

1 DAVID GLENN SPIVAK (SBN 179684)

2 david@spivaklaw.com

3 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

4 8605 Santa Monica Bl, PMB 42554

5 West Hollywood, CA 90069

6 Telephone: (213) 725-9094

7 Facsimile: (213) 634-2485

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff(s),

9 JOSE GONZALEZ-HERNANDEZ, and all others similarly situated

10 (Additional attorneys for Plaintiff on next page)

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF YUBA**

13 **(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)**

14 JOSE GONZALEZ-HERNANDEZ, on behalf of
15 himself and all others similarly situated, and the
16 general public, and as an “aggrieved employee”
17 on behalf of other “aggrieved employees” and the
18 State of California under the Labor Code Private
19 Attorneys General Act of 2004,

20 *Plaintiff(s),*

21 vs.

22 COLUSA PRODUCE CORPORATION, a
23 California corporation; COLUSA PRODUCE
24 INSPECTION SERVICES, LLC, a Pennsylvania
25 limited liability company; and DOES 1–50,
26 inclusive,

27 *Defendant(s).*

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
by
Superior Court of California
County of Yuba

on 3/24/2025

by C Fuentes

Case No. CVCV25-00117

CLASS ACTION

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR:

1. Failure to Pay All Wages Earned for All Hours Worked and Other Compensable Hours at the Correct Rates of Pay (Lab. Code §§ 221, 226.2, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198);
2. Failure to Provide Rest Breaks (Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 1198);
3. Failure to Provide Meal Periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198);
4. Failure to Indemnify (Lab. Code §§ 1198 and 2802);
5. Wage Statement Penalties (Lab. Code § 226);
6. Waiting Time Penalties (Lab. Code § 203);
7. Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.; and
8. Civil Penalties (Lab. Code §§ 2898, et seq.)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Action filed: 01/21/2025



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

ADDITIONAL ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

WALTER L. HAINES (SBN 71075)

walter@uelglaw.com

UNITED EMPLOYEES LAW GROUP

8605 Santa Monica Bl.

PMB 63354

West Hollywood, CA 90069

Telephone: (562) 256-1047

Facsimile: (562) 256-1006

Attorneys for Plaintiff,

JOSE GONZALEZ-HERNANDEZ, and all others similarly situated



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:

8605 Santa Monica Bl

PMB 42554

West Hollywood, CA 90069

(213) 725-9094 Tel

(213) 634-2485 Fax

SpivakLaw.com

Office:

1875 Century Park East

Fl 7

Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 Plaintiff, Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez (hereafter “Plaintiff” or “Gonzalez-Hernandez”), on
2 behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, the general public, and as an “aggrieved
3 employee” on behalf of other “aggrieved employees” and the State of California under the Labor
4 Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, complains and alleges as follows:

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 1. Plaintiff brings this class and representative action for alleged violations of the
7 California Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 13-2001 (hereafter “the Wage
8 Order”), and the California Business and Professions Code against Defendants Colusa Produce
9 Corporation, a California corporation, Colusa Produce Inspection Services, LLC, a Pennsylvania
10 limited liability company, and Does 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).

11 2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to
12 him and other similarly situated workers for unpaid wages, statutory and civil penalties, interest,
13 and related relief. These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to:

14 (A) Pay all wages, including minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime
15 wages, earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay;

16 (B) Provide all meal periods;

17 (C) Authorize and permit all rest breaks;

18 (D) Pay premium wages for unprovided meal periods;

19 (E) Pay premium wages for unprovided rest breaks;

20 (F) Indemnify for necessary work-related expenditures;

21 (G) Issue only accurate and complete itemized wage statements;

22 (H) Timely pay wages upon termination of employment;

23 Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to recover unpaid wages, interest, liquidated damages,
24 restitution, statutory and civil penalties, attorneys’ fees, costs, and related relief through this class
25 action.

26 **II. THE PARTIES**

27 3. Plaintiff Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez is a resident of California. At all relevant times,
28 Plaintiff was an “employee” within the meaning of Title 8 California Code of Regulations § 11050



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 and an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of Labor Code § 2699 (c).

2 4. Defendant Colusa Produce Corporation is a corporation organized and existing
3 under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based on Plaintiff’s information and
4 belief.

5 5. Defendant Colusa Produce Inspection Services, LLC is a limited liability company
6 organized and existing under the laws of Pennsylvania and also a citizen of California based on
7 Plaintiff’s information and belief.

8 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extents of
9 participation in the conduct alleged herein of the Defendants sued as DOES 1-50, inclusive, but
10 is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said Defendants are legally responsible for the
11 wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names.
12 Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants
13 when ascertained.

14 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
15 herein, all Defendants were the agents, employees and/or servants, masters or employers of the
16 remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting or failing to act
17 within the course and scope of such agency, employment, direction and control, and with the
18 approval and ratification of each of the other Defendants.

19 8. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
20 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
21 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not compensating Plaintiff and the other Class
22 Members or otherwise complying with their rights in accordance with applicable California labor
23 laws as alleged herein.

24 9. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
25 Defendants and each of them acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy and/or practice, or
26 lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and other members of the below-
27 described class in accordance with applicable laws as alleged herein.

28 ///



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 **III. CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

2 10. This action has been brought and may be maintained as a class action pursuant to
3 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of
4 interest among the persons who comprise the readily ascertainable class defined below and
5 because Plaintiff is unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in managing this case as
6 a class action.

