

1 DAVID GLENN SPIVAK (SBN 179684)

david@spivaklaw.com

2 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

8605 Santa Monica Bl

3 PMB 42554

4 West Hollywood, CA 90069

Telephone: (213) 725-9094

5 Facsimile: (213) 634-2485

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff,

7 LUCIA CRUZ FRANCISCO, as an “aggrieved
employee” on behalf of herself and other similarly

8 situated “aggrieved employees” under the Labor

Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004

9 (Additional attorneys for Plaintiff(s) on next page)

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**
12 **(UNLIMITED JURISDICTION)**

13 LUCIA CRUZ FRANCISCO, as an “aggrieved
14 employee” on behalf of herself and other
15 similarly situated “aggrieved employees” under
16 the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of
2004,

17 *Plaintiff,*

18 vs.

19 SOCAL FOOD GROUP, LP, a California
20 limited partnership; and DOES 1–50, inclusive,

21 *Defendants.*
22

Case No. **CVRI 2505862**

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF
THE LABOR CODE AND CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
GENERAL ACT OF 2004, LABOR
CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED



23 SPIVAK LAW
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

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

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

ADDITIONAL ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

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(s),
LUCIA CRUZ FRANCISCO, 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, Lucia Cruz Francisco (hereafter “Plaintiff” or “Cruz Francisco”), on behalf of
2 herself, the State of California, and the other Aggrieved Employees, complains and alleges as
3 follows:

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this representative action based on alleged violations of the
6 California Labor Code and Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 5-2001 (hereafter “the
7 Wage Order”), against Defendants SoCal Food Group, LP, a California limited partnership, and
8 DOES 1-50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”).

9 2. As set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants are liable to
10 her, the State of California, and the Aggrieved Employees (defined below), for civil penalties and
11 other related relief. These claims are based on Defendants’ failures to:

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

14 (B) Provide all meal periods;

15 (C) Authorize and permit all rest breaks;

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

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

18 (F) Issue only accurate and complete itemized wage statements;

19 (G) Timely pay wages during employment;

20 (H) Timely pay wages upon termination of employment; and

21 (I) Maintain accurate employment records.

22 Accordingly, Plaintiff now seeks to recover civil penalties and related relief through this
23 representative action.

24 **II. THE PARTIES**

25 3. Plaintiff Lucia Cruz Francisco is resident of California.

26 4. Defendant SoCal Food Group, LP is a limited partnership organized and existing
27 under the laws of California and also a citizen of California based on Plaintiff’s information and
28 belief.



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

7 6. The “Aggrieved Employees” are all individuals the Defendants have employed or
8 otherwise contracted with in California as hourly, non-exempt workers, including cooks, prep
9 cooks, dishwashers, and cleaners, individuals performing work comparable to the
10 aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions during the period beginning one year before
11 the Plaintiff’s notice of July 09, 2025 to the California Labor and Workforce Development
12 Agency and ending on the date judgment is entered.

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

18 8. At all relevant times, in perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein,
19 Defendants, and each of them, acted pursuant to and in furtherance of a policy, practice, or a lack
20 of a practice which resulted in Defendants not paying Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved
21 Employees in accordance with applicable California labor laws as alleged herein.

22 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each and every one of
23 the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all Defendants,
24 each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control of each of the other
25 defendants, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course and scope of said agency,
26 employment, and/or direction and control.

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

III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. IWC Wage Order 5-2001 (“the Wage Order”) applies to “all persons employed in the public housekeeping industry whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis.”

Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines "Public Housekeeping Industry" to mean

any industry, business, or establishment which provides meals, housing, or maintenance services whether operated as a primary business or when incidental to other operations in an establishment not covered by an industry order of the Commission, and includes, but is not limited to the following:

- (1) Restaurants, night clubs, taverns, bars, cocktail lounges, lunch counters, cafeterias, boarding houses, clubs, and all similar establishments where food in either sold or liquid form is prepared and served to be consumed on the premises;
- (2) Catering, banquet, box lunch service, and similar establishments which prepare food for consumption on or off the premises;
- (3) Hotels, motels, apartment houses, rooming houses, camps, clubs, trailer parks, office or loft buildings, and similar establishments offering rental of living, business, or commercial quarters;
- (4) Hospitals, sanitariums, rest homes, child nurseries, child care institutions, homes for the aged, and similar establishments offering board or lodging in addition to medical, surgical, nursing, convalescent, aged, or child care;
- (5) Private schools, colleges, or universities, and similar establishments which provide board or lodging in addition to educational facilities;
- (6) Establishments contracting for development, maintenance or cleaning of grounds; maintenance or cleaning of facilities and/or quarters of commercial units and living units; and
- (7) Establishments providing veterinary or other animal care services.

Wage Order, § 2(P). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the Defendants, Cruz Francisco, and all of the Aggrieved Employees were covered by the Wage Order because the Defendants operated, and Cruz Francisco, and all of the Aggrieved Employees, worked for one or more restaurants. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to the protections the Wage Order provides.



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 11. On approximately September 15, 2024, the Defendants began to employ Cruz
2 Francisco in Calimesa (Riverside County) in the position of hourly, non-exempt cook, prep cook,
3 dishwasher, and cleaner. The Defendants have continuously employed her since her hire date.

4 12. At all relevant times, the Defendants issued wages to Cruz Francisco and all of the
5 other Aggrieved Employees on a biweekly (26 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour.
6 At all relevant times, the Defendants classified Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved
7 Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage
8 Order.

9 13. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all
10 of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular
11 rates of pay. The Defendants required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work
12 for through meal periods while clock out.

13 14. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all
14 of the other Aggrieved Employees at the correct rates of pay for all hours worked over eight in a
15 day, over 40 in a week, and for the first eight hours of the seventh day of the workweek. The
16 Defendants required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work over eight hours
17 per day, over 40 hours per week, and on the seventh day of the same workweek. During such
18 workdays and workweeks, the Defendants required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved
19 Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

20 15. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of
21 the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. The Defendants
22 scheduled Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to clock out for a meal period over
23 five hours after they began their work shifts. Additionally, the Defendants required Cruz
24 Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to continue working after clocking out for their
25 meal periods. The Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which failed to
26 provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with meal periods as required
27 by law.

28 16. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to authorize and permit Cruz Francisco



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 all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, off-duty, paid rest breaks every four
2 hours worked or major portion thereof. The Defendants did not allow Cruz Francisco and the
3 other Aggrieved Employees to take their paid, duty free, 10-minute rest periods due to
4 understaffing. The Defendants also failed to pay premium wages for days on which failed to
5 authorize and permit Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks
6 as required by law.

7 17. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to issue to Cruz Francisco and all of
8 the other Aggrieved Employees complete and accurate wage statements that state all hours
9 worked at the correct rates of pay, and all wages earned. The Defendants knowingly and
10 intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Cruz Francisco and all of the
11 other Aggrieved Employees the unpaid wages discussed above. The wage statements fail to state
12 all minimum wages earned, all regular wages earned, all overtime wages earned, all meal period
13 premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related information.

14 18. At all relevant times, the Defendants also failed to timely pay Cruz Francisco and
15 all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages as described above during and at the
16 conclusion of employment.

17 19. At all relevant times, the Defendants failed to maintain accurate employee records
18 of Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

19 20. For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff alleges that as a result of Defendants'
20 unlawful practice and policies, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were:

21 A. Not paid all wages earned, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular,
22 and overtime wages for work performed while clocked out;

23 B. Not provided with all off duty meal periods;

24 C. Not authorized and permitted to take all rest break periods;

25 D. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
26 authorize and permit them to take one or more timely rest periods;

27 E. Not paid one hour's pay for each workday in which Defendants failed to
28 provide them with one or more timely meal periods;



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. Not provided with accurate and complete wage statements; and
2 G. Not timely paid all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with
3 Defendants and at the time such employment ended.

