

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Xavier L. Woodford (State Bar No. 355326)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com
xavier@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Joshua Silva

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
10/30/2025 1:18:00 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By J. Ortler ,Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

JOSHUA SILVA, on behalf of others similarly
situated and the State of California under the
Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SIMAYA INC.; AMERICAN HIGH, INC.; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CU047872C

Judge: Blaine K. Bowman
Department: 74

CLASS ACTION

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages Owed
2. Failure to Pay All Overtime Wages
3. Meal Period Violations
4. Rest Period Violations
5. Paid Sick Leave Violations
6. Unpaid Reporting Time Wages
7. Untimely Payment of Wages
8. Wage Statement Violations
9. Waiting Time Penalties
10. Unfair Competition
11. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys
General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

Action Filed: September 10, 2025

1 Plaintiff JOSHUA SILVA, on behalf of all others similarly situated and the State of California
2 under the Private Attorneys General Act (“Plaintiff”) brings this FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
3 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants SIMAYA INC.; AMERICAN
4 HIGH, INC.; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), alleging as follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This is a class action filed for wage and hour violations of the California Labor Code.

7 2. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and class members for all hours suffered or
8 permitted to work in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

9 3. Defendants’ underpayment of wages was facilitated by their company-wide practices
10 of requiring off-the-clock work.

11 4. Defendants also underpaid overtime, paid sick leave, and premiums by failing to
12 properly calculate the regular rate of pay.

13 5. Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and/or permit Plaintiff and the class members
14 to take compliant meal and rest periods to which they were entitled. Yet, Defendants did not pay all
15 meal and rest period premiums.

16 6. Defendants failed to pay reporting time wages to Plaintiff and the class members.

17 7. Defendants’ employment policies, practices, and payroll administration systems
18 enabled and facilitated these violations on a company-wide basis with respect to the class members.

19 8. Defendants are further liable for derivative claims for wage statements, untimely
20 payment, and other associated violations.

21 9. Plaintiff seeks to recover the underpaid damages, plus associated penalties, interests,
22 attorney’s fees and costs.

23 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

24 10. Jurisdiction of this action is proper in this Court under Article VI, Section 10 of the
25 California Constitution as the causes of action are premised upon violations of California law.

26 11. The monetary damages and restitution sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of
27 the Superior Court.

12. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves to the California economy so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

13. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure sections 393(a), 395, and/or 395.5 because, upon information and belief, Defendants conducted business and committed some of the alleged violations in this County.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Joshua Silva

14. Plaintiff Silva is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee from about December 2024 to March 2025. Plaintiff worked as a Line Cook.

15. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party in interest.”])). To the extent permitted by law, including pursuant *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting, Inc.* (2024) 101 Cal. App. 5th 533 and *Rodriguez v. Packers Sanitation Services Ltd.* (Feb. 26, 2025, D083400) __ Cal.Rptr.3d __ [2025 WL 615064], the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include arbitrable claims.

B. Defendants

16. Defendant Simaya Inc. is a California corporation that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county.

17. Defendant American High, Inc. is a California corporation that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county.

18. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the parties sued as DOES 1 through 50, are presently unknown, unascertainable, or uncertain, and are sued by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Upon information and belief, each of DOES 1 through 50 constitutes a legal employer or is otherwise legally responsible in some

manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein. This Complaint may be amended to reflect their true names and capacities once ascertained.

19. Upon information and belief, Defendants in this action are employers, co-employers, joint employers, and/or part of an integrated employer enterprise, as each of the Defendants exercised control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of the employees, suffered and permitted them to work, and otherwise engaged them as employees under California law.

20. Upon information and belief, at least some of the Defendants have common ownership, common management, interrelationship of operations, and centralized control over labor relations and are therefore part of an integrated enterprise and thus jointly and severally responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein, including pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, and 1197.1.

21. Upon information and belief, Defendants acted in all respects pertinent to this action as an alter-ego, agent, servant, joint employer, joint venturer, co-conspirator, partner, in an integrated enterprise, or in some other capacity on behalf of all other co-defendants, such that the acts and omissions of each defendant may be legally attributable to all others.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

22. This action is brought individually and on behalf of the following class pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382:

- a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from four years (plus the additional 178-day statutory tolling period under Emergency Rule 9) prior to the filing of this action through date of class certification.

23. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish various subclass definitions as appropriate at the class certification stage, according to proof.

24. The class is ascertainable and shares a well-defined community of interest in this litigation:

- a. Numerosity: The class is estimated to exceed 50 individuals, although the precise membership of the entire class is unknown at this time. The class is so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The identities of

class members are ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other class members. They were subject to the same policies and practices of Defendants, which resulted in losses to the class. Proof of common unlawful business practices, which Plaintiff experienced, will establish the right of the class to recover on the causes of action alleged herein.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate class representative; will take all necessary steps to protect the class members' interests adequately and fairly; has no interest antagonistic to other class members; and is represented by attorneys who have substantial experience prosecuting, defending, resolving, and litigating wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions in California state and federal courts.

d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other means for adjudicating this dispute. Individual joinder is impractical. Class treatment will allow for common issues to be resolved in a single forum, simultaneously, and without duplication of effort and expense.

e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action advances the State of California's strong public interest in ensuring its approximately millions of employed residents are properly paid the wages they earned for the hours they worked. Class actions provide a mechanism for enforcement of labor laws and allow for vindication of employee rights by unnamed class members.