7 11. **Class Definition:** The Class is defined as follows: All persons Defendants
8 employed in California hourly and non-exempt, including forklift operators, individuals
9 performing work comparable to the aforementioned, compensated comparably to the
10 aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions, at any time during the period beginning four
11 years prior to the filing of this action and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this
12 action ("Class" or "Class Members").

13 12. **Reservation of Rights:** Pursuant to Rule of Court 3.765(b), Plaintiff reserves the
14 right to amend or modify the class definition with greater specificity, by further division into
15 subclasses and/or by limitation to particular issues.

16 13. **Numerosity:** The Class Members are so numerous that the individual joinder of
17 each individual Class Member is impractical. While Plaintiff does not currently know the exact
18 number of Class Members, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the actual number exceeds the
19 minimum required for numerosity under California laws.

20 14. **Commonality and Predominance:** Common questions of law and fact exist as to
21 all Class Members and predominate over any questions which affect only individual Class
22 Members. These questions include, but are not limited to:

23 A. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages earned to Class Members for
24 all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, overtime, doubletime,
25 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages;

26 B. Whether Defendants subjected wages to discount;

27 C. Whether Defendants unlawfully deducted wages from Class Members;

28 D. Whether Defendants failed to provide the Class Members with all meal



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 periods in compliance with California law;

2 E. Whether Defendants failed to authorize and permit the Class Members to
3 take all rest periods in compliance with California law;

4 F. Whether Defendants failed to indemnify the Class Members for the
5 reasonable expenses they incurred during the course of performing their duties;

6 G. Whether Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide the
7 class with accurate and complete itemized wage statements;

8 H. Whether Defendants willfully failed to provide the class with timely final
9 wages;

10 I. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair competition within the meaning of
11 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., with respect to the Class; and

12 J. Whether Class Members are entitled to restitution of money or property
13 that Defendants may have acquired from them through alleged Labor Code violations.

14 15. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other Class Members' claims.
15 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants have a policy and/or
16 practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants failing to comply with the California Labor
17 Code, the Wage Order, and the Business and Professions Code.

18 16. **Adequacy of Class Representative:** Plaintiff is an adequate class representative
19 in that he has no interests that are adverse to, or otherwise in conflict with, the interests of absent
20 Class Members. Plaintiff is dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of Class
21 Members. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of Class
22 Members.

23 17. **Adequacy of Class Counsel:** Plaintiff's counsel are adequate class counsel in that
24 they have no known conflicts of interest with Plaintiff or absent Class Members, are experienced
25 in class action litigation, and are dedicated to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of
26 Plaintiff and absent Class Members.

27 18. **Superiority:** A class action is vastly superior to other available means for fair and
28 efficient adjudication of Class Members' claims and would be beneficial to the parties and the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 Court. Class action treatment will allow a number of similarly situated persons to simultaneously
2 and efficiently prosecute their common claims in a single forum without the unnecessary
3 duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. In addition, the
4 monetary amounts due to many individual Class Members are likely to be relatively small and
5 would thus make it difficult, if not impossible, for individual Class Members to both seek and
6 obtain relief. Moreover, a class action will serve an important public interest by permitting Class
7 Members to effectively pursue the recovery of monies owed to them. Further, a class action will
8 prevent the potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments inherent in individual litigation.

9 **IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

10 19. The Wage Order applies to “all persons employed in industries preparing
11 agricultural products for market, on the farm whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or
12 other basis...” Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines “Industries Preparing Agricultural
13 Products for Market, on the Farm” as

14 “any operation performed in a permanently fixed structure or establishment on the
15 farm or on a moving packing plant on the farm for the purpose of preparing
16 agricultural, horticultural, egg, poultry, meat, seafood, rabbit, or dairy products for market
17 when such operations are done on the premises owned or operated by the same employer
18 who produced the products referred to herein and includes all operations incidental
thereto.”

19 Wage Order, § 2(H). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Defendants,
20 Gonzalez-Hernandez, and all of the Class Members were covered by the Wage Order because the
21 Defendants operated, and Gonzalez-Hernandez, and all of the Class Members worked for, one or
22 businesses that inspect, process, and package produce. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez and all
23 of the other Class Members are entitled to the protections the Wage Order provides.

24 20. On approximately March 15, 2011, the Defendants began to employ Gonzalez-
25 Hernandez in Meridian in the position of hourly, nonexempt forklift operator. The Defendants
26 continuously employed him in that capacity until on or about March 6, 2024 when his
27 employment ended.

28 21. At all relevant times, the Defendants issued wages to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 of the other Class Members on a basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant times, the
2 Defendants classified Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class Members as non-exempt
3 employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

4 22. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez
5 and all of the other Class Members for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular
6 rates of pay. The Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for all
7 hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Defendants
8 also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for time they were restricted to
9 the premises for off-the-clock meal periods.

10 23. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez
11 and all of the other Class Members at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a
12 day, over 40 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The
13 Defendants required Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Class Members to work over eight hours
14 per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such
15 workdays and workweeks, the Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class
16 Members for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections.
17 The Defendants also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for time they were
18 restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid
19 overtime wages. Also, the Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members
20 for overtime hours at overtime premium rates of time and one half their regular rates of pay.
21 Instead, the Defendants paid Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members at their regular rates
22 of pay for overtime hours worked.

