Raymond P. Boucher, State Bar No. 115364
ray@boucher.la
Alexander Gamez, State Bar No. 309708
gamez@boucher.la
BOUCHER LLP
21600 Oxnard Street, Suite 600
Woodland Hills, California 91367-4903
Tel: (818) 340-5400
Fax: (818) 340-5401

Sahag Majarian II, State bar No.146621
sahag@majarianlawgroup.com
Garen Majarian, State Bar No. 334104
garen@majarianlawgroup.com
MAJARIAN LAW GROUP, APC
18250 Ventura Blvd.
Tarzana, CA 91356
Tel: (818) 263-7343
Fax: (818) 609-0892

Per local Rule, This case is assigned to Judge Weil, Edward G, for all purposes.

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mary Ann Contreras, Aggrieved Employee of Defendants, on Behalf of the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency for All Aggrieved Employees of Defendants

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

MARY ANN CONTRERAS, Aggrieved Employee of Defendants, on Behalf of the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency for All Aggrieved Employees of Defendants, Plaintiff, v. HONEYBEE FOODS CORPORATION DBA JOLLIBEE, a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-100, Inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. C25-02331 **<u>REPRESENTATIVE ACTION</u>** **COMPLAINT FOR:** **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA'S LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004 (CAL. LAB. CODE 2698, *ET SEQ*.)** **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff MARY ANN CONTRERAS (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), who is an aggrieved employee of Defendants HONEYBEE FOODS CORPORATION DBA JOLLIBEE and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, (collectively, "Defendants"), brings this representative action as proxy for the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants in California, and hereby alleges the following facts and claims against Defendants, and respectfully request civil penalties, all other available relief, and a trial by jury of all issues and causes of action so triable.

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff brings this representative action as the proxy for the State of California's LWDA against Defendants for civil penalties pursuant to California's Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (hereinafter, the "PAGA"), Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*., resulting from Defendants' violations of "wage and hour" laws protective of Defendants' aggrieved employees under the California Labor Code and the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Orders. The PAGA permits an aggrieved employee to bring a representative action as the State's designated proxy on behalf of herself and all other current and former non-exempt aggrieved employees of an employer to recover civil penalties for violation of California's Labor Code.

2. Defendants' systematic pattern of Labor Code and IWC Wage Order violations toward Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees include, but are not limited to:

a. Failure to compensate for all hours worked in violation of Labor Code sections 204, 1194, 1197, and 1198;

b. Failure to pay all overtime wages owed for time worked in violation of Labor Code section 510;

c. Failure to provide meal periods and/or premium pay for non-compliant meal periods in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, and 1199 and Section 11 of the IWC Wage Order(s);

d. Failure to authorize and permit all paid rest periods and/or provide premium pay for non-compliant rest periods in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 1197, 1198, and 1199, and Section 12 of the IWC Wage Order(s);

e. Failure to provide payment for sick leave in violation of Labor Code sections 246, 248.2, 248.5;

f. Failure to indemnify for business expenses in violation of Labor Code section 2802; and

g. Failure to furnish accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226(a).

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff MARY ANN CONTRERAS is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). Plaintiff is and, at all relevant times mentioned in this Complaint, was a California citizen residing within Contra Costa County, California. Plaintiff has been employed by Defendants in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February of 2015 to the present. Plaintiff is currently employed as an hourly assistant manager at Defendant's Concord location. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff was an "employee" as that term is used in the Labor Code. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff was subject to various policies, procedures, and practices implemented by Defendants that, as alleged herein, were and are in violation of the Labor Code.

4. Defendant HONEYBEE FOODS CORPORATION DBA JOLLIBEE is and at all relevant times herein was a Delaware Corporation, having its principal place of business at 100 N. Barranca Street, Suite 1200 West Covina, CA 91791, and is the owner and operator of an industry, business and/or facility licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California as a fast-food chain. Defendant HONEYBEE FOODS CORPORATION is an "employer" as the term is used in the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

5. The Defendants sued by the fictitious names DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are on information and belief now, and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were licensed to do business and/or actually doing business in California, including Contra Costa County, and each of the fictitiously named Defendants are responsible for the conduct alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive and for that reason, DOES 1 through 100 are sued under such

fictitious names pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure ("Code of Civil Procedure") section 474. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to allege such names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained.

6. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were in some manner legally responsible for the events, happenings and circumstances alleged in this Complaint.

7. Defendants, and each of them, proximately subjected Plaintiff to the unlawful practices, wrongs, complaints, injuries and/or damages alleged in this Complaint.

8. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned herein were the agents, servants and/or employees of some or all other Defendants, or vice-versa, and in doing the things alleged in this Complaint, Defendants are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were acting within the course and scope of that agency, servitude and/or employment.

9. Defendants, and each of them, are now and/or at all times mentioned in this Complaint were members of and/or engaged in a joint venture, partnership and common enterprise, and were acting within the course and scope of, and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership and common enterprise.

10. Defendants, and each of them, at all times mentioned in this Complaint concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants in proximately causing the complaints, injuries and/or damages alleged in this Complaint.

11. Defendants, and each of them, at all times mentioned in this Complaint approved of, condoned and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts and/or omissions alleged in this Complaint.

12. Defendants, and each of them, at all times mentioned in this Complaint aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and every one of the other Defendants thereby proximately causing the damages alleged in this Complaint.

<u>JURISDICTION AND VENUE</u>

13. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all

causes except those given by statute to other trial courts." The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other specific basis for jurisdiction.

14. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because both the individual and aggregate monetary damages and restitution sought herein exceed the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established at trial, according to proof.

15. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction over Defendants because they are corporations and/or entities and/or persons with sufficient minimum contacts in California, are citizens of California, or otherwise intentionally availed themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. There is no federal question at issue as the issues herein are based solely on California statutes and law, including the Labor Code. Thus, this Court maintains appropriate jurisdiction to hear this matter.

16. Venue is proper in the Superior Court of California for the County of Contra Costa, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 395(a) and Code of Civil Procedure section 395.5 in that liability arose in Contra Costa County because at least some of the acts and omissions that are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred therein and/or each Defendant either is found, maintains offices, transacts business, exists, and/or has an agent in Contra Costa County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

17. During the applicable statutory period, Defendants have employed Plaintiff as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2015 to the present.

18. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked and overtime hours worked after eight hours in a day and/or after forty hours in a week. For example, Plaintiff is required to participate in group texts to discuss various matters while off the clock, including but not limited to scheduling. On other occasions, Plaintiff is required to send photos of work-related items. As such, Plaintiff is not paid for all time under which she is subject to the control of Defendants.

19. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants further failed to compensate Plaintiff for all overtime hours worked based upon the appropriate regular rate of pay by not

taking into account all renumeration paid, including relevant shift differentials earned by Plaintiff.

20. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed and fail to provide Plaintiff with compliant thirty minute off-duty thirty-minute-long meal periods for work periods and failed to pay her premium wages at the regular rate of pay thereto. For example, Plaintiff often had to take late and/or interrupted meals and was not paid meal period premiums for the incompliant meal periods. If Plaintiff was paid premium wages, they were incompliant pursuant to *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878 by virtue that Defendants failed to properly calculate the regular rate of pay by not including all renumeration paid.

21. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff to provide her with legally-compliant ten (10) minute off-duty rest periods for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, as required by California law and failed to pay premiums for the incompliant rest periods. Furthermore, if Plaintiff was able to take rest periods, they were incompliant because she was required to remain on premises during the rest periods.

22. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff for all vested sick time earned at the correct accrual rates in accordance with her employment contracts and/or Defendants' policies. For example, Plaintiff worked a total of 537.93 hours from January 1 to April 20, 2025. If Defendants had calculated the accrued sick time pursuant to Labor Code section 246(b)(1), she should have been entitled to 17.93 hours. However, Plaintiff was only paid 10.68 hours with no balance left for her sick pay on her April 25, 2025 wage statement. Lastly, if Plaintiff was paid sick pay, the amounts paid were also incorrect because Defendants failed to incorporate all renumeration paid, like shift differential pay, when calculating the regular rate of pay for sick time.

23. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff for all necessary expenditures incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of her duties by requiring Plaintiff to use her personal cell phone and service data to participate in group texts to discuss scheduling and send photos of work-related items, and was not reasonably reimbursed for the costs incurred.

24. During the relevant statutory period, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with

accurate itemized wage statements. As a result of the alleged violations discussed above, Defendants furnished wage statements that failed to correctly show, among other items: (1) gross wages earned, (2) all deductions, and (3) net wages earned.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees are current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants that work or worked at Defendants' facilities in California as non-exempt employees during the statutory period.

26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that during the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff and other current and former aggrieved employees were subject to the same various policies, procedures, and practices implemented by Defendants that, as alleged herein, were and are in violation of the Labor Code.

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and overtime hours worked after eight hours in a day and/or after forty hours in a week due to Defendants' policy and practice of not compensating Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all time they are subject to Defendant's control.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants further failed to compensate Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked based upon the appropriate regular rate of pay by not taking into account all renumeration paid, including relevant shift differentials earned by Plaintiff and aggrieved employees.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants failed and fail to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees with compliant thirty minute off-duty thirty-minute-long meal periods for work periods and failed to pay them premium wages at the regular rate of pay thereto. If Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were premium wages, they were incompliant pursuant to *Ferra* by virtue that Defendants failed to properly calculate the regular rate of pay by not including all renumeration paid.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy

and/or practice, Defendants failed to relinquish control over Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to provide them with legally-compliant ten (10) minute off-duty rest periods for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, as required by California law and failed to pay premiums for the incompliant rest periods. Furthermore, if Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were able to take rest periods, they were incompliant because they were required to remain on premises during the rest periods.

31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants failed and fail to compensate Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all vested sick time earned at the correct accrual rates in accordance with their employment contracts and/or Defendants' policies. Lastly, if Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were paid sick pay, the amounts paid were incorrect because Defendants failed to incorporate all renumeration paid, like shift differential pay, when calculating the regular rate of pay for sick time.

32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants failed to indemnify Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all necessary expenditures incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that as a matter of policy and/or practice, Defendants, failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees with accurate itemized wage statements. As a result of alleged violations discussed above, Defendants furnished wage statements that failed to correctly show, among other items: (1) the gross wages earned, (2) all deductions, and (3) net wages earned.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq*.)

34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every one of the allegations contained in the preceding and foregoing paragraphs of this complaint, as though fully set forth herein.

35. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*., Plaintiff seeks to recover all

applicable civil penalties and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, permitted under PAGA through a representative action on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees that work or worked for Defendants during the relevant time period.

36. In accordance with *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969, a representative action is not subject to the formalities required of a class action and class certification of PAGA claims is not required.

37. Plaintiff is an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code section 2699(c) because she was employed by Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code violations, as alleged herein. Thus, Plaintiff is well suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees in in this PAGA representative action.

38. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(i), seventy-five percent (75%) of civil penalties recovered by aggrieved employees shall be distributed to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (hereinafter "LWDA") for enforcement of labor laws and education of employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities under this code, and twenty-five percent (25%) shall be distributed to the aggrieved employees.

39. Plaintiff's representative action alleges violations of certain Labor Code sections that are listed within Labor Code section 2699.5. Accordingly, Labor Code section 2699.3(a) applies to this action, and Labor Code section 2699.3(b)-(c) do not apply.

40. On June 9, 2025, Plaintiff complied with Labor Code section 2699.3(a) by electronically filing written notice with the LWDA and serving written notice, via certified mail, upon the LWDA and Defendants regarding the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated by Defendants and Plaintiff's intent to pursue civil penalties against Defendants on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of Plaintiff's notice letter.

41. Labor Code section 2699.3(a) provides in pertinent part that: "The agency shall notify the employer and the aggrieved employee or representative by certified mail that it does not intend to investigate the alleged violation within 60 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice received… [u]pon receipt of that notice or if no notice is provided within 65 calendar days

of the postmark date of the notice given… the aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to Section 2699."