25. Common questions of law and fact as to the class members predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The common questions of law and fact exist as to whether the employment policies and practices formulated by Defendants and applied to the class members constitute violations of California law.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

26. Plaintiff and the class members worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees and were compensated on an hourly basis.

27. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the class members at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages.

28. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and class members to complete work off-the-clock, without compensation.

29. Plaintiff and the class members were made to finish closing tasks while off the clock. For example, Plaintiff was required to check that all gas ignition equipment and electric heating equipment were off after clocking out for the evening. Moreover, on multiple occasions, Defendants required Plaintiff to refrain from clocking in upon arriving at his scheduled shift. Due to this unlawful practice, all hours worked were not directly compensated, resulting in the underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the class members.

30. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the class members overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. First, as described above, Defendants compelled Plaintiff and other class members to work off-the-clock after clocking out. Each time this practice resulted in unpaid work over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime.

31. Second, Defendants failed to pay overtime at the “regular rate of pay.” Specifically, Defendants paid Plaintiff and class members non-discretionary bonuses that Defendants failed to include in the overtime rates in the pay periods when employees worked overtime hours. Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the class members at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the class members earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “at a rate no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee” as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders. Furthermore, Defendants unlawfully paid double time to Plaintiff and the class members at 2x their straight hourly rate. For each double hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the class members earned the additional forms of remuneration,

1 Defendants should have (but failed to) pay double-time “at the rate of no less than twice the regular
2 rate of pay of an employee.” as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the
3 IWC Wage Orders.

4 32. An illustrative example is shown in Plaintiff’s wage statement for the pay period of
5 02/17/2025 to 03/02/2025. During this pay period, Plaintiff worked approximately 8 hours of overtime
6 and was paid a non-discretionary bonus of \$485.56. However, Defendants paid Plaintiff at a deficient
7 rate of 1.5x times his base rate of \$20.00. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff’s overtime wages and the
8 lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

9 33. Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave laws with respect to the
10 class members. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the class members with all sick leave
11 accrued. To the extent that Defendants provided paid sick leave, they did not pay all sick leave wages
12 at the proper rate of pay because they failed to incorporate the hours that Plaintiff and the class
13 members worked off-the-clock. Therefore, Plaintiff and other class members were not awarded the
14 total accrued sick leave time they had earned.

15 34. Further, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants failed to correctly
16 include non-discretionary bonuses and other forms of qualifying remuneration in the regular rate of
17 pay calculation for paid sick leave.

18 35. Defendants maintained an unlawful policy and practice of failing to pay reporting time
19 wages to the class members. Plaintiff was scheduled and required to come in to work, but upon his
20 arrival at work, was told to clock out and instead go home. This happened on multiple occasions,
21 including March 28, 2025. Defendants failed to pay any reporting time wages on these occasions. On
22 information and belief, Defendants had a similar policy of failing to pay reporting time wages to other
23 class members under similar circumstances.

24 36. An illustrative example of this reporting time pay violation is shown in Plaintiff’s time
25 records and wage statement for the period of 03/16/2025 to 03/31/2025. During this period, Plaintiff
26 reported to work on 3/28/2025 but was told to clock out and go home after only .15 hours. However,
27 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff reporting time pay as required under Labor Code section 1198.
28

1 37. Defendants failed to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the class
2 members.

3 38. Due to the high demands of their positions and ongoing understaffing, Plaintiff and the
4 class members frequently experienced missed, late, shortened, or interrupted meal periods. For
5 example, Plaintiff was only allowed to take breaks when there was a lull between services. However,
6 there was not always enough downtime for Plaintiff to take a timely, uninterrupted meal period. As a
7 result, his meal periods were often short, late, and interrupted. Meal periods were well below the
8 required 30 minutes because of needing to catch up with service or because there was a rush and
9 assistance was needed. Plaintiff was instructed not to clock out for breaks and especially on days when
10 he was scheduled for overtime or a morning shift during the week, he was the only kitchen staff on
11 duty and was told to take a "standing break." During these breaks, Plaintiff would be allowed to sit,
12 but if there was some sort of necessity, he had to get up and do it.

13 39. Meal periods were therefore regularly conducted "on duty"; however, Defendants
14 failed to provide a valid on duty meal period agreement. When Defendants did not provide compliant
15 meal periods, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members a meal period premium in
16 violation of Labor Code section 226.7 for all violations.

17 40. An illustrative example of this meal period violation is shown in Plaintiff's time records
18 and wage statement for the period of 03/03/2025 to 03/16/2025. Here, every shift that Plaintiff worked
19 for the period from 03/05/2025 to 03/14/2025 was longer than five hours, but showed no record of
20 compliant meal periods. However, Plaintiff's corresponding wage statement shows no meal period
21 premium was paid when Defendant failed to provide a compliant meal period. As a result, Defendants
22 are liable for both unpaid wages and meal period premiums for all on-duty or otherwise noncompliant
23 meal periods taken by Plaintiff and the class members. When compliant meal periods were not
24 provided, Defendants failed to pay the meal period premium in violation of California Labor Code
25 section 226.7.