23 24. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez
24 and all of the other Class Members at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over 12 in a
25 day, and all over the first eight of the seventh day of the workweek. The Defendants required
26 Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Class Members to work over 12 hours per day and over eight
27 hours on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such workdays and workweeks, the
28 Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for all hours worked,



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Defendants also failed to
2 pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for time they were restricted to the premises for
3 off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid doubletime wages. The
4 Defendants also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for doubletime hours
5 at doubletime premium rates of two times their regular rates of pay. Instead, the Defendants paid
6 Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members at their regular rates of pay for doubletime hours
7 worked.

8 25. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and
9 all of the other Class Members with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. The Defendants
10 failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for time they were restricted to the
11 premises for off-the-clock meal periods. The Defendants also failed to provide Gonzalez-
12 Hernandez and the Class Members with meal periods within the first five hours of work. The
13 Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Gonzalez-
14 Hernandez and all of the other Class Members with meal periods as required by law.

15 26. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-
16 Hernandez and all of the other Class Members to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every
17 four hours worked or major portion thereof. The Defendants restricted Gonzalez-Hernandez and
18 the Class Members to the premises for their rest breaks. The Defendants also failed to pay
19 premium wages for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-Hernandez and
20 all of the other Class Members to take rest breaks as required by law.

21 27. At all relevant times, the Defendants required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the
22 other Class Members to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties.
23 The Defendants required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class Members to supply
24 mobile phones to perform their job duties. However, the Defendants did not provide these items
25 and did not reimburse Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Class Members for these items.

26 28. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to issue to Gonzalez-Hernandez and
27 all of the other Class Members complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked
28 at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Defendants knowingly and intentionally



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other
2 Class Members the unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum
3 wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned,
4 all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related
5 information.

6 29. At all relevant times, the Defendants also failed to timely pay Gonzalez-Hernandez
7 and all of the other Class Members all earned wages as described above during and at the
8 conclusion of employment.

9 30. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to maintain accurate employee records
10 of Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class Members.

11 31. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff alleges that as a result of Defendants'
12 unlawful practices and policies, Plaintiff and the Class Members were:

- 13 A. Not provided with all off duty meal periods;
- 14 B. Not authorized and permitted to take all rest break periods;
- 15 C. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
16 authorize and permit them to take one or more timely rest periods;
- 17 D. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
18 provide them with one or more timely meal periods;
- 19 E. Not paid all wages earned, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular,
20 overtime, and doubletime wages for work performed while clocked out;
- 21 F. Not indemnified for all necessary business expenditures incurred during
22 the discharge of their duties;
- 23 G. Not provided with accurate and complete wage statements; and
- 24 H. Not timely paid all earned and unpaid wages at the time their employment
25 ended.

26
27 ///

28



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES AT THE CORRECT RATES**

3 **Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198**

4 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

5 32. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

6 33. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Class Members have been non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

7 **A. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES EARNED FOR ALL HOURS WORKED AT**
8 **THE CORRECT RATES OF PAY**

9 34. Section 2 of the Wage Order defines “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is
10 suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.”

11 35. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

12
13
14 (1) The following overtime provisions are applicable to
15 employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or
16 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend
17 school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from
18 engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be
19 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or
20 more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee
21 receives one and one-half (1 1/2) times such employee’s
22 regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in
23 the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day’s
24 work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday
25 or more than six (6) days in any workweek is permissible
26 under the following conditions:

27 (a) Any work by an employee in excess of 72 hours in
28 any one workweek shall be on a voluntary basis. No
employee shall be discharged or in any other
manner discriminated against or refusing to work in
excess of 72 hours in any one workweek;

(2) Overtime hours shall be compensated at: (a) One and one-half (1 1/2) times the employee’s regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including 12 hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

work in a workweek; and (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12 hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.

36. Section 4 of the Wage Order requires an employer to pay non-exempt employees at least the minimum wage set forth therein for all hours worked, which consists of all hours that an employer has actual or constructive knowledge that employees are working.

37. Labor Code section 510 states:

Eight hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee. Nothing in this section requires an employer to combine more than one rate of overtime compensation in order to calculate the amount to be paid to an employee for any hour of overtime work.

38. Labor Code section 1194 invalidates any agreement between an employer and an employee to work for less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order.

39. Labor Code section 1197 makes it unlawful for an employer to pay an employee less than the minimum wage required under the applicable Wage Order for all hours worked during a payroll period.

40. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for an employer to employ an employee under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

41. In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay non-exempt employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours worked, including unrecorded hours when the employer knew or reasonably should have known that employees were working during those hours. (See *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 585.)



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 42. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to
2 compensate Plaintiff and the Class Members for all hours worked, including, but not limited to
3 minimum, regular, overtime and doubletime wages for all minimum, regular, overtime and
4 doubletime hours, respectively, that they worked at the correct rates of pay.

5 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
6 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
7 failure to compensate Plaintiff and the other Class Members for all hours worked at the correct
8 rates of pay as required by California law.

9
10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

12 **Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 512**

13 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

14 44. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

15 45. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
16 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
17 of California Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

18 46. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

19 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the
20 commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of
21 labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those
22 fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

23 47. In relevant part, In relevant part, California Labor Code § 512 states:

24 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
25 more than five hours per day without providing the employee with
26 a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total
27 work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the
28 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the
 employer and employee.

 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with
a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

total hours worked is no more than 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.