4 **IV. FIRST (AND ONLY) CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **CIVIL PENALTIES**

6 **(Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*)**

7 **(By Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the other Aggrieved Employees, against all**
8 **Defendants)**

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

10 22. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have been non-
11 exempt employees entitled to the protections of both the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

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

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

17 24. Section 3 of the Wage Order states:

18 **(A) Daily Overtime - General Provisions**

19 (1) The following overtime provisions are applicable to
20 employees 18 years of age or over and to employees 16 or
21 17 years of age who are not required by law to attend
22 school and are not otherwise prohibited by law from
23 engaging in the subject work. Such employees shall not be
24 employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or
25 more than 40 hours in any workweek unless the employee
26 receives one and one-half (1 ½) times such employee’s
27 regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours in
28 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
provided the employee is compensated for such overtime
at not less than:

(a) One and one-half (1 ½) times the employee’s



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

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.

(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.

(c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly salary as one-fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

25. 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. 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.

29. Labor Code section 1198 makes it unlawful for an employer to employ an



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 employee under conditions that violate the Wage Order.

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

7 31. At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants failed to
8 compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not
9 limited to overtime wages for all overtime hours they worked at the correct rates of pay.

10 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
11 Defendants maintained a policy and/or practice, or lack thereof, which resulted in Defendants'
12 failure to compensate Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked as
13 required by California law.

14 **B. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

15 33. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

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

20 34. In relevant part, In relevant part, California Labor Code § 512 states:

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

27 An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of
28 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.



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

2
3 **Meal Periods**

4 (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of
5 more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less
6 than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not
7 more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the
8 meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the
9 employee and the employee. Unless the employee is
10 relieved of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the
11 meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period
12 and counted as time worked. An 'on duty' meal period shall
13 be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an
14 employee from being relieved of all duty and when by
15 written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid
16 meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state
17 that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at
18 any time.

14 (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
15 in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order,
16 the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at
17 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work
18 day that the meal period is not provided.

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

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

23 (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period
24 or rest period in accordance with a state law, including, but
25 not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable
26 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
27 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
28 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest



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

period is not provided.

37. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 512 and the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees 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.

38. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled to be provided with net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour period of work, or major fraction thereof.

39. Defendants intentionally failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all required 30-minute duty free meal periods and 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the Wage Order.

40. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all timely rest and meal periods. The Defendants scheduled Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to clock out for a meal period over five hours after they began their work shifts. Additionally, the Defendants required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to continue working after clocking out for their meal periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods.

41. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid, duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. The Defendants did not allow Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to take their paid, duty free, 10-minute rest periods due to understaffing. Defendants did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Divisions of Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays they failed to provide them with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

42. 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



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 which resulted in Defendants not providing the and the Aggrieved Employees with all off-duty
2 meal periods and rest breaks required by California law.

3 **C. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST BREAKS**

4 43. In relevant part, California Labor Code § 1198 states:

5 The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor
6 fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and
7 the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment
8 of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or
under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

9 44. In relevant part, Section 12 of the Wage Order states:

10 **Rest Periods**

11 (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees
12 to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the
13 middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall
14 be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10)
15 minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.
16 However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees
17 whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 1/2)
18 hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours
19 worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

20 (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in
21 accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the
22 employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the
23 employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that
24 the rest period is not provided.

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

26 (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during
27 a meal or rest period mandated pursuant to an applicable
28 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



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 regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare
2 Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health
3 Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety
4 and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one
5 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
6 compensation for each work day that the meal or rest
7 period is not provided.

8
9 46. Pursuant to the Wage Order, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled
10 to be authorized and permitted to take net rest breaks of at least ten minutes for each four-hour
11 period of work, or major fraction thereof.

12 47. Defendants intentionally failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
13 Employees to take all 10-minute rest periods free from any work duties in accordance with the
14 Wage Order.

15 48. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the
16 Aggrieved Employees to take all timely rest periods. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay
17 premium wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for days on which they failed to
18 authorize and permit Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees to take timely rest periods.