26 41. To the extent Defendants ever paid a meal period premium, Defendants violated Labor
27 Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the "regular rate of compensation" to
28

1 Plaintiff and the class members, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-
2 excludable remuneration.

3 42. Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay rest period premiums to
4 employees who were unable to take compliant rest periods. Plaintiff and the class members frequently
5 experienced missed, late, shortened, or interrupted rest periods, for the same reasons described in the
6 above section—namely, excessive workload demands, rushes, and understaffing. Even when Plaintiff
7 was able to take brief pauses between tasks, these rest periods were not duty-free and therefore did not
8 comply with California law. Plaintiff was regularly expected to remain available to step back in and
9 assist in cooking dishes. Consequently, Plaintiff and the class members were not consistently
10 authorized or permitted to take their full, uninterrupted rest periods. On numerous occasions, Plaintiff
11 worked an entire eight-hour shift without receiving a single compliant meal or rest period.

12 43. To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor
13 Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the “regular rate of compensation” to
14 Plaintiff and the class members, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-
15 excludable remuneration.

16 44. These violations create derivative liability for failure to timely pay all wages owed each
17 payday or upon separation of employment. For example, Defendants terminated Plaintiff on March
18 31, 2025, and told him to come back the following day, April 1, 2025, to pick up his last check. Plaintiff
19 did not receive the final payment of wages until two days later, on April 3, 2025. However, Defendants
20 subsequently revoked the check they had given Plaintiff, stating that he had been overpaid. Plaintiff
21 did not receive a final paycheck for the hours he worked until May 8, 2025.

22 45. Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the class members
23 each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated
24 Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages
25 earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate
26 reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements.

27 46. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on
28 employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of

1 hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees.
2 The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the
3 pay stub.

4 47. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list
5 employees' "total hours worked," as the wage statements did not accurately include the
6 uncompensated time plaintiff and other class members worked due to Defendants' policy and practice
7 of requiring off-the-clock work.

8 48. Plaintiff and other class members cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage
9 statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed,
10 these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other
11 class members with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours
12 worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false
13 statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

14 49. Because of these policies and practices set forth above, Defendants failed to accurately
15 maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES OWED**

18 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, 218, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197**

19 **(All Claims Alleged by Plaintiff and Class Members Against All Defendants)**

20 50. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

21 51. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
22 §§ 200, 218, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Hours
23 and Days of Work" and "Minimum Wages" sections of the applicable orders), which require non-
24 exempt employees be timely paid at least the state or local minimum wage (if higher) for each hour of
25 work, and further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to pay all minimum wages
26 (plus liquidated damages). In addition to minimum wages, Labor Code § 200 states that "'wages'
27 includes all amounts for labor performed by employees of every description, whether the amount is
28

1 fixed or ascertained by the standard of time, task, piece, commission basis, or other method of
2 calculation.”

3 52. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Plaintiff and class
4 members at least the lawful minimum wage for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code sections
5 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Hours and Days of
6 Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable orders), including payment at the lawful
7 local and county minimum wage ordinances in effect. As a result, Defendants are liable for all
8 associated damages, including liquidated damages for the minimum wage violations pursuant to Labor
9 Code § 1194.2.

10 53. Defendants’ unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of
11 minimum, regular and overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial. Plaintiff and class
12 members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages, plus liquidated damages in an
13 amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid (and interest thereon), in addition to interest, attorneys’
14 fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code sections 1194 and 1194.2,
15 218.6 and any other applicable statutes.

16 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES**

18 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194**

19 54. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

20 55. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
21 §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198, which require non-exempt employees be timely paid overtime
22 wages all overtime hours worked, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer’s
23 failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime hours worked.

24 56. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Plaintiff and class members no
25 less than one and one-half times their respective “regular rate of pay” for all hours worked in excess
26 of eight hours in one day, 40 hours in one week, or the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of
27 work in any one workweek, and no less than twice their respective “regular rate of pay” for all hours
28 over 12 hours in one day and any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek for

1 such hours worked, in violation of Labor Code sections 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 and the IWC
2 Wage Orders (the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable orders).

3 57. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid
4 overtime, in addition to interest, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys’ fees, and costs to the
5 extent permitted by law.

6 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

8 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512**

9 58. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

10 59. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
11 §§ 226.7, 558 and 512, which require non-exempt employees be provided complaint meal periods (or
12 meal period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an
13 employer’s failure to lawfully provide all meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums at the lawful
14 regular rate of compensation.

15 60. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently provide
16 Plaintiff and class members compliant, duty-free meal periods of not less than 30 minutes beginning
17 before the fifth hour of hour for each work period of more than five hours per day and a second duty-
18 free meal period of not less than 30 minutes beginning before the tenth hour of hour of work in
19 violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, 558, 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Meal Periods”
20 sections of the applicable orders).