48. In relevant part, Section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods:

- (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee.
- (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 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.
- (C) Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty" meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.
- (D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
- (E) In all places of employment where employees are required to eat on the premises, a suitable place for that purpose shall be designated.

49. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

(c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

50. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Class Members were entitled to uninterrupted meal periods of at least 30 minutes for each day they worked five or more hours. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512, they were also entitled to a second 30-minute meal period when they worked more than 10 hours in a workday.

51. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with all required 30-minute duty free meal periods in accordance with the Wage Order. The Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. The Defendants also failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members with meal periods within the first five hours of work.

52. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Class Members with all timely rest and meal periods. Defendants denied Plaintiff and the other Class Members their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with timely meal periods.

53. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not providing the and the Class Members with all off-duty meal periods required by California law.

54. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages
2 owed for all meal periods not provided to them.

3 55. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium
4 wages for workdays in which one or more meal periods were not provided to them pursuant to
5 California Labor Code § 226.7.

6 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS**

8 **Lab. Code § 226.7**

9 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

10 56. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

11 57. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
12 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
13 of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 1198, and the Wage Order.

14 58. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

15 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
16 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
17 the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment
18 of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or
19 under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

20 59. In relevant part, Section 12 of the Wage Order states:

21 **Rest Periods:**

22 (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take
23 rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
24 each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based
25 on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
26 rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a
27 rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily
28 work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized
rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there
shall be no deduction from wages.

(B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the
employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

60. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 226.7 states:

(b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

(c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

61. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Class Members were entitled to be authorized and permitted to take net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or major fraction thereof.

62. Defendants intentionally failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order. The Defendants restricted Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Class Members to the premises for their rest breaks.

63. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take all timely rest periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Class Members to take timely rest periods.

64. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover,



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members premium wages on workdays they failed
2 to authorize and permit them to take 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major
3 fraction thereof.

4 65. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
5 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
6 which resulted in Defendants not authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and the Class Members to
7 take all rest breaks required by California law.

8 66. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with all required rest breaks in accordance
9 with the Wage Order. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at relevant times
10 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
11 which resulted in Defendants not providing the Class Members with all rest breaks required by
12 California law.

13 67. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the additional wages required by California
14 Labor Code § 226.7 for all rest breaks not provided to him. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
15 thereon alleges that, at relevant times within the applicable limitations period, Defendants have
16 maintained a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy which resulted in Defendants not providing the
17 Class Members with additional wages for all rest breaks not provided to them as required by
18 California Labor Code § 226.7.

19 68. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and the Class Members have
20 suffered damages in amounts subject to proof to the extent they were not paid additional wages
21 owed for all rest breaks not provided to them.

22 69. By reason of the above, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to premium
23 wages for workdays in which one or more rest breaks were not provided to them pursuant to
24 California Labor Code § 226.7.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO INDEMNIFY

Lab. Code § 2802

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)

25 70. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.

26 71. In pertinent part, California Labor Code § 2802(a) states: "An employer shall
27 indemnify his or her employee[s] for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
28



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

72. California Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

73. At all relevant times, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Class Members to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties.

74. As described above, the Defendants required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class Members to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The Defendants required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class members to supply mobile phones to perform their job duties. However, the Defendants did not provide these items and did not reimburse Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Class members for these items.

75. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants’ failure to indemnify Plaintiff and the Class Members for the reasonable expenses they incurred during the course of performing their duties.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ISSUE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WAGE STATEMENTS

Lab. Code § 226

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)

A. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS

76. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

77. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Class Members were entitled to receive, semi-monthly or at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized statement showing:

A. Gross wages earned;

B. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;

C. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;

D. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;

E. Net wages earned;

F. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;

G. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;

H. The name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and

I. All applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

78. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if the employer fails to provide a wage statement. Also, an employee is deemed to suffer injury if the employer fails to provide accurate and complete information as required by California Labor Code § 226(a) and the employee cannot “promptly and easily determine” from the wage statement alone one or more of the following:

A. The amount of the gross wages or net wages paid to the employee during the pay period or any of the other information required to be provided on the itemized wage statement pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a);

B. Which deductions the employer made from gross wages to determine the net wages paid to the employee during the pay period;

C. The name and address of the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682 of the California Labor Code, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer during the pay period;

D. The name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; and

E. The number of piece-rate units earned and the piece rate.

79. “Promptly and easily determine,” as stated in California Labor Code § 226(e), means a reasonable person would be able to readily ascertain the information without reference

1 to other documents or information.

2 80. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
3 Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and
4 accurately itemize each employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked,
5 the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements
6 of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they
7 issued to Plaintiff and the other Class Members all their hours worked and wages earned,
8 including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock
9 after clocking-out (as described above). Defendants knowingly and intentionally did not issue
10 either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or
11 separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, statements to Plaintiff and the Class
12 Members that state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages
13 earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break
14 premium wages earned, and other required information.

15 81. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Class Members with accurate
16 wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide Plaintiff and
17 the other Class Members with accurate wage statements but intentionally provided wage
18 statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

19 82. As a result of being provided with inaccurate wage statements by Defendants,
20 Plaintiff and the other Class Members have suffered injury. Their legal rights to receive accurate
21 wage statements were violated and they were misled about the amount of wages they had actually
22 earned and were owed. In addition, the absence of accurate information on their wage statements
23 prevented immediate challenges to Defendants' unlawful pay practices, has required discovery
24 and mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed, has caused difficulty
25 and expense in attempting to reconstruct time and pay records and/or has led to the submission of
26 inaccurate information about wages to state and federal government agencies. Further, Plaintiff
27 and the other Class Members were not able to ascertain from the wage statements whether
28 Defendants complied with their obligations under California Labor Code section 226(a).



