



Nazo@Koullaw.com

P (213) 325 - 3032

F (818) 561 - 3938

217 SOUTH KENWOOD ST.

GLENDALE, CA 91205

www.koullaw.com

August 4, 2025

Via E-filing:

California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Via Certified U.S. Mail:

SABATER USA, INC.
14824 S. MAIN STREET
GARDENA, CA 90248

Re: PAGA Notice Pursuant to California Labor Code §2698 *et seq.*

Claimant(s): Isidro Bribiesca
Employer(s): Sabater USA, Inc.

Dear Sir or Madam:

Isidro Bribiesca ("Claimant") has retained Nazo Koulloukian, Esq. of Koul Law Firm, APC, and Sahag Majarian, II, and Garen Majarian of Majarian Law Group, APC, to represent Claimant, and all other aggrieved employees, for conditions of employment and wage and hour claims against former employer, Sabater USA, Inc. (hereafter "Employer").

Employer manufactures and distributes botanicals and spices. Claimant worked for Employer from October 18, 2013 to January 6, 2025, first as a machine operator, then as a Production Supervisor at Employer's Carson, California location. Claimant worked as an hourly, nonexempt employee earning approximately minimum wage at the time of separation.

Claimant alleges herein the specific provisions of California law that Employer has violated, requiring this Notice, including but not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 208, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.2, 226.7, 245-248.6, 432, 432.5, 432.6, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and all applicable Wage Orders.

During Claimant's employment, Claimant personally experienced the Labor Code violations described below. We request that your agency investigate the claims alleged below or permit Claimant to seek civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act on behalf of the Labor and Workforce and development Agency and the State of California in a representative

action. This letter will serve as notice of these allegations pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3.

Failure to Pay For All Hours Worked, Including Overtime Hours Worked

(Cal. Labor Code §§200, 204, 206, 206.5, 207, 210, 216, 218, 218.6, 221, 223, 351, 510, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, IWC Wage Orders)

The Wage Orders define “hours worked” as “the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.” Employer has been engaged in many unlawful employment practices which resulted in underpayment for hours worked each pay period, including overtime hours worked based on the employees regular rate of pay, as more fully set forth below. Employer has also failed to pay the required minimum wage for all hours worked, and has failed to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Claimant and aggrieved employees have been employed under conditions prohibited by the