19 49. At all relevant times, due to high workload and low staffing levels, Defendants
20 failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take ten-minute, paid,
21 duty-free rest breaks every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants did not seek
22 an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of
23 Labor Standards Enforcement. Moreover, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
24 Employees premium wages on workdays they failed to authorize and permit them to take 10-
25 minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

26 50. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times
27 within the applicable limitations period, Defendants had a policy, practice, or a lack of a policy
28 which resulted in Defendants not authorizing and permitting Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
Employees to take all rest breaks required by California law.

///



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 **D. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE AND COMPLETE WRITTEN WAGE**
2 **STATEMENTS**

3 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
4 Employees were entitled to receive, bi-weekly or at the time of each payment of wages, an
5 accurate itemized statement showing: a) gross wages earned; b) net wages earned; c) all applicable
6 hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and d) the corresponding number of hours worked at
7 each hourly rate by the employee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

27 54. As alleged herein, at all relevant times during the applicable limitations period,
28 Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226 because they did not properly and



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 accurately itemize each employee's gross wages earned, net wages earned, the total hours worked,
2 the corresponding number of hours worked at each rate by the employee and other requirements
3 of California Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to state in the wage statements they
4 issued to Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees all their hours worked and wages earned,
5 including, but not limited to, regular and overtime wages for work they performed off-the-clock
6 after clocking-out (as described above).

7 55. Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with
8 accurate wage statements was knowing and intentional. Defendants had the ability to provide
9 Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees with accurate wage statements but intentionally
10 provided wage statements that Defendants knew were not accurate.

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

22 **E. UNTIMELY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT**

23 57. Labor Code § 204 states:

- 24 (a) All wages, other than those mentioned in Section 201,
25 201.3, 202, 204.1, or 204.2, earned by any person in any
26 employment are due and payable twice during each
27 calendar month, on days designated in advance by the
28 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



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

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.

58. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including overtime. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all meal and rest periods in compliance with California laws. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all premium wages on workdays they failed to provide them with one or more meal or rest periods in compliance with California laws. As a result, Defendants failed to timely pay all earned minimum, overtime, and premium wages due during employment within the time periods set by California Labor Code section 204.

///



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. UNTIMELY FINAL WAGES**

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

4 60. Labor Code § 202 provides that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who
5 quits after providing at least 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable at the time of
6 quitting and that all earned and unpaid wages of an employee who quits without providing at least
7 72-hours notice before quitting are due and payable within 72 hours.

8 61. By failing to pay earned minimum and premium wages to Plaintiff and the
9 Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to timely pay them all earned and unpaid wages in
10 violation of Labor Code § 201 or § 202.

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

16 **G. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE EMPLOYMENT RECORDS**

17 63. Labor Code § 1174 states:

18 Every person employing labor in this state shall:

19 ...

- 20
- 21 (c) Keep a record showing the names and addresses of all employees
employed and the ages of all minors.
- 22
- 23 (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
24 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
25 employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall
be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the
26 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
27 personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-
rate units earned.
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 64. Labor Code § 1174.5 states:

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

6 65. Section 7 of the Wage Order states:

7 (a) Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each
8 employee including the following:

9 (1) Full name, home address, occupation, and social security
10 number.

11 (2) Birth date, if under 18 years, and designation as a minor.

12 (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each
13 work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily
14 hours worked shall also be recorded. Meal periods during which
15 operations cease and authorized rest periods need not be
16 recorded.

17 (4) Total wages paid each payroll period, including value of board,
18 lodging, or other compensation actually furnished to the
19 employee.

20 (5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of
21 pay. This information shall be made readily available to the
22 employee upon reasonable request.

23 (6) When a piece rate or incentive plan is in operation, piece rates or
24 an explanation of the incentive plan formula shall be provided to
25 employees. An accurate production record shall be maintained by
26 the employer.

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

 67. On information and belief, Defendants have willfully failed to maintain the records
 required by § 1174 and Wage Order, including, but not limited to, the total premium wages earned
 for missed meal and rest periods, and records pertaining to all unpaid hours worked by Plaintiff
 and the Aggrieved Employees.