21 61. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay
22 Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation
23 for each workday that a fully compliant meal period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code
24 sections 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Meal Periods” sections of the
25 applicable orders).

26 62. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the meal period
27 premiums owed, in addition to interest, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys’ fees, and costs to
28 the extent permitted by law.

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

3 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516**

4 63. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

5 64. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
6 §§ 226.7 and 516, which require non-exempt employees be authorized to take complaint rest periods
7 (or rest period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an
8 employer's failure to lawfully provide all rest periods and/or pay rest period premiums at the lawful
9 regular rate of compensation.

10 65. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently authorize and
11 permit Plaintiff and class members to receive compliant, duty-free rest periods of not less than ten
12 (10) minutes for every four hours worked (or major fraction thereof) in violation of Labor Code
13 sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Rest Periods" sections of the
14 applicable orders).

15 66. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay
16 Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation
17 for each workday that a fully compliant rest period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code
18 sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders.

19 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL PAID SICK LEAVE WAGES**

21 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 200, 218, 246 *et seq.***

22 67. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

23 68. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to pay
24 sick leave wages to Plaintiff and a paid sick leave subclass in violation of Labor Code section 246
25 *et seq.* Paid sick leave earnings constitute wages for purposes of California wage and hour law.
26 (*Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Productions, Inc.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 1094, 1103 ["Courts have recognized
27 that 'wages' also include those benefits to which an employee is entitled as a part of his or her
28 compensation, including money, room, board, clothing, vacation pay, and sick pay"].)

69. Labor Code section 246(l), in conjunction with Labor Code section 248 *et seq.*, 248.1, 248.2, and 248.6, in addition to the applicable County sick pay ordinances in locales worked by class members, govern how Defendants were required to calculate paid sick leave.

70. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members their paid sick leave wages at one of the lawful rates set forth in the statute or ordinance because Defendants failed to include in their sick leave calculation the additional remuneration received by Plaintiff and class members (i.e., at the regular rate of pay and/or calculated based on total wages earned).

71. Furthermore, to the extent the paid sick leave paid constitutes Covid-related paid sick leave, Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Covid-19 Supplemental Sick Leave wages to class members at the correct accrual rate or hourly pay rate in violation of Labor Code sections 246, 248.1, 248.2, and 248 *et seq.*

72. As a result, Defendants violated the Labor Code and are liable to Plaintiff and class members for underpaid sick leave wages, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNPAID REPORTING TIME WAGES

Violation of Labor Code § 1198

97. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

98. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1198 and Section 5 (Reporting Time Pay) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders concerning reporting time wages with respect to the aggrieved employees.

99. Section 5 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders requires an employer to pay reporting time pay if an employee shows up for a scheduled shift and is not put to work or is furnished with less than half of the scheduled shift. In this situation, the employer owes the employee reporting time pay in the amount of the greater of two hours or half the scheduled shift length.

100. Section 5 further requires an employer to pay reporting time pay if an employee is required to report to work for a second time and is furnished with less than two hours of work on the second reporting. In this situation, the employer owes the employee reporting time pay in the amount of the greater of two hours or half the scheduled shift length.

1 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

3 **Violation of Labor Code § 226**

4 77. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

5 78. This cause of action is brought by a wage statement subclass pursuant to Labor Code
6 § 226(a) which requires non-exempt employees be provided accurate itemized wage statements each
7 pay period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to comply
8 with this obligation.

9 79. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to provide
10 accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and class members resulting in injury to Plaintiff and
11 class members. Specifically, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and class members did not
12 accurately state each pay period all of the information required by Labor Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

13 80. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of
14 accurate itemized wage statements, causing confusion and concealing wage and premium
15 underpayments.

16 81. As a result, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the statutory penalty of
17 \$50 per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and \$100 per employee for
18 each violation in a subsequent pay period, up to an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in
19 addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor
20 Code section 226(e).

21 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **WAITING TIME PENALTIES**

23 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 201 *et seq.***

24 82. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

25 83. This cause of action is brought by a waiting time subclass pursuant to Labor Code
26 §§ 201 through 203, which require an employer to timely pay all wages earned upon termination of
27 employment, and which further provide a private right of action to recover statutory waiting time
28

penalties each day an employer fails to comply with this obligation, up to a maximum of 30 days wages.

84. Defendants willfully failed and continue to fail in their affirmative obligation to pay all wages earned and unpaid to Plaintiff and class members immediately upon termination of employment or within 72 hours thereafter for employees who did not provide at least 72 hours prior notice of his or her intention to quit, and further failed to pay those sums for 30 days thereafter in violation of Labor Code sections 201 through 203 and the IWC Wage Orders.

85. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover a waiting time penalty for a period of up to 30 days, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

86. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

87. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in the State of California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 by committing the foregoing wage and hour violations alleged throughout this Complaint.

88. Defendants' dependence on these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continue to deprive other class members of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage to Defendants over competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers in compliance with California's wage and hour laws. These failures constitute unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business acts and practices in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*

89. Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged in this Complaint, and Plaintiff, as an individual and on behalf of others similarly situated, seeks full restitution of the moneys as necessary and according to proof to restore all monies withheld, acquired, and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

90. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law for past or future violations, to the extent the statute of limitations on each of the alleged causes of action do not extend to the four year

1 limitation provided under the UCL or to the extent the underlying Labor Code and IWC Wage Order
2 violations do not provide a private right of action.