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
WILLFUL FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES
(Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)

83. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

84. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiffs and the Class have been non-exempt employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203, and the Wage Order.

85. Labor Code § 201 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who is discharged are due and payable immediately at the time of discharge.

86. Labor Code § 202 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits after providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable at the time of quitting and that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits without providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable within 72 hours.

87. The Defendants failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Class Members whose employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their employment with Gonzalez-Hernandez, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and other compensation.

88. By failing to pay such earned wages to Plaintiff and the Class Members, Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in violation of Labor Code § 201 or § 202.

89. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' failures to timely pay Plaintiff and the Class Members all of their earned and unpaid wages (described above) have been willful in that, at all relevant times, Defendants have deliberately maintained policies and practices that violate the requirements of the Labor Code and the Wage Order, even though at all relevant times, they have had the ability to comply with those legal requirements.

90. Pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Plaintiffs seeks waiting time penalties on behalf of



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 themselves and the Class, in amounts subject to proof not to exceed 30 days of waiting time
2 penalties for each Class Member.

3 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

5 **(Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

6 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, against all Defendants)**

7 91. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

8 92. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Plaintiff and the
9 Class Members have been employees of Defendants and entitled to the benefits and protections
10 of the Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

11 93. The unlawful conduct of Defendants alleged herein amount to and constitutes
12 unfair competition within the meaning of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et*
13 *seq.* Due to their unfair and unlawful business practices alleged herein, Defendants have unfairly
14 gained a competitive advantage over other comparable companies doing business in California
15 that comply with their legal obligations to compensate employees for all earned wages.

16 94. As a result of Defendants' unfair competition as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the
17 Class Members have suffered injuries in fact and lost money or property. Plaintiff and the Class
18 Members were deprived of minimum, regular, overtime, doubletime, rest break premium, and
19 meal period premium wages, unreimbursed phone expenses, and comparable money and
20 property.

21 95. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code § 17203, Plaintiff and the
22 Class Members are entitled to restitution of all monies rightfully belonging to them that
23 Defendants did not pay them or otherwise retained by means of their unlawful and unfair business
24 practices.

25 96. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees in
26 connection with their unfair competition claims pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §
27 1021.5, the substantial benefit doctrine and/or the common fund doctrine.
28

///

///



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES

Lab.Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*

**(By Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California,
against all Defendants)**

97. Plaintiff incorporates all paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

98. The “Aggrieved Employees” are all members of the Class defined above who Defendants employed during the period beginning January 10, 2024, and ending on the date that final judgment is entered in this action.

99. Labor Code § 204 states

(a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201, 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 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. ...

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, 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.

(2) An employer is in compliance with the requirements of subdivision (a) of Section 226 relating to total hours worked by the employee, if hours worked in excess of the normal work period during the current pay period are itemized as corrections on the paystub for the next regular pay period. Any corrections set out in a subsequently issued paystub shall state the inclusive dates of the pay period for which the employer is correcting its initial report of hours worked.

(c) However, when employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement that provides different pay arrangements, those arrangements shall apply to the covered employees.

(d) The requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

100. Defendants paid wages to employees on regular intervals. Defendants, however, failed to pay Plaintiff on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked. On information



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants also failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees on such
2 intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked.

3 101. During the applicable time period, Defendants violated California Labor Code §§
4 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

5 102. California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (g) authorize an aggrieved employee, on
6 behalf of themselves and other current or former employees, to bring a civil action to recover civil
7 penalties pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3.

8 103. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff, the State, and the
9 Aggrieved Employees, are entitled to recover civil penalties for each of the Defendants' violations
10 of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198,
11 and 2802 during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:

12 A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars
13 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars
14 (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation
15 (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

16 B. For violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), two hundred fifty dollars
17 (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for initial violation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000.00)
18 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by
19 California Labor Code § 226.3).

20 C. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars
21 (\$50.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for initial violation and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for
22 each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalty amounts
23 established by California Labor Code § 558).

24 D. For violations of California Labor Code § 1174, five hundred dollars
25 (\$500.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each violation of Labor Code § 1174 (penalty
26 amounts established by Labor Code § 1174.5).

27 E. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars
28 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred
fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
(regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed) (penalty amounts
established by California Labor Code § 1197.1).



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

1 F. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194,
2 1198, and 2802, one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for
3 each initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
4 period for each subsequent violation (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code §
2699(f)(2)).

5 104. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
6 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated January 10, 2025, Plaintiff filed written notice online with
7 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and gave written notice by certified
8 mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
9 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct copy
10 of the notice to the LWDA dated January 10, 2025 is attached as Exhibit A. Plaintiff submitted
11 his LWDA notice with a fee in the amount of \$75.00. The LWDA has failed to take action in
12 response within 65 calendar days of the date of Plaintiff’s notice, but Plaintiff anticipates that the
13 LWDA will provide written notice to Plaintiff informing him that it does not intend to investigate
14 these allegations.

15 105. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorney’s fees and costs in
connection with their claims for civil penalties.