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 68. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco seeks an award of civil penalties against the
2 Defendants on behalf of herself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as follows: (1) \$500
3 for each aggrieved employee for each violation of Labor Code section 1174 (penalties set by
4 Labor Code section 1174.5); and (2) \$100 for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation
5 of Labor Code section 1198, and \$200 for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent
6 violation, per pay period (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

7 **H. CIVIL PENALTIES SOUGHT**

8 69. Defendants paid wages to employees on regular intervals. Defendants failed to pay
9 Plaintiff on such intervals for all wages earned and all hours worked. On information and belief,
10 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants also failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees on such intervals for
11 all wages earned and all hours worked.

12 70. During the applicable time period, Defendants violated California Labor Code
13 §§ 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 204, and related Labor Code statutes.

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

17 72. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699(a) and (f), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
18 Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for each of the Defendants' violations of
19 California Labor Code §§ 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, 204, and related Labor
20 Code statutes during the applicable limitations period in the following amounts:

21 A. For violations of California Labor Code § 204, one hundred dollars
22 (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation and two hundred dollars
23 (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee for each subsequent, willful or intentional violation
24 (penalty amounts established by California Labor Code § 210).

25 B. For violations of California Labor Code § 226, \$250 for each Aggrieved
26 Employee for each initial violation of Labor Code section 226(a), and \$1,000 for each Aggrieved
27 Employee for each subsequent violation (penalties set by Labor Code
28 section 226.3); Alternatively, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay



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 period; Alternatively, twenty-five dollars (\$25) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period if
2 the employee could promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the accurate
3 information specified by subdivision (a) of Section 226; and alternatively, fifty dollars (\$50) for
4 each aggrieved employee per pay period if the alleged violation resulted from an isolated,
5 nonrecurring event that did not extend beyond the lesser of 30 consecutive days or four
6 consecutive pay periods.

7 C. For violations of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 512, fifty dollars
8 (\$50.00) for each aggrieved employee for each initial violation for pay period for which the
9 employee was underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each underpaid employee for
10 each pay period for which the employee was underpaid (penalty amounts established by
11 California Labor Code § 558).

12 D. For violations of California Labor Code § 1174, five hundred dollars
13 (\$500.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation (penalty amounts established
14 by Labor Code § 1174.5).

15 E. For violations of California Labor Code § 1197, one hundred dollars
16 (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial and intentional violation and two hundred
17 fifty dollars (\$250.00) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation, per pay period
18 (regardless of whether the initial violations were intentionally committed) (penalty amounts
19 established by California Labor Code § 1197.1).

20 **I. NOTICE TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND DEFENDANTS**

21 73. Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California
22 Labor Code § 2699.3. By letter dated July 09, 2025, Plaintiff gave written notice by certified mail
23 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants of the specific
24 provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and
25 theories to support the alleged violations. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s letter to the LWDA
26 dated July 09, 2025 is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The LWDA has not responded to Plaintiff’s
27 letter.

28 74. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g), Plaintiff and the Aggrieved



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 Employees are entitled to an award of civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs in
2 connection with their claims for civil penalties.

3 **V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

4 75. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Aggrieved Employees, prays
5 for relief and judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 6 A. Civil penalties;
7 B. Costs of suit;
8 C. Reasonable attorneys' fees; and
9 D. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

10 **VI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

11 Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all other Aggrieved Employees, hereby demands a jury
12 trial on all issues so triable.

13 Respectfully submitted,

14 THE SPIVAK LAW FIRM

15
16 Dated: October 15, 2025

17 By:



18 DAVID G. SPIVAK, Attorneys for
19 Plaintiff, LUCIA CRUZ FRANCISCO,
20 as an "aggrieved employee" on behalf
21 of herself and other similarly situated
22 "aggrieved employees" under the
23 Labor Code Private Attorneys General
24 Act of 2004



25 SPIVAK LAW
26 EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

27 Mail:
28 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 Mail
1875 Century Park East Fl 7 Los Angeles CA 90067 Office
(213) 725-9094 Tel
(213) 634-2485 Fax
spivaklaw.com Web

SENT BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION AND CERTIFIED MAIL