3 91. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to injunctive relief against Defendants,
4 restitution, and other equitable relief to return all funds over which Plaintiff and class members have
5 an ownership interest and to prevent future damage and the public interest under Business and
6 Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Plaintiff and class members are further entitled to recover interest,
7 attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Code of Civil Procedure
8 § 1021.5.

9 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

11 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***

12 **(By Plaintiff on Behalf of the State and the Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants)**

13 92. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

14 93. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
15 the following “aggrieved employees” pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”),
16 codified as Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*:

- 17 a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in
18 California at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the initial
19 PAGA notice through date of trial.

20 94. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
21 aggrieved employees, according to proof.

22 95. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
23 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action with respect to this cause of action. (*Kim v. Reins*
24 *Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff
25 files suit is always the real party in interest.”])

26 96. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,,
27 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
28 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,

1 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
2 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former
3 employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures
4 specified in Section 2699.3. “

5 97. Any allegations regarding violations of the IWC Wage Orders are enforceable as
6 violations of Labor Code section 1198, which states: “[t]he employment of any employee for longer
7 hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

8 98. Labor Code section 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
9 penalties under the PAGA.

10 99. On or about **August 25, 2025**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and provided
11 written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants) of
12 Defendants’ alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
13 violations.

14 100. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s written PAGA notice, entitled “Notice of Labor
15 Code Violations” is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference as though fully set
16 forth herein (the “PAGA notice”).

17 101. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received a response to Plaintiff’s
18 written PAGA notice from the LWDA.

19 102. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice sent by Plaintiff, neither
20 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
21 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

22 103. Now that at least 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these
23 violations, without notice of cure from Defendants or notice from the LWDA of its intent to investigate
24 the alleged allegations and issue the appropriate citations to Defendants, Plaintiff exhausted all
25 prerequisites and commenced this civil action under Labor Code section 2699 *et seq.*

26 104. As set forth in the PAGA notice attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this
27 Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all corresponding civil
28 penalties:

- a. ***Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- b. ***Unpaid Overtime.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- c. ***Unpaid Paid Sick Leave.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7.
- d. ***Unpaid Reporting Time Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code § 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- e. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- f. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- g. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210.
- h. ***Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256.
- i. ***Non-Compliant Wage Statements.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- j. ***Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.*** Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders.

105. Plaintiff seeks to collect all recoverable civil penalties for the Labor Code violations alleged in this Complaint and the PAGA notice (including amendments thereto) against Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) and (f), in addition to attorneys' fees, costs, and interest to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 2699(k).

PRAYER


Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. For certification of this action as a class action;
- b. For appointment of Plaintiff as the class representative;
- c. For appointment of above-captioned counsel for Plaintiff as Class Counsel;

- d. For division of class members into appropriate classes and/or subclasses according to proof;
- e. For recovery of all statutory penalties and liquidated damages;
- f. For disgorgement of all amounts wrongfully obtained to the extent permitted by law;
- g. For restitution and injunctive relief;
- h. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent permitted by law, including (without limitation) under Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 1194, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.;
- i. For recovery of damages in amount according to proof;
- j. For all recoverable pre- and post-judgment interest;
- k. For this action to be maintained as a representative action under the PAGA;
- l. For Plaintiff and counsel of record to be provided with all enforcement capability as if the action were brought by the State of California or the California Division of Labor Enforcement;
- m. For recovery of all civil penalties and other recoverable amounts under the PAGA;
- n. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent permitted by law, associated with the PAGA claims pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and any other applicable sections; and
- o. For such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: October 30, 2025

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.



Xavier L. Woodford

Nicholas J. Ferraro

Attorneys for Plaintiff Joshua Silva

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA
SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

August 25, 2025

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL
- Electronic Return Receipt -

Simaya Inc.
1051 Garnet Ave
San Diego, California 92109

American High, Inc.
1051 Garnet Ave
San Diego, California 92109

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **JOSHUA SILVA** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “aggrieved employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

SIMAYA INC.; AMERICAN HIGH, INC.

Defendant(s) shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(s). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff's counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal.4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Line Cook from about December 2024, to March 2025. During their employment Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “aggrieved employees” and the “PAGA Period”).

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “aggrieved employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants' violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage **Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very 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.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal.App.3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to complete work off-the-clock, without compensation. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were made to finish closing tasks while off the clock. For example, Plaintiff was required to check that all gas ignition equipment and electric heating equipment were off after clocking out for the evening. Moreover, on multiple occasions, Defendants required Plaintiff to refrain from clocking in upon arriving at his scheduled shift. Due to this unlawful practice, all hours worked were not directly compensated, resulting in the underpayment of wages to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Overtime **Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny 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;” and “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;” and “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.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages. First, as described above, Defendants compelled Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock after clocking out. Each time this practice resulted in unpaid work over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime.