17 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 106. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, prays for
19 relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

20 A. An order that the action be certified as a class action with respect to
21 Plaintiff’s claims for violations of California law;

22 B. An order that Plaintiff be appointed class representative;

23 C. An order that counsel for Plaintiff be appointed class counsel;

24 D. Unpaid wages, including minimum, regular, overtime, double-time, split
25 shift, vacation, missed meal period, missed rest period, nonproductive time, rest and recovery
26 time, and reporting time wages;

27 E. Liquidated damages;

28 F. Statutory penalties, including waiting time penalties;



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

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

- G. Civil penalties;
- H. Restitution;
- I. Declaratory relief;
- J. Actual damages;
- K. Pre-judgment interest;
- L. Costs of suit;
- M. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- N. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

VI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all other Class Members, hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

Dated: March 24, 2025

By: 

DAVID G. SPIVAK, Attorney for
Plaintiff, JOSE GONZALEZ-
HERNANDEZ, and all others similarly
situated



SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

Mail:
8605 Santa Monica Bl
PMB 42554
West Hollywood, CA 90069
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
SpivakLaw.com

Office:
1875 Century Park East
Fl 7
Los Angeles, CA 90067

EXHIBIT A



THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

8605 Santa Monica Bl PMB 42554 West Hollywood CA 90069
1801 Century Park East 25th Fl Los Angeles CA 90067
(213) 725-9094
(213) 634-2485
spivaklaw.com

Mail
Office
Tel
Fax
Web

SENT BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION, CERTIFIED MAIL, AND EMAIL

January 10, 2025

Attn: PAGA Administrator
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
<http://dir.tflaforms.net>
Via Electronic Submission

Re: Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez / Colusa Produce

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez (hereafter “Gonzalez-Hernandez” or “Complainant”) provides notice that Colusa Produce Corporation, a California corporation, Colusa Produce Inspection Services, LLC, a Pennsylvania limited liability company, and related entities (collectively “the Colusa Produce Employers” or “the Employers”) violated his rights and those of all other individuals the Colusa Produce Employers have employed or otherwise contracted with in California as hourly and non-exempt, including forklift operators, individuals performing work comparable to the aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions (hereafter the “Aggrieved Employees”) under Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 2802, and related employee protections. On behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved Employees, Gonzalez-Hernandez hereby provides this notice to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency and the Colusa Produce Employers and their agents and representatives.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers have employed persons, conducted business, and engaged in illegal payroll practices and policies, throughout California. Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are “employees” within the meaning of Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 13-2001 (hereafter “the Wage Order”) section 2, subdivision (E) and “Aggrieved Employees” within the meaning of Labor Code section 2699(c).

Statement of Facts

On approximately March 15, 2011, the Colusa Produce Employers began to employ Gonzalez-Hernandez in Meridian in the position of hourly, nonexempt forklift operator. The Colusa Produce Employers continuously employed him in that capacity until on or about March 6, 2024 when his employment ended.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers issued wages to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees on a basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers classified Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay. The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a day, over 40 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over eight hours per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such workdays and workweeks, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid overtime wages. Also, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for overtime hours at overtime premium rates of time and one half their regular rates of pay. Instead, the Colusa Produce Employers paid Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rates of pay for overtime hours worked.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over 12 in a day, and all over the first eight of the seventh day of the workweek. The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over 12 hours per day and over eight hours on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such workdays and workweeks, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid doubletime wages. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for doubletime hours at doubletime premium rates of two times their regular rates of pay. Instead, the Colusa Produce Employers paid Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rates of pay for doubletime hours worked.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees with meal periods within the first five hours of work. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with meal periods as required by law.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four hours worked or major portion thereof. The Colusa Produce Employers restricted Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees to the premises for their rest breaks. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks as required by law.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-

Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to supply mobile phones to perform their job duties. However, the Colusa Produce Employers did not provide these items and did not reimburse Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees for these items or phone bills.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to issue to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Colusa Produce Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees the unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related compensation.

The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to timely pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages as described above during and at the conclusion of employment.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to maintain accurate employee records of Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

For the reasons stated herein, Gonzalez-Hernandez alleges the following violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees:

- (a) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, overtime, and doubletime wages;
- (b) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all meal periods in compliance with California law;
- (c) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks in compliance with California law;

- (d) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the Colusa Produce Employers failed to provide them with one or more meal periods as required by law;
- (e) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the Colusa Produce Employers failed to authorize and permit them to take one or more rest breaks as required by law;
- (f) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to indemnify Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all necessary business expenditures incurred during the discharge of their duties;
- (g) The Colusa Produce Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to issue to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees accurate and complete wage statements;
- (h) The Colusa Produce Employers willfully failed to timely pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with the Colusa Produce Employers and when their employment ended; and
- (i) The Colusa Produce Employers failed to maintain accurate employment records pertaining to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees based on the Colusa Produce Employers' alleged violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Wage Order

The Wage Order applies to "all persons employed in industries preparing agricultural products for market, on the farm whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis." Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines "Industries Preparing Agricultural Products for Market, on the Farm" as

“any operation performed in a permanently fixed structure or establishment on the farm or on a moving packing plant on the farm for the purpose of preparing agricultural, horticultural, egg, poultry, meat, seafood, rabbit, or dairy products for market when such operations are done on the premises owned or operated by the same employer who produced the products referred to herein and includes all operations incidental thereto.”