42. Sixty-five calendar days have passed since Plaintiff served notice upon the LWDA and Defendants, and the LWDA did not provide notice of its intent to investigate Plaintiff's claims. Accordingly, Plaintiff exhausted her obligation to provide administrative notice and is authorized to commence this representative action seeking civil penalties on behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees of Defendants.

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

44. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), for all provisions of the Labor Code for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided, there is established a civil penalty that imposes a penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

45. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and aggrieved employees, seeks applicable civil penalties for violations of Labor Code sections 204, 226, 226.7, 246, 248.2, 248.5, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1199, and 2802 during the statutory period as set forth below:

a. For violations of Labor Code section 204, 226.7, 246, 248.2, 248.5, 510, 512, 1194, 1197 1198, 1199, Labor Code section 2699(f)(2) imposes a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

b. For violations of Labor Code section 204, Labor Code section 210 imposes a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was willful or intentional;

c. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by not paying Plaintiff and aggrieved employees all wages owed for all hours worked for each pay period as a result of Defendants' policy or practice of subjecting them to Defendant's control while off the clock. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

d. Defendants further violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 1199 by not paying Plaintiff and aggrieved employees all wages owed for all hours worked for each pay period as a result of Defendants' policy or practice of failing to pay all overtime compensation based upon the regular rate of pay by not taking into account all renumeration paid, including shift differentials, as alleged herein. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

e. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 by denying Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees an opportunity to take timely off-duty and uninterrupted thirty minute meal periods for every five hours worked, including timely off-duty and uninterrupted thirty minute long meal periods before the end of the fifth hour of work, and by failing to pay a premium wage equivalent to an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay for each day a compliant meal period was not provided. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

f. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 by denying Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of Defendants a ten minute off-duty rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, and by failing to provide a premium wage equivalent to an additional hour of pay at the regular rate of pay for each workday that a compliant rest period was not provided. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

g. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 and 248 by willfully failing to properly compensate Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for all vested sick time earned at the correct accrual rates in accordance with their employment contracts and/or Defendants' policies when they sought sick leave. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation of these sections, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

h. Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 by forcing Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to make business related expenditures without reimbursement. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

i. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a) by failing to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees with accurate itemized wage statements correctly identifying, among other things, the correct wages earned, the correct amount of net wages earned, and the correct amount of deductions that were paid or should have been paid. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3 and 2699(a), Defendants, in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from any other penalty, are subject to a civil penalty for violation Labor Code section 226(a) in the amount of two hundred and fifty dollars ($250) per aggrieved employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per aggrieved employee for each violation in a subsequent citation;

46. At all material times, Defendants were Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees' employers, or persons acting on their behalf, within the meaning of Labor Code section 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in the applicable IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code section 558. The civil penalties provided for under Labor Code section 558 are in addition to any other civil penalty provided by law.

47. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699(a), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of fifty dollars ($50) for each initial violation and one hundred dollars ($100) for each subsequent violation of Labor Code sections 510 and 1194 for each pay period for which Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees of Defendants were not paid all wages owed as a result of Defendants' failure to pay wages owed for all overtime, as alleged herein.

48. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699(a), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty of fifty dollars ($50) for each initial violation and one hundred dollars ($100) for each subsequent violation of Labor Code section 226.7 for each pay period for which Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees of Defendants were not provided with a compliant timely off-duty and uninterrupted thirty minute meal period and/or ten minute long rest periods for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as alleged herein.

49. Defendants violated Labor Code section 1198 by failing to comply with the maximum hours of work and the standards conditions of labor fixed by the IWC under the "Hours and Days of Work", and "Record" sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order, by failing to keep and provide accurate records, and failing to timely pay owed wages upon separation of employment, as alleged herein. Thus pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2), Defendants are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars ($200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

1. For all civil penalties authorized by Labor Code section 2698, *et seq*.;

2. For civil penalties under Labor Code section 226.3 in the amount two hundred fifty dollars ($250) per aggrieved employee for the first violation, and one thousand dollars ($1,000) per aggrieved employee for each subsequent violation;