Second, Defendants failed to pay overtime at the “regular rate of pay.” Specifically, Defendants paid Plaintiff and aggrieved employees non-discretionary bonuses that Defendants failed to include in the overtime rates in the pay periods when employees worked overtime hours. Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “at a rate no less than **one and one-half times the regular rate of pay** for an employee” as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders. Furthermore, Defendants unlawfully paid double time to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 2x their straight hourly rate. For each double hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay double-time “at the rate of no less than **twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.**” as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders. An illustrative example is shown below:

Company Code LT / QRE 29577349 Simaya Inc 1051 Garnet Ave San Diego, CA 92109	Loc/Dept 01/	Number 10030	Page 1 of 1	Earnings Statement	
Taxable Filing Status: Single Exemptions/Allowances: Federal: Std W/H Table State: 0 Local: 0 Social Security Number: XXX-XX-4949				Period Starting: 02/17/2025 Period Ending: 03/02/2025 Pay Date: 03/07/2025	
Tax Override: Federal: 0.00 Addnl State: 35.80 Flat Local:				Joshua Silva 	

Earnings	rate	hours/units	this period	year to date	Other Benefits and Information	this period	year to date
Regular	20.0000	69.02	1380.40	5609.40	Total Hours Worked	77.02	299.95
Overtime	30.0000	8.00	240.00	584.40			
Bonus			0.00	485.56			
Gross Pay			\$1,620.40	\$6,679.36			

Statutory Deductions	this period	year to date
Federal Income	-116.04	429.64
Social Security	-100.47	384.02
Medicare	-23.50	89.81
California State Income	-35.80	131.25
California State DI	-19.45	74.33
Net Pay	\$1,325.14	

Simaya Inc
 1051 Garnet Ave
 San Diego, CA 92109-2834

Important Notes
 Basis of pay: Hourly

Extract of Plaintiff's wage statement for pay period 2/17/2025 to 3/02/2025 showing pay for overtime at a rate of \$30.00 for 8.00 hours

Company Code LT / QRE 29577349 Simaya Inc 1051 Garnet Ave San Diego, CA 92109	Loc/Dept 01/	Number 3072025	Page 1 of 1	Earnings Statement	
Taxable Filing Status: Single Exemptions/Allowances: Federal: Std W/H Table State: 0 Local: 0 Social Security Number: XXX-XX-4949				Period Starting: 02/17/2025 Period Ending: 03/02/2025 Pay Date: 03/07/2025	
Tax Override: Federal: 0.00 Addnl State: 0.00 Flat Local:				Joshua Silva 	

Earnings	rate	hours/units	this period	year to date
Regular			0.00	5609.40
Overtime			0.00	584.40
Bonus		0.00	485.56	485.56
Gross Pay			\$485.56	\$6,679.36

Statutory Deductions	this period	year to date
Federal Income	0.00	429.64
Social Security	-30.10	414.12
Medicare	-7.04	96.85
California State Income	0.00	131.25
California State DI	-5.82	80.15
Net Pay	\$442.60	

Simaya Inc
 1051 Garnet Ave
 San Diego, CA 92109-2834

Important Notes
 Basis of pay: Hourly

Extract from Plaintiff's wage statement for pay period 2/17/2025 to 3/02/2025 showing a "Bonus" payment for \$485.56

Here, Plaintiff worked approximately 8 hours of overtime and was paid a non-discretionary bonus of \$485.56. However, Defendants paid Plaintiff at a deficient rate of 1.5x times his base rate of \$20.00. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff's overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave **Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 40 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) "the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;" (2) "by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee's total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;" or (3) "for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time." Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees "with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee's itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee's payment of wages."

Defendants failed to comply with California's paid sick leave laws with respect to the aggrieved employees. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with all sick leave accrued. To the extent that Defendants provided paid sick leave, they did not pay all sick leave wages at the proper rate of pay because they failed to incorporate the hours that Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock. Additionally, each time Plaintiff and the

aggrieved employees worked off-the-clock that resulted in unpaid overtime, the overtime hours were not accounted for when calculating an employee's accrued paid sick leave. Therefore, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not awarded the total accrued sick leave time they had earned.

Further, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants failed to correctly include non-discretionary bonuses and other forms of qualifying remuneration in the regular rate of pay calculation for paid sick leave.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Reporting Time Wages
Violation of Labor Code § 1198; IWC Wage Orders


Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1198 and Section 5 (Reporting Time Pay) of the applicable IWC Wage Orders concerning reporting time wages with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Section 5 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders requires an employer to pay reporting time pay if an employee shows up for a scheduled shift and is not put to work or is furnished with less than half of the scheduled shift. In this situation, the employer owes the employee reporting time pay in the amount of the greater of two hours or half the scheduled shift length. Section 5 further requires an employer to pay reporting time pay if an employee is required to report to work for a second time and is furnished with less than two hours of work on the second reporting. In this situation, the employer owes the employee reporting time pay in the amount of the greater of two hours or half the scheduled shift length. Labor Code section 1198 authorizes enforcement of the reporting time pay provisions of the IWC Wage Orders.