Wage Order, § 2(H). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Colusa Produce “Employers, Gonzalez-Hernandez, and all of the Aggrieved Employees were covered by the Wage Order because the Colusa Produce Employers operated, and Gonzalez-Hernandez, and all of the Aggrieved Employees worked for, one or more businesses that inspect, process, and package produce. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections the Wage Order provides.

Failure To Pay Wages For All Hours Worked At The Correct
Rates of Pay
(Lab. Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198)

Under Labor Code section 1197, “The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

In relevant part, section 2(G) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so[.]

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1194 states:

- (a) Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney’s fees, and costs of suit.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 510 states:

Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

In relevant part, Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

- (1) The following overtime provisions are applicable to employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee receives one and one-half (1 1/2) times such employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in the workweek. Eight (8) hours of labor constitutes a day's work. Employment beyond eight (8) hours in any workday or more than six (6) days in any workweek is permissible under the following conditions:
 - (a) Any work by an employee in excess of 72 hours in any one workweek shall be on a voluntary basis. No employee shall be discharged or in any other manner discriminated against or refusing to work in excess of 72 hours in any one workweek;
- (2) Overtime hours shall be compensated at: (a) One and one-half (1 1/2) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including 12 hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek; and (b) Double the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 12

hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek.

Labor Code § 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

In conjunction, these provisions of the Labor Code require employers to pay employees no less than their agreed-upon or statutorily mandated wage rates for all hours worked, including hours spent working “off-the-clock” (before punching in or after punching out on a time clock) when the employer knew or reasonably should have known that employees were working during those hours. *Morillion v. Royal Packing Co.* (2000) 22 Cal.4th 575, 585.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods.

The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over eight hours per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such workdays and workweeks, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid overtime wages. Also, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for overtime hours at overtime premium rates of time and one half their regular rates of pay. Instead, the Colusa Produce Employers paid Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rates of pay for overtime hours worked.

The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over 12 hours per day and over eight hours on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such workdays and workweeks, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including time spent in temperature checks and health inspections.

The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. This resulted in unpaid or underpaid doubletime wages. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for doubletime hours at doubletime premium rates of two times their regular rates of pay. Instead, the Colusa Produce Employers paid Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees at their regular rates of pay for doubletime hours worked.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to minimum, regular, overtime, and doubletime wages for all hours they worked at the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez now seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 510, and \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by Labor Code § 558);
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1194, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
3. \$100 for each underpaid aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1197, and \$250 for each underpaid aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation per pay period (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed), in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203 (penalties set by Labor Code § 1197.1) and
4. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code § 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Provide Meal Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198)

In relevant part, section 2(G) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states, “The employment of any employee ... under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.”

In relevant part, Labor Code section 512 states:

An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 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.

In relevant part, section 11 of the Wage Order states:

Meal Periods:

- (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee.
- (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that

if the total hours worked is no more than 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.

- (C) Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty" meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.
- (D) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
- (E) In all places of employment where employees are required to eat on the premises, a suitable place for that purpose shall be designated.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.
- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer 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.

At all relevant times, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. The Colusa Produce Employers denied Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees for time they were restricted to the premises for off-the-clock meal periods. The Colusa Produce Employers also failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees with meal periods within the first five hours of work. Furthermore, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the Colusa Produce Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));
2. \$50 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 512, and \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages (penalties set by Labor Code section 558); and
3. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

// /

// /

// /

// /

Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods
(Lab. Code §§ 226.7 & 1198)

Section 2(G) of the Wage Order states,

“Hours worked” means the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In relevant part, Labor Code section 1198 states,

The employment of any employee . . . under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful.

Section 12 of the Wage Order provides, in relevant part:

Rest Periods:

- (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized 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. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.
- (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

- (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable

statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.

- (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer 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.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to authorize and permit Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. The Colusa Produce Employers did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. The Colusa Produce Employers restricted Gonzalez-Hernandez and the Aggrieved Employees to the premises for their rest breaks. Moreover, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays the Colusa Produce Employers failed to provide Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the Colusa Produce Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226.7, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)); and
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Reimburse for Expenses
(Lab. Code §§ 1198 and 2802)

In pertinent part, Labor Code § 2802(a) states, “An employer shall indemnify his or her employee[s] for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.”

Additionally, the Wage Order states,

- (A) When uniforms are required by the employer to be worn by the employee as a condition of employment, such uniforms shall be provided and maintained by the employer.

...

- (B) When tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft.

Wage Order, §§ 9(A) and (B).

Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits an employer from employing any person under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

As described above, the Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to incur certain business expenses in the course of performing their duties. The Colusa Produce Employers required Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to supply mobile phones to perform their job duties. However, the Colusa Produce Employers did not provide these items and did not reimburse Gonzalez-Hernandez and the other Aggrieved Employees for these items or the phone bills they incurred. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the Colusa Produce Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 2802, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)); and
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements
(Lab. Code § 226)

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to provide an employee, either semi-monthly or at the time of each wage payment, with an accurate and itemized written wage statement that shows:

1. Gross wages earned;
2. Total hours worked by the employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
3. The number of piece rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis;
4. All deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the Employee may be aggregated and shown as one item;
5. Net wages earned;
6. The inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid;
7. The name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement;

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 the employee.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Colusa Produce Employers violated Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and accurately itemize each Aggrieved Employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked, the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the Aggrieved Employee and other requirements of Labor Code section 226. The Colusa Produce Employers failed to state in the wage statements they issued to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned, including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock after clocking-out (as described above). The Colusa Produce Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees the earned but unpaid wages described above. The wage statements do not state all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related compensation. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the Colusa Produce Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$250 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226(a), and \$1,000 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 226.3).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment
(Lab. Code § 204)