3. For civil penalties under Labor Code section 210 in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation that was neither willful nor intentional, and two hundred dollars ($200.00) for each aggrieved employee, plus twenty-five percent (25%) of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, for each subsequent violation, regardless of whether the subsequent violation was willful or intentional;

4. For civil penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f), for Labor Code violations without a specific civil penalty, in the amount of one hundred dollars ($100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each initial violation and two hundred dollars ($200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

5. For civil penalties under Labor Code section 558, as follows: (1) for an initial violation, fifty dollars ($50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid; (2) for each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars ($100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid;

6. For an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(g)(1), or other applicable laws;

7. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and

8. For such additional relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

DATED: August 14, 2025

BOUCHER LLP

By: ______________________________

RAYMOND P. BOUCHER
ALEXANDER GAMEZ

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mary Ann Contreras, Aggrieved Employee of Defendants, on Behalf of the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency for All Aggrieved Employees of Defendants

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all claims alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint to the fullest extent authorized by law.

DATED: August 14, 2025

BOUCHER LLP

By: ______________________________

RAYMOND P. BOUCHER
ALEXANDER GAMEZ

Attorneys for Plaintiff Mary Ann Contreras, Aggrieved Employee of Defendants, on Behalf of the State of California's Labor and Workforce Development Agency for All Aggrieved Employees of Defendants

EXHIBIT 1

BOUCHERLLP

21600 Oxnard Street, Suite 600
Woodland Hills, California 91367

Telephone 818.340.5400
Facsimile 818.340.5401

June 9, 2025

ELECTRONICALLY FILED

Attn: PAGA Administrator
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, California 94612
https://dir.tfaforms.net/308

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Honeybee Foods Corporation
c/o Agent for Service of Process
Amanda Garcia
330 N Brand Blvd
Glendale, CA 91203

Re: *Contreras v. Honeybee Foods Corporation, et al.*
Notice Regarding Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 Claim

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to section 2699.3 of the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA" or "the Act") (Lab. Code § 2698 *et seq*.), this letter shall serve as written notice of claims for civil penalties that will be pursued by Ms. Mary Ann Contreras as proxy for the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") on behalf of all non-exempt aggrieved employees employed by Honeybee Foods Corporation, DBA Jollibee, ("HFC") in California during the statutory period, against HFC.

HFC is a fast-food chain that is headquartered at 100 N. Barranca Street, Suite 1200 West Covina, CA 91791 and owns and operates approximately 33 locations throughout the State.[1] Ms. Contreras has been employed by HFC from approximately February 2015 to the present. She currently works as an hourly assistant manager at HFC's location in Concord, California. Pursuant to California law, HFC was and is at all relevant times Ms. Contreras's employer during the statutory period.

[1] https://locations.jollibeefoods.com/usa/ca

In her representative action, Ms. Contreras will seek civil penalties pursuant to PAGA as a result of HFC's failure to: (1) compensate for all hours worked, including overtime (Lab. Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1198); (2) provide proper meal periods and/or premium pay for non-compliant meal periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 1199); (3) provide proper rest periods and/or premium pay for non-compliant rest periods (Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 558, 1197, 1198, 1199); (4) provide paid sick time payment for sick leave (Lab. Code §§ 246, 248.2, 248.5) (5) indemnify for business expenses (Lab. Code § 2802); and (6) furnish complete and accurate itemized wage statements (Lab. Code § 226(a)).

FAILURE TO PAY HOURLY AND OVERTIME WAGES
(Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2699)

Labor Code section 204 states that "all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period."

Pursuant to Labor Code section 510, non-exempt employees are entitled to 1.5 times their hourly rate of pay for any work performed in excess of 8 hours in a day or any work performed in excess of 40 hours per week, and twice their regular hourly rate for any work performed past 12 hours in one day or past 8 hours on the seventh consecutive day.

Labor Code section 1194(a) states, "Notwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable 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."

Labor Code section 1197 states, in pertinent part, "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 minimum wage so fixed is unlawful."

Labor Code section 1198 states, in pertinent part, "The employment of any employee… under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful."

In relevant part, Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order states that, "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."

