13 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed. California Labor Code §
14 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th days of any calendar
15 month, Defendants are required to pay their employees between the 1st and 15th day of the
16 following calendar month. In addition, California Labor Code § 204 provides that all wages
17 earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday of the
18 next regular payroll period.

19 52. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
20 for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
21 Labor Code § 2699.

22 **SEVENTH VIOLATION**

23 **(Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees)**

24 53. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 201, 202, and 203, Defendant is required to
25 pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code §
26 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and
27 unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.
28

(Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses)

55. Labor Code section 2802 provides that an employer shall indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

56. Defendant failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties. Specifically, Defendant failed to indemnify Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for expenditures they incurred on their behalf, including, but not limited to use of their personal mobile phones to conduct company business. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendant failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for these business-related expenditures.

57. Furthermore, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were required to use their personal cellphones in the course and scope of their employment to carry out their employment duties, including without limitation contacting clients and communicating with their supervisors for instructions or to provide status reports. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not provided reimbursement for the reasonable usage of their personal cellphone by Defendant.

58. By virtue of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered, and will continue to suffer, damages in amounts which are presently unknown, but will be ascertained according to proof at trial.

59. Plaintiff seeks recovery of civil penalties individually, on behalf of the Aggrieved

1 Employees and the State of California for violations of Labor Code section 2802 during the
2 PAGA period, in a sum as provided by the Labor Code and/or other statutes.

3 60. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the aggrieved employees and the State of
4 California also seeks attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision
5 (g) and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.

6
7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 9 1. For penalties in an amount according to proof;
10 2. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to the PAGA; and
11 3. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.
12

13
14 Dated: December 23, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,
WORK LAWYERS, PC

15
16 
17 _____

Justin Lo, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A



NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA
(Labor Code § 2699.3)

DATE October 8, 2021

DELIVERY Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

RECIPIENTS California Labor &
Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS
Human Resources/Legal Dept.
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS
Agent for Service of Process
Philip Verwey
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

PHILIP VERWEY, an individual
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

PHILIP VERWEY
Agent for Service of Process
Philip Verwey
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY
Human Resources/Legal Dept.
19763 13th Ave

Office: (424) 355-8535
E-Mail: justin@caworklawyer.com
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 202
Torrance, California 90505

Hanford CA 93230

SHELLEY VERWAY, an individual
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY
Agent for Service of Process
Philip Verway
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC.
Agent for Service of Process
Philip Verway
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC.
Human Resources/Legal Dept.
19763 13th Ave
Hanford CA 93230

SUBJECT **LUIS ORLANDO ORELLANA GARCIA v. PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., et al.** —
NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3

Dear PAGA Administrator:

This office represents Luis Orlando Orellana Garcia (“Complainant” or “Employee”) in connection with her claims under the California Labor Code. Complainant is a former employee of PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., a California Corporation, PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS, PHILIP VERWEY, an individual, SHELLEY VERWAY, an individual, PHILIP VERWEY, and SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY (collectively referred to as “Employers”). Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a), we are

providing written notice that Employers are in violation of various provisions of the California Labor Code.

Complainant intends to file a complaint against Employers in California Superior Court pursuant to Labor Code section 2699 on behalf of herself and all aggrieved employees within the one year prior to the filing of the complaint (“Aggrieved Employees”). Aggrieved Employees are all non-exempt workers employed by Employers during the relevant PAGA period, holding various positions and who experienced the violations set forth in this notice.

To the extent that entities and/or individuals are named and charged with violations of the Labor Code—making them liable on an individual basis as permitted by numerous Labor Code Sections including, but not limited to 558, 558.1, and 1197.1—Complainant reserves any and all rights to add, substitute, or change the name of employer entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations at issue.

Any further amendments and changes to this notice shall relate back to the date of this notice. Consequently, Employers are on notice that Complainant continues its investigation, with the full intent to amend and/or change this notice, to add any undiscovered violations of any of the provisions of the California Labor Code—to the extent that are applicable to this case—and to change and/or add the identities of any entities and/or individuals responsible for the violations contained herein.

If Employers intend to cure the alleged violations within the statutory time period set forth in Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.3, subdivision (a), the Employers shall provide notice including a description of actions taken to cure. If the alleged violation is not cured within the statutory time period, Complainant will commence a civil action pursuant to Section 2699.