Labor Code section 204 states all wages (other than those mentioned in Labor Code sections 201 and 202) earned by any person in any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. Labor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and the 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. In addition, all wages for work performed in excess of the normal work period must be paid by no later than the following regular payday.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for wages earned, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and related compensation, at the intervals stated above. As a result, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to timely pay all earned wages due during employment within the time periods set by Labor Code section 204. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez now seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the Colusa Produce Employers have committed against him and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 204, and \$200 for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee (penalties set by Labor Code section 210).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination of Employment
(Lab. Code §§ 201, 202, and 203)

Under Labor Code § 201, if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. Under § 202, 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. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee who quits without providing a 72-hour notice shall be entitled to receive payment by mail if he or she so requests and designates a mailing address. *Id.* The date of the mailing shall constitute the date of payment for purposes of the requirement to provide payment within 72 hours of the notice of quitting. *Id.*

Under Labor Code § 203, if an employer willfully fails to pay without abatement or reduction, in accordance with §§ 201 and 202, the 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.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees whose employment ended all of the earned but unpaid wages described above by the conclusion of their employment with Gonzalez-Hernandez, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, doubletime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and related compensation. Additionally, the Colusa Produce Employers failed to issue to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees whose employment ended their final paychecks until the next regular pay day following the termination. By failing to pay Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as set forth above at the end of employment, the Colusa Produce Employers are liable for violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203. Accordingly, on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees, Gonzalez-Hernandez seeks civil penalties from the Colusa Produce Employers as follows:

1. For violations of Labor Code § 201, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 201 occurred, and \$200 per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 201 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2));
2. For violations of Labor Code § 202, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 202 occurred, and \$200 per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 202 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)); and
3. For violations of Labor Code § 203, \$100 per aggrieved employee for each of the pay periods in which initial violations of § 203 occurred, and \$200 for per aggrieved employee per pay period in which subsequent violations of § 203 occurred (penalties set by Labor Code § 2699(f)(2)).

Failure to Maintain Accurate Employment Records
(Lab. Code §§ 1174 & 1198)

Labor Code section 1174, which also pertains to recordkeeping, states:

Every person employing labor in this state shall:

...

- (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and the ages of all minors.
- (d) 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 in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.

Labor Code section 1174.5 states:

Any person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

Section 7 of Wage Order states,

- (A) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following:
 - (1) Full name, home address, occupation and social security number.
 - (2) Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.
 - (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods

during which operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be recorded.

- (4) Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board, lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the Employee.
- (5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay. This information shall be made readily available to the employee upon reasonable request.
- (6) When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by the employer.

Labor Code section 1198 prohibits employers from employing their employees under conditions prohibited by the Wage Order.

The Colusa Produce Employers failed to compensate Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all doubletime wages earned, all meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related compensation. As a result, the Colusa Produce Employers have failed to accurately maintain all records required by section 1174 and the Wage Order, including but not limited to Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees' total hours worked, total wages paid, and applicable hourly rates during each payroll period. Accordingly, Gonzalez-Hernandez seeks civil penalties on behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows:

1. \$500 for each aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by Labor Code section 1174.5); and
2. \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

Person Acting on Behalf of Employers who Violates Labor Code
(Labor Code § 558.1)

In relevant part, Labor Code section 558.1 states:

- (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer, who violates, or causes to be violated, any provision regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, or violates, or causes to be violated, Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802, may be held liable as the employer for such violation.
- (b) For purposes of this section, the term “other person acting on behalf of an employer” is limited to a natural person who is an owner, director, officer, or managing agent of the employer, and the term “managing agent” has the same meaning as in subdivision (b) of Section 3294 of the Civil Code.

At all relevant times, was an employer of Gonzalez-Hernandez and all of the other Aggrieved Employees, and/or “owner,” “managing agent,” and/or “officer” of the Colusa Produce Employers and the other employers identified above. directly or indirectly, or through an agent or other person, employed and exercised control over the wages, hours, and/or working conditions of the Aggrieved Employees, and caused the violations to the Labor Code and the Wage Order described above. On behalf of himself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees, Gonzalez-Hernandez seeks the same civil penalties against on the same grounds for which he seeks civil penalties against the Colusa Produce Employers.

///

///

///

///

///

LWDA / The Colusa Produce Employers

Re: Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez

1/10/2025

Page 23 of 23

Conclusion

As noted above, this letter constitutes the required notice under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004. Please be advised that Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez will seek both reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) in a civil action should the LWDA decline to pursue this matter. This letter also serves as a formal notice under the catalyst theory and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 to resolve this matter before litigation.

Sincerely,



David Glenn Spivak, Esq.

david@spivaklaw.com

cc: Mr. Jose Gonzalez-Hernandez

Mr. Walter L. Haines, Esq.

United Employees Law Group, PC

8605 Santa Monica Blvd., PMB 63354

West Hollywood, CA 90069

walter@uelglaw.com

Colusa Produce Corporation

c/o Joe Wallace

Agent for service of process

1954 Progress Rd

Meridian, CA 95957

Colusa Produce Inspection Services, LLC

c/o Registered Agents Inc

1401 21st Street, Ste R

Sacramento, CA 95811