In relevant part, Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order states that, "Every employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission or otherwise."

Upon information and belief, during Ms. Contreras's employment, HFC failed and fails to compensate her and aggrieved employees for all hours worked and overtime hours worked after eight hours in a day and/or after forty hours in a week due to HFC's policy and practice of requiring Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees to participate in group texts to discuss various matters while off the clock, including but not limited to scheduling. On other occasions, employees are also required to send photos of work-related items.

Moreover, upon information and belief, during Ms. Contreras' employment, HFC failed and fails to compensate her and aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked after eight hours in a day and/or after forty hours in a week due to HFC's policy and practice of failing to compensate her and aggrieved employees all overtime compensation based upon the appropriate regular rate of pay by not properly taking into account all renumeration paid, including relevant shift differentials earned by Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will pursue civil penalties and all available remedies to the extent allowed by law for the alleged violations.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS

(Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), 558, 1198, 2699, and the "Meal Periods" Section of the Applicable Wage Order)

Labor Code section 226.7(b) states, in pertinent part, "An employer shall not require an employee to work during meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission"

Labor Code section 226.7(c), provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with statute or an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, 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 period is not provided.

Labor Code section 512(a) states, in pertinent part, "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… [a]n employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than thirty minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee only if the first meal period was not waived."

Labor Code section 1198 states, in pertinent part, "The employment of any employee… under conditions of labor prohibited by the [Wage Order] is unlawful."

In relevant part, Section 2 of the applicable Wage Order states that, "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."

Section 11 of the applicable Wage Order provides that:

(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. 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.

(B) 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 employer's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

The California Supreme Court in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 878, held that the "regular rate of compensation" under meal period rules, like "regular rate of pay" under overtime rules, "encompasses not only hourly wages but all nondiscretionary payments for work performed by the employee."

Upon information and belief, HFC failed and fails to provide Ms. Contreras and aggrieved with compliant thirty minute off-duty meal periods for work periods and failed to pay them premium wages at their regular rates of pay. For example, Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees often had to take late and/or interrupted meals and were not paid meal period premiums for the incompliant meal periods. If Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees were premium wages, they were incompliant pursuant to *Ferra* by virtue that HFC failed to properly calculate the regular rate of pay by not including all renumeration paid.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will pursue civil penalties and all available remedies to the extent allowed by law for the alleged violations.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS

(Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1197, 1198, 2699, and the "Rest Periods" Section of the Applicable Wage Order)

Labor Code section 1198 states, in pertinent part, "The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful."

Labor Code section 226.7(b) states, in pertinent part, "An employer shall not require an employee to work during meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission."

Pursuant to *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2017) 2 Cal.5th 257, 260, "[d]uring required rest periods, employers must relieve their employees of all duties and relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time."

Labor Code section 226.7(c), provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with statute or an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, 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 period is not provided.

Section 12 of the applicable Wage Order provides that:

(A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle each work period. The authorized rest period 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.

(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 compensations for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

Upon information and belief, HFC's policies and practices failed and fails to provide Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees with off-duty rest periods of at least ten minutes for each four hour work period, or major fraction thereof, and failed and fail to pay them a premium wage at their regular rates of pay on workdays they failed to provide them with an opportunity to take rest periods. Ms. Contreras and other employees typically worked and work eight hours per day, and HFC's policies and practices routinely prevented and prevent them from taking the off-duty ten-minute rest breaks they are entitled to by making Ms. Contreras and other aggrieved employees either miss their rest periods altogether, work through their rest periods, take untimely rest periods, or take shortened rest periods. Furthermore, if Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees were able to take rest periods, they were incompliant because they were required to remain on premises during the rest periods.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will pursue civil penalties and all available remedies to the extent allowed by law for the alleged violations.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE PAYMENT FOR SICK LEAVE

(Labor Code §§ 246, 248.5, 2699)

Labor Code section 246(a)(1) provides that an employee who, on or after July 1, 2015, works in California for the same employer for 30 or more days within a year from the commencement of employment is entitled to paid sick days.