July 9, 2025

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

Re: Lucia Cruz Francisco / SoCal Food Group

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, Lucia Cruz Francisco (hereafter “Cruz Francisco” or “Complainant”) provides notice that SoCal Food Group, LP, a California limited partnership, and related entities (collectively “the SoCal Food Group Employers” or “the Employers”) violated her rights and those of all other individuals the SoCal Food Group Employers have employed or otherwise contracted with in California as hourly, non-exempt workers, including cooks, prep cooks, dishwashers, and cleaners, individuals performing work comparable to the aforementioned, and individuals in similar positions (hereafter the “Aggrieved Employees”) under Labor Code sections 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1198, and other Labor Code statutes. On behalf of herself and all other Aggrieved Employees, Cruz Francisco hereby provides this notice to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency and the SoCal Food Group Employers and their agents and representatives.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers have employed persons, conducted business, and engaged in illegal payroll practices and policies, throughout California. Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees are “employees” within the meaning of Industrial Welfare Commission Order No. 5-2001 (hereafter “the Wage Order”) section 2, subdivision (F) and “Aggrieved Employees” within the meaning of Labor Code section 2699(c).

// /
// /
// /

Statement of Facts

On approximately September 15, 2024, the SoCal Food Group Employers began to employ Cruz Francisco in Calimesa and Redlands (Riverside County) in the position of hourly, non-exempt cook, prep cook, dishwasher, and cleaner. The SoCal Food Group Employers continuously employed her in that capacity to the present.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers issued wages to Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees on a biweekly (26 paychecks/year) basis and paid them by the hour. At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers classified Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees as non-exempt employees entitled to the protections of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the applicable minimum or regular rates of pay. The SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely 30-minute, off-duty meal periods. The SoCal Food Group Employers scheduled Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to clock out for a meal period over five hours after they began their work shifts. Additionally, the SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to continue working after clocking out for their meal periods. The SoCal Food Group Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with meal periods as required by law.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to authorize and permit Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers did not allow Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to take their paid, duty free, 10-minute rest periods due to understaffing. The SoCal Food Group Employers also failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to authorize and permit Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks as required by law.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to issue to Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Cruz Francisco 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 meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and other required information.

The SoCal Food Group Employers also failed to timely pay Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned wages as described above during employment.

The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to maintain accurate employee records of Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

For the reasons stated herein, Cruz Francisco alleges the following violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order on behalf of herself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees:

- (a) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to pay Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all wages earned for all hours worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages;
- (b) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all meal periods in compliance with California law;

- (c) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to authorize and permit Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees to take rest breaks in compliance with California law;
- (d) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to provide them with one or more meal periods as required by law;
- (e) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees at one hour's pay for each day in which the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to authorize and permit them to take one or more rest breaks as required by law;
- (f) The SoCal Food Group Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with complete and accurate wage statements;
- (g) The SoCal Food Group Employers willfully failed to timely pay Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees all earned and unpaid wages during their employment with the SoCal Food Group Employers; and
- (h) The SoCal Food Group Employers failed to maintain accurate employment records pertaining to Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees.

Accordingly, Cruz Francisco now seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself and all of the other Aggrieved Employees based on the SoCal Food Group Employers' alleged violations of the Labor Code and the Wage Order.

The Wage Order

The Wage Order applies to "all persons employed in the public housekeeping industry whether paid on a time, piece rate, commission, or other basis." Wage Order, § 1. The Wage Order defines "Public Housekeeping Industry" to mean

any industry, business, or establishment which provides meals, housing, or maintenance services whether operated as a primary business or when incidental to other operations in an establishment not covered by an industry order of the Commission, and includes, but is not limited to the following:

- (1) Restaurants, night clubs, taverns, bars, cocktail lounges, lunch counters, cafeterias, boarding houses, clubs, and all similar establishments where food in either solid or liquid form is prepared and served to be consumed on the premises;
- (2) Catering, banquet, box lunch service, and similar establishments which prepare food for consumption on or off the premises;
- (3) Hotels, motels, apartment houses, rooming houses, camps, clubs, trailer parks, office or loft buildings, and similar establishments offering rental of living, business, or commercial quarters;
- (4) Hospitals, sanitariums, rest homes, child nurseries, child care institutions, homes for the aged, and similar establishments offering board or lodging in addition to medical, surgical, nursing, convalescent, aged, or child care;
- (5) Private schools, colleges, or universities, and similar establishments which provide board or lodging in addition to educational facilities;
- (6) Establishments contracting for development, maintenance or cleaning of grounds; maintenance or cleaning of facilities and/or quarters of commercial units and living units; and
- (7) Establishments providing veterinary or other animal care services.

