

April 3, 2025

AMENDED PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Amended Notice Letter of on Behalf of RUDY VELASQUEZ,
STEPHANIE ANDRO, CHERISH ADAMS, and Aggrieved Employees
Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employer:	Benihana Downey Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana National Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana International Inc. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana Carlsbad Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana Ontario Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana Marina Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana Chino Hills Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana Encino Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana Puente Hills Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana San Mateo Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana Santa Anita Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900. Aventura, FL 33180	Benihana Sunrise Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Benihana Carson Concession Corp. 18400 South Avalon Blvd. Carson, CA 90746	Benihana Temecula Corp. 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180
	Trent Donahue 21500 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 900 Aventura, FL 33180	

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time the initial PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This amended PAGA Notice concerns RUDY VELASQUEZ, STEPHANIE ANDRO, CHERISH ADAMS’ (“Employee(s)”) employment with Employee’s former employers: Benihana Downey Corp.; Benihana National Corp.; Benihana Carlsbad Corp; Benihana Carson Concession Corp; Benihana Chino Hills Corp.; Benihana Encino Corp.; Benihana International, Inc.; Benihana Marina Corp.; Benihana Puente Hills Corp.; Benihana Ontario Corp.; Benihana San Mateo Corp.; Benihana Santa Anita Corp.; Benihana Sunrise Corp.; Benihana Temecula Corp. and Trent Donahue (“Employer”). Employee RUDY VELASQUEZ was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 1447 4th St, Santa Monica, CA 90401, with duties that included, but were not limited to, cleaning tables, floors and grills and setting the tables, from approximately October of 2023 through to approximately February of 2024. Employee STEPHANIE ANDRO was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 16226 Ventura Blvd. Encino, CA 91436, with duties that included, but were not limited to, receiving customers and seating customers, managing take-out orders and cleaning the bathrooms, from approximately January of 2018 through to the present. Employee CHERISH ADAMS was employed as a non-exempt employee of Employer, at without limitation, 4250 Birch St, Newport Beach, CA 92660, with duties that included, but were not limited to, cooking rice, cleaning up and assisting with orders, from approximately August of 2023 through to approximately May of 2024. Employees seek to represent non-exempt employees of Employer and each of them, as further set forth below. All employees that Employee seeks to represent, as detailed in this Paragraph, shall be referred to as “Aggrieved Employees”. Moreover, the allegations herein shall encompass the “PAGA Period”, which shall refer to three years preceding the date of this letter and continuing past the date of this Letter into perpetuity.

Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered Employer’s violations of the Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek (in violation of Labor Code sections 551 and 552) without paying them proper overtime wages every day, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Employer’s control due to, without limitation: As to Employees RUDY VELASQUEZ and Employee STEPHANIE ANDRO, to perform pre-shift tasks prior to clocking in. In addition, Employer failed to pay at the proper overtime include all forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion

of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employees and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, either the detrimental rounding, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. These practices were all to the detriment of Employees and other Aggrieved Employees. Consequently, Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 223, 551, 552, 1194, 1198, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employees and other aggrieved employees to damages, including, without limitation, unpaid overtime wages each day worked by each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employees and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer's control each day as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Employer's control due to, without limitation: As to Employees RUDY VELASQUEZ and Employee STEPHANIE ANDRO, to perform pre-shift tasks prior to clocking in. Moreover, from the information provided by Employer, it appears that, at least for a portion of time, Employer failed to pay for all time clocked in by Employees and Aggrieved Employees because of, although unclear from the time and pay records shown, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. As such, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198 to compensate them for work each day for each Aggrieved Employee in the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1197.1, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its Employees and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to every day work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu

thereof including, each workday, without limitation failure to provide a suitable break area; by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods, including without, limitation meal periods that were recorded for less than thirty minutes, and meal periods that may appear on the record to be thirty minutes or longer but in practice were shorter than thirty minutes as follows: As to Employee RUDY VELASQUEZ, without limitation, due to being required to take a meal break at the beginning of his work shift, then working in excess of five consecutive hours thereafter, and being instructed by management to take late breaks due to workflow. As to Employee STEPHANIE ANDRO, without limitation, due to being short staffed and having break interrupted. As to Employee CHERISH ADAMS, without limitation, due to being short staffed and having breaks interrupted. Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code 512 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employees and other Aggrieved Employees every day to, including, without limitation, work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation: by failing to provide rest periods all together; failing to provide a suitable rest facility; failing to provide rest periods that were at least ten minutes in length, including rest periods that were shorter than ten minutes, or rest periods that may have encompassed a total of ten minutes but were in practice less than ten uninterrupted minutes due to the following, without limitation: As to Employee RUDY VELASQUEZ, without limitation, due to interrupting them and being instructed by management to take late breaks due to workflow. As to Employee STEPHANIE ANDRO, without limitation, due to being short staffed and having break interrupted. As to Employee CHERISH ADAMS, without limitation, due to being short staffed and having breaks interrupted. Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations. Consequently, Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employees are informed and believe that those premium

payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210 (for failure to timely pay these wages), 558, 1198 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

In addition to the above, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employees and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employees and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn would entitle Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 2699. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Aggrieved Employees, including, without limitation, Employees, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employee and each Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employees are informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1198, and 2699. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.2, 226.3, 558, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, both independently and for the reasons stated above, also willfully or intentionally failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employees and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; and all premium pay owed. Consequently, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 201, 202 203, and 1198 each pay period for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus Employees and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 203 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(j). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer required or requires the execution of a release of claim or right on account of wages due, or to become due, or made as an advance on wages to be earned, including, without limitation, as a condition of being paid, to execute a statement of the hours worked during a pay period in which Employer knew to be false. As such, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Employer violated Labor Code sections 206.5 and 1198, and that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for purchasing uniforms and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer are liable to reimburse Employees and other Aggrieved Employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employees and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at

Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employees are further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employees are further informed and believes that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other Aggrieved Employees as contemplated under California and local laws, including, without limitation, under Labor Code section 233, that permits its use to attend to an illness of a child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner without retaliation. Employees are additionally informed and believe that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employees are thus informed and believe that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. As such, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employees are informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employees and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204 and that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Employees are further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer has or had collected, taken, or received gratuities (or a part thereof) that is paid, given to, or left for Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees by a patron, or deducted amounts from wages due to Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees on account of a gratuity, or required Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees to credit the amount (or a part thereof) of a gratuity against and as part of the wages due to the Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees from the Employer. In addition, Employees

are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer permits and/or permitted patrons to pay gratuities by credit card but failed to pay Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees the full amount of the gratuity that the patron indicated on the credit card slip, without any deductions, for any credit card payment processing fees that may be charged to the employer by the credit card company by not later than the regular payday following the date the patron authorized the credit card. In addition, Employer failed to keep accurate records of all gratuities received by Employer and made those open to inspection at all reasonable hours. Employees are informed and believes that this has resulted in a violation of Labor Code sections 351, 353, 1198. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code sections 351 and 353, Employees and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations thereto and Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 351, 353, 1198 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employees and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Employer also required Employees and Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employees' and Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work. As a result, Employees are informed and believe that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5 and 1198. As such, Employees are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employees and other Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, and that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employees and other Aggrieved Employees to damages. Employees are further informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Employer's conduct above gave rise to such violations was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 1198, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employer would further be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employees or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If within 5 years of any of violations described above, the LWDA or a court has issued a finding or determination to the Employer that its policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be further liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i). To the extent Employer was found to have unlawfully committed some or all of the above-related Labor Code violations, Employer would thus be subject to increased penalties, as applicable, under Labor Code sections 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as the Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, the Employer thus is subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either 2699(g) or 2699(h), for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Beth A. Christopher

Beth A. Christopher

cc: Benihana Downey Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana National Corp.

(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Carlsbad Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Carson Concession Corp
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Chino Hills Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Encino Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana International, Inc.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Marina Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Puente Hills Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Ontario Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana San Mateo Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Santa Anita Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Sunrise Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Benihana Temecula Corp.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)

Trent Donahue
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)