Defendants maintained an unlawful policy and practice of failing to pay reporting time wages to the aggrieved employees. Plaintiff was scheduled and required to come in to work but upon his arrival to work, was told to clock out and instead go home. This happened on multiple occasions, including March 28, 2025. Defendants failed to pay any reporting time wages on these occasions. On information and belief, Defendants had a similar policy of failing to pay reporting time wages to other aggrieved employees under similar circumstances. An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

Cook	2.93	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sun	3/16/25 3:29 PM	3/16/25 6:25 PM
Cook	6.21	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Thu	3/20/25 3:58 PM	3/20/25 10:10 PM
Cook	6.44	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Fri	3/21/25 3:28 PM	3/21/25 9:55 PM
Cook	7.31	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sat	3/22/25 3:31 PM	3/22/25 10:50 PM
Cook	6.37	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sun	3/23/25 3:57 PM	3/23/25 10:19 PM
Cook	6.03	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Mon	3/24/25 10:00 AM	3/24/25 4:01 PM
Cook	5.67	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Tue	3/25/25 10:30 AM	3/25/25 4:10 PM
Cook	0.15	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Fri	3/28/25 2:59 PM	3/28/25 3:08 PM
Cook	6.36	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sun	3/30/25 3:00 PM	3/30/25 9:21 PM
Cook	4.18	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Mon	3/31/25 4:02 PM	3/31/25 8:12 PM

Extract of Plaintiff's time record for the period of 03/16/2025 to 03/31/2025 showing a shift on 03/28/2025 for only .15 hours.

Company Code LT7 QRE 29577349 Simaya Inc 1051 Garnet Ave San Diego, CA 92109	Loc/Dept 017	Number 412025	Page 1 of 1	Earnings Statement	
Taxable Filing Status: Single Exemptions/Allowances: Federal: Std W/H Table State: 0 Local: 0 Social Security Number: XXX-XX-4949				Period Starting: 03/17/2025 Period Ending: 03/30/2025 Pay Date: 04/01/2025	
Tax Override: Federal: 0.00 Addnl State: 12.21 Flat Local:				Joshua Silva 	

Earnings Regular 20.0000 48.74 974.80 7863.00 Overtime 0.00 584.40 Bonus 0.00 485.56 Gross Pay \$974.80 \$8,932.96	Other Benefits and Information Total Hours Worked 48.74 412.63
--	--

Statutory Deductions Federal Income -39.79 544.48 Social Security -60.43 553.84 Medicare -14.14 129.53 California State Income -12.21 164.23 California State DI -11.70 107.20 Net Pay \$836.53	Simaya Inc 1051 Garnet Ave San Diego, CA 92109-2834 Important Notes Basis of pay: Hourly
---	---

Extract of Plaintiff's Wage statement for the period of 03/17/2025 to 03/30/2025 showing no payment of reporting time pay.

Here, Plaintiff reported to work on 3/28/2025 but was told to clock out and go home after only .15 hours. However, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff reporting time pay as required under Labor Code section 1198.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). "[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage." *Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is "exceedingly narrow" and applies only when (1) "the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty" and (2) *both* "the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period." *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal.5th 444, 459.

Defendants failed to provide legally compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees. Due to the high demands of their positions and ongoing understaffing, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees frequently experienced missed, late, shortened, or interrupted meal periods. For example, Plaintiff was only allowed to take breaks when there was a lull between services. However, there was not always enough downtime for Plaintiff to take a timely, uninterrupted meal period. As a result, his meal periods were often short, late, and interrupted. Meal periods were well below the required 30 minutes because of needing to catch up with service or because there was a rush and assistance was needed. Plaintiff was instructed not to clock out for breaks and especially on days when he was scheduled for overtime or a morning shift during the week, he was the only kitchen staff on duty and was told to take a "standing break." During these breaks, Plaintiff would be allowed to sit, but if

there was some sort of necessity, he had to get up and do it. Meal periods were therefore regularly conducted “on duty” however, Defendants failed to provide a valid on duty meal period agreement. When Defendants did not provide compliant meal periods, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees a meal period premium in violation of Labor Code section 226.7 for all violations. An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

Cook	7.10	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Wed	3/5/25 2:39 PM	3/5/25 9:45 PM
Cook	5.54	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Thu	3/6/25 2:42 PM	3/6/25 8:14 PM
Cook	7.74	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Fri	3/7/25 3:30 PM	3/7/25 11:14 PM
Cook	7.44	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sat	3/8/25 3:30 PM	3/8/25 10:56 PM
Cook	6.74	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Sun	3/9/25 3:30 PM	3/9/25 10:14 PM
Cook	6.90	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Wed	3/12/25 2:39 PM	3/12/25 9:33 PM
Cook	7.19	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Thu	3/13/25 2:33 PM	3/13/25 9:45 PM
Cook	6.60	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	Fri	3/14/25 3:26 PM	3/14/25 10:02 PM

Extract of Plaintiff's timecard for the period of 03/05/2025 to 03/14/2025 showing no meal periods recorded on shifts longer than five hours.