Labor Code section 246(b)(1) provides that an employee shall accrue paid sick days at the rate of not less than one hour per every 30 hours worked, beginning at the commencement of employment, subject to the use and accrual limitations set forth in this section.

Labor Code section 246(n) provides that an employer shall provide payment for sick leave taken by an employee no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period after the sick leave was taken.

Labor Code section 248.5(a)(2) states that if paid sick days were unlawfully withheld, the dollar amount of paid sick days withheld from the employee multiplied by three, or two hundred fifty dollars ($250), whichever amount is greater, but not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), shall be included in the administrative penalty.

Upon information and belief, Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees accrued sick time throughout their employment, but Defendants failed to properly accrue and compensate them for all vested sick time earned at the correct accrual rates in accordance with their employment contracts and/or HFC's policies when they sought sick leave. For example, Ms. Contreras worked a total of 537.93 hours from January 1 to April 20, 2025. If HFC had calculated the accrued sick time pursuant to Labor Code section 246(b)(1), she should have been entitled to 17.93 hours. However, Ms. Contreras was only paid 10.68 hours with no balance left for her sick pay on her April 25, 2025 wage statement. Lastly, if Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees were paid sick pay, the amounts paid were also incorrect because like the overtime issue identified above, HFC failed to incorporate all renumeration paid, like shift differential pay, when calculating the regular rate of pay for sick time.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will pursue civil penalties and all available remedies to the extent allowed by law for the alleged violations.

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

(Labor Code § 2802)

In pertinent part, Labor Code section 2802(a) states that, "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. At relevant times during the statutory period, HFC required Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees to incur business expenses which HFC failed and/or refused to reimburse them for. For example, Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees were and are required to use their cell phone and service data to participate in group texts to discuss scheduling and send photos of work-related items, and were and are not reasonably reimbursed for the costs incurred.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will pursue civil penalties and all available remedies to the extent allowed by law for the alleged violations.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

(Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3, and 2699)

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to provide an employee with an accurate itemized wage statement that shows: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (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 pay; (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee.

For violations of Labor Code section 226(a), Labor Code section 226.3 imposes a civil penalty on any employer that violates section 226(a) in the amount of $250.00 per employee per violation in an initial citation and $1,000.00 per employee for each subsequent violation. The civil penalties provided for in Labor Code section 226.3 are in addition to any other penalty provided by law.

HFC failed to furnish accurate wages statements to Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees. As a result of the alleged violations discussed above, HFC furnished wage statements to Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees that failed to correctly show, among other items: (1) gross wages earned, (2) all deductions, and (3) net wages earned.

Accordingly, Ms. Contreras on behalf of aggrieved employees, will seek to recover available civil penalties for violations of Labor Code 226(a).

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF THE LABOR CODE AND IWC WAGE ORDERS
(Labor Code § 558)

Labor Code section 558 subjects any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates Part 2, Chapter 1, of the Labor Code (Labor Code §§ 500-558), or any provision regulating the hours and days in any IWC Wage Order, to a civil penalty in the amount of $50 for any initial violation for each pay period in which an employee is underpaid, and $100 for each subsequent violation.

As set forth above, HFC failed to pay all overtime compensation and provide Ms. Contreras and aggrieved employees compliant meal periods and/or rest periods and failed to pay premium wages owed. Accordingly, Ms. Contreras, on behalf of aggrieved employees, will seek to recover civil penalties under Labor Code section 558.

CONCLUSION

The allegations set forth herein are supported by, among other things, records and documents from Ms. Contreras's employment with HFC, including but not limited to wage statements and Ms. Contreras's confirmation of HFC's unlawful practices and policies. As a result of the foregoing violations, Ms. Contreras is entitled to file a Complaint and invoke the protections of the Act. Ms. Contreras has placed HFC on notice by mailing a certified copy of this notice to their corporate headquarters and/or authorized agents.

Very truly yours,

BOUCHER LLP

By: ______________________
Alexander Gamez, Esq.

cc via email:
Sahag Majarian II
Garen Majarian
Majarian Law Group, APC
18250 Ventura Boulevard
Tarzana, California 91356
sahag@majarianlawgroup.com
garen@majarianlawgroup.com