The Employers

Employers and its agents own, operate, or otherwise manage a business known as PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., a California Corporation, PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS, PHILIP VERWEY, an individual, SHELLEY VERWEY, an individual, PHILIP VERWEY, and SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY all of which are registered and authorized to conduct business in the State of California. Employers may be contacted directly through its agent for service of process at the above-listed addresses.

Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Employers employ, at a minimum, twenty-five (25) or more Aggrieved Employees who are non-exempt employees at its

California locations at any given time. Specifically, it is believed that at any given time, Employers have approximately 25 or more persons employed as non-exempt employees within California with additional employees in other positions within California.

The Named Entities Are Joint Employers of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees

California courts have recognized that the definition of “employer” for the purpose of enforcement of the California Labor Code goes beyond the concept of traditional employment to reach irregular working arrangements for the purpose of preventing evasion and subterfuge of California’s labor laws. *Martinez v. Combs* (2010) 49 Cal.4th 35,65. As such, anyone who directly or indirectly, or through an agent or any other person, engages, suffers or permits any person to work or exercises control over the wages, hours, working conditions or any person, may be liable for violations of the California Labor Code as to that person.

Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., a California Corporation, PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS, PHILIP VERWEY, an individual, SHELLEY VERWAY, an individual, PHILIP VERWEY, and SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY must be classified as joint employers of Complainant for purposes of liability for civil penalties under PAGA, as the aforementioned entities engaged, suffered, and permitted Complainant to perform services from which they benefitted, and furthermore the aforementioned entities had the right to exercise control over the wages, hours and/or working conditions of Complainant at all relevant times, so as to be considered the joint employers of Complainant. By reason of their status as joint employers of Complainant, they are each liable for civil penalties for violation of the California Labor Code as to the Complainant and other aggrieved employees.

Alter Ego and Single-Enterprise Liability

Complainant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Employers PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC., a California Corporation, PHILIP VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY FARMS, PHILIP VERWEY, an individual, SHELLEY VERWAY, an individual, PHILIP VERWEY, and SHELLEY VERWEY DBA PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY are jointly and severally liable under alter ego and single-enterprise liability. Complainant is informed and believes that each of the Employers were and are the alter ego of each other, that there exists a unity of interest and ownership between them, such that any individuality and separateness between each of

them have ceased. Complainant further alleges that each of the Employers has exercised control and dominion over each other with a disregard for the separate legal status of the entities in an attempt to commit the violations set forth herein. Complainant believes that said entities operated as a single-enterprise to achieve a common business purpose. Adherence to the separate existence of PHILIP VERWEY DAIRY INC. would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would sanction fraud and promote injustice.

Factual Background

Complainant milked cows for Employers. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were treated as non-exempt hourly employees in California and performed various duties.

The position required Complainant to work more than 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours per week without lawful compensation. Not all of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees' compensable work time spent under the control of Employers was accounted for and compensated. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated properly according to the amount of time worked. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not paid overtime. If any overtime was paid, it was paid at an illegally calculated rate. Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were also subject to an unlawful rounding policy for their compensable work time. Employers failed to timely pay all wages earned by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. Oftentimes, payment of wages would be late. Employers still owe wages to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees despite wages earned.

Employers failed to authorize and permit all required meal and rest periods for Complainant and Aggrieved Employees because, upon information and belief, Employers maintained unlawful meal and rest period policies and practices. In order to curtail labor costs, Employers regularly did not staff enough employees to provide sufficient coverage to maintain their business operations so Complainant and Aggrieved Employees could not both complete their assigned daily duties and take complete, timely, and uninterrupted meal and rest breaks. Employers prioritized completion of daily duties ahead of meal and rest period compliance. Furthermore, Employers nevertheless automatically deducted a half hour from the daily time worked by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for ostensible meal periods despite the fact that such breaks were not actually taken. Moreover, Employers maintained a policy prohibiting Complainant and Aggrieved Employees from leaving the worksite during meal periods such that any meal periods actually received by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were not "duty-free" as required by statute. In addition, due to the work load, Complainant and Aggrieved

Employees were unable to take uninterrupted meal and rest periods. Employers failed to provide Complainant and Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of pay for each meal and rest period violation, as required by Labor Code section 226.7.

As a result of the violations described above, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees experienced collateral or derivative violations. Specifically, Employers failed to provide Complainant and Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized wage statements in writing in compliance with Labor Code section 226, and failed to compensate Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all wages owed at the time employment with Employers had ended.