Company Code LT / QRE 29577349 Loc/Dept 017 Number 50076 Page 1 of 1	Earnings Statement  Period Starting: 03/03/2025 Period Ending: 03/16/2025 Pay Date: 03/21/2025
---	--

Taxable Filing Status: Single Exemptions/Allowances: Federal: Std W/H Table State: 0 Local: 0 Social Security Number: XXX-XX-4949	Tax Override: Federal: 0.00 Addnl State: Local:	Joshua Silva 
--	---	---

<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Earnings</th> <th>rate</th> <th>hours/units</th> <th>this period</th> <th>year to date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Regular</td> <td>20.0000</td> <td>63.94</td> <td>1278.80</td> <td>6888.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overtime</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td>584.40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bonus</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.00</td> <td>485.56</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gross Pay</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$1,278.80</td> <td>\$7,958.16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Statutory Deductions</th> <th>this period</th> <th>year to date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Federal Income</td> <td>-75.05</td> <td>504.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Security</td> <td>-79.29</td> <td>493.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Social Security</td> <td>0.01</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medicare</td> <td>-18.54</td> <td>115.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Medicare</td> <td>0.01</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>California State Income</td> <td>-20.77</td> <td>152.02</td> </tr> <tr> <td>California State DI</td> <td>-15.35</td> <td>95.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Pay</td> <td>\$1,069.82</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Earnings	rate	hours/units	this period	year to date	Regular	20.0000	63.94	1278.80	6888.20	Overtime			0.00	584.40	Bonus			0.00	485.56	Gross Pay			\$1,278.80	\$7,958.16	Statutory Deductions	this period	year to date	Federal Income	-75.05	504.69	Social Security	-79.29	493.41	Social Security	0.01		Medicare	-18.54	115.39	Medicare	0.01		California State Income	-20.77	152.02	California State DI	-15.35	95.50	Net Pay	\$1,069.82		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Other Benefits and Information</th> <th>this period</th> <th>year to date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total Hours Worked</td> <td>63.94</td> <td>363.89</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> Simaya Inc 1051 Garnet Ave San Diego, CA 92109-2834 Important Notes Basis of pay: Hourly	Other Benefits and Information	this period	year to date	Total Hours Worked	63.94	363.89
Earnings	rate	hours/units	this period	year to date																																																							
Regular	20.0000	63.94	1278.80	6888.20																																																							
Overtime			0.00	584.40																																																							
Bonus			0.00	485.56																																																							
Gross Pay			\$1,278.80	\$7,958.16																																																							
Statutory Deductions	this period	year to date																																																									
Federal Income	-75.05	504.69																																																									
Social Security	-79.29	493.41																																																									
Social Security	0.01																																																										
Medicare	-18.54	115.39																																																									
Medicare	0.01																																																										
California State Income	-20.77	152.02																																																									
California State DI	-15.35	95.50																																																									
Net Pay	\$1,069.82																																																										
Other Benefits and Information	this period	year to date																																																									
Total Hours Worked	63.94	363.89																																																									

Extract of Plaintiff's wage statement for the pay period from 03/03/2025 to 03/16/2025

Here, every shift that Plaintiff worked for the period from 03/05/2025 to 03/14/2025 was longer than five hours, but showed no record of compliant meal periods. However, Plaintiff's corresponding wage statement shows no meal period premium was paid when Defendant failed to provide a compliant meal period. As a result, Defendants are liable for both unpaid wages and meal period premiums for all on-duty or otherwise noncompliant meal periods taken by Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees. When compliant meal periods were not provided, Defendants failed to pay the meal period premium in violation of California Labor Code section 226.7.

To the extent Defendants ever paid a meal period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the "regular rate of compensation" to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-excludable remuneration.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Defendants maintained a policy and practice of failing to pay rest period premiums to employees who were unable to take compliant rest periods. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees frequently experienced missed, late, shortened, or interrupted rest periods, for the same reasons described in the "Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages" section—namely, excessive workload demands, rushes, and understaffing. Even when Plaintiff was able to take

brief pauses between tasks, these rest periods were not duty-free and therefore did not comply with California law. Plaintiff was regularly expected to remain available to step back in and assist in cooking dishes. Consequently, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not consistently authorized or permitted to take their full, uninterrupted rest periods. On numerous occasions, Plaintiff worked an entire eight-hour shift without receiving a single compliant meal or rest period.

To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the “regular rate of compensation” to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees, which should have factored in bonuses and other forms of non-excludable remuneration.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of “all wages” for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid “not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides “every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty” of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Indeed, Defendant failed to pay all premiums, overtime, regular, sick leave, and other earnings on time each payday.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours' notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours' notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

Defendants terminated Plaintiff on March 31, 2025, and told him to come back the following day, April 1, 2025, to pick up his last check. Plaintiff did not receive the final payment of wages until two days later, April 3, 2025. However, Defendants subsequently revoked the check they had given Plaintiff, stating that he had been overpaid. Plaintiff did not receive a final paycheck for the hours he worked until May 8, 2025.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, "an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:" (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable

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

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list employees’ “total hours worked,” as the wage statements did not accurately include the uncompensated time plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants’ policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “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.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys' Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other aggrieved employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys' fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,



Xavier L. Woodford

Cc Plaintiff Joshua Silva

Geoffrey Harris – Manager (geoffrey.societypb@gmail.com)

jg