Wage Order, § 2(P). At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the SoCal Food Group Employers, Cruz Francisco, and all of the Aggrieved Employees were covered by the Wage Order because the SoCal Food Group Employers operated, and Cruz Francisco, and all of the Aggrieved Employees, worked for one or more restaurants. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco 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(K) 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:

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 in a workweek unless the employee receives one and one half (1½) 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 provided the employee is compensated for such overtime at not less than:

- (a) One and one-half (1½) times the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours up to and including twelve (12) hours in any workday, and for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh (7th) consecutive day of work in a workweek;
- (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; and
- (c) The overtime rate of compensation required to be paid to a nonexempt full-time salaried employee shall be computed by using the employee's regular hourly salary as one fortieth (1/40) of the employee's weekly salary.

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 SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

The SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

The SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to work for through meal periods while clock out.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including, but not limited to minimum, regular, and overtime wages for all hours they worked at the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco now seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself 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(K) 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. 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. . . .
- (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 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal 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.

At all relevant times, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with all timely meal periods. The SoCal Food Group Employers denied Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees their 30-minute off-duty meal period within the first five hours of work. The SoCal Food Group Employers scheduled Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to clock out for a meal period over five hours after they began their work shifts. Additionally, the SoCal Food Group Employers required Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to continue working after clocking out for their meal periods. Furthermore, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to pay premium wages for days on which they failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with timely meal periods. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the SoCal Food Group Employers have committed against her 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(K) 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 SoCal Food Group Employers failed to authorize and permit Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers did not seek an exemption from the rest period protections of the Wage Order from the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement. The SoCal Food Group Employers did not allow Cruz Francisco and the other Aggrieved Employees to take their paid, duty free, 10-minute rest periods due to understaffing. Moreover, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to pay Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees premium wages on workdays the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to provide Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees with 10-minute rest periods every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that the SoCal Food Group Employers have committed against her 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 Provide Accurate and Complete 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 SoCal Food Group 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 SoCal Food Group Employers failed to state in the wage statements they issued to Cruz Francisco 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 SoCal Food Group Employers knowingly and intentionally failed to state on the wage statements they issued to Cruz Francisco 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 meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and other required information.

Accordingly, Cruz Francisco seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the SoCal Food Group Employers have committed against her 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 SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees for wages earned, including minimum wages, regular wages, overtime wages, unprovided meal period premium wages, unprovided rest break premium wages, and other compensation, at the intervals stated above. As a result, the SoCal Food Group Employers failed to timely pay all earned wages due during employment within the time periods set by Labor Code section 204. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco now seeks civil penalties for the Labor Code violations that the SoCal Food Group Employers have committed against her 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 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 SoCal Food Group Employers failed to compensate Cruz Francisco 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 meal period premium wages earned, all rest break premium wages earned, and related compensation. As a result, the SoCal Food Group Employers have failed to accurately

LWDA / The SoCal Food Group Employers
Re: Lucia Cruz Francisco
July 9, 2025
Page 18 of 18

maintain all records required by section 1174 and the Wage Order, including but not limited to Cruz Francisco and all of the other Aggrieved Employees' total hours worked, total wages paid, and applicable hourly rates during each payroll period. Accordingly, Cruz Francisco seeks civil penalties on behalf of herself 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)).

Conclusion

As noted above, this letter constitutes the required notice under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004. Please be advised that Lucia Cruz Francisco 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 Spivak, Esq.
David@spivaklaw.com

cc: Lucia Cruz Francisco
Walter L. Haines, Esq.

SoCal Food Group, LP
c/o Omar Boukai, Agent for Service of Process
32 Edelman
Irvine, CA 92618