Legal Violations

At all relevant times, Complainant and Aggrieved Employees were non-exempt employees working for Employers. At all relevant times, Complainant was an aggrieved employee as defined in Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (c). (Lab. Code, § 2699, subd. (c) [“any person who was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or more of the violations was committed”].)

Complainants and Aggrieved Employees’ employment resulted in numerous violations of the California Labor Code, including the following:

- Employers failed to keep accurate and complete time records for Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. (Lab. Code, §§ 1174, 1198, 1199; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 7(A)(3) [“Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following: . . . Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period.”].)
- Employers failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked. (Lab. Code, § 1197; *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.4th 314, 324 [an employer’s failure to pay for any particular hour of time worked by an employee is unlawful, even if averaging an employee’s total pay over all hours worked, paid or not, results in an average hourly wage above minimum wage].)

- ☐ Employers failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees at least minimum wage for all hours worked or overtime rates for overtime work. (Lab. Code, §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1.)
- ☐ Employers failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees overtime equal to one and one-half times their regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond eight (8) hours per workday and each hour worked beyond forty (40) hours per work week. (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1198–1199; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 3.)
- ☐ Employers failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees overtime equal to double their regular hourly rate of pay for each hour worked beyond twelve (12) hours per workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day or work in a work week. (Lab. Code §§ 510, 1198–1199; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 3.)
- ☐ Employers failed to maintain a company meal period policy compliant with California law and failed to provide Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees with proper meal periods. (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 11.)
- ☐ Employers failed to properly compensate Complainant and Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of premium pay for missed or improper meal periods. (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512, subd. (a); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 11.)
- ☐ Employers failed to maintain a company rest break policy compliant with California law and failed to provide Complainant and other Aggrieved Employees with proper rest breaks. (Lab. Code, § 226.7; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 12.)

- ☐ Employer failed to properly compensate Complainant and Aggrieved Employees with an additional hour of premium pay for missed or improper rest breaks. (Lab. Code, § 226.7; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 12.)
- ☐ Employers failed to properly record Complainant and Aggrieved Employees' meal periods as required by Labor Code section 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders (Lab. Code, § 1198; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 11040, subd. 7(A)(3) ["Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded."].)
- ☐ Employers failed to pay Complainant and Aggrieved Employees all wages earned by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees on at least semimonthly paydays. (Labor Code, §§ 204, subd. (a), 207.)
- ☐ Employers took improper deductions from the pay of Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. (Lab. Code, § 221–224, 2802.)
- ☐ Employers refused to make and/or falsely denied the amount of payments due to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. (Lab. Code, § 216; see also Lab. Code, §§ 1174, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, 2699.)
- ☐ Employers intentionally and willfully failed to provide proper and accurate wage statements to employees Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. (Lab. Code, §§ 226, subd. (a), 226.3, 226.6.) The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify the total hours worked, the gross wages, and correct hourly rate earned by Complainant and Aggrieved Employees.
- ☐ Employers failed to provide proper notices regarding employee pay to Complainant and Aggrieved Employees. (Lab. Code, § 2810.5.)
- ☐ Employers failed to pay employees all earned and unpaid wages when they separated/separate from employment. (Lab. Code, §§ 201, 202, 203, 210.)

- ☐ Employers refused to reimburse Complainant and Aggrieved Employees for all expenses incurred during the course and scope of their employment(Lab. Code, § 2802.)

Employers have violated the above-referenced California Labor Code provisions, as well as other laws, and is lable for all applicable premium wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs. Complainant and otherAggrieved Employees seek to recover those amounts.

Conclusion

Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certi fied letter to the employer in question and to the Labor Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the Labor Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims or take anyaction it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by Labor Code sections 2699 and 2699.3, subdivision (a), prior to seeking penalties and premium wages allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violationsin a civil action. We look forward to determining whether the Labor Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly ask that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the code.

If the Labor Commissioner or LWDA elects not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, Complainant will seek these penalties in a civil action, on behalf of herself and all other California-based non-exempt aggrieved employees of Employer within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

Please advise if your office intends to investigate any of the factual and legal allegations and provide notice within **sixty (60) days** of this notice to our office and to that of other charged parties.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address below:

Justin Lo, Esq.
Work Lawyers PC
22939 Hawthorne Boulevard, Suite 202
Torrance, California 90505

Tel: (424) 355-8535
Email: justin@caworklawyer.com

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,


JUSTIN LO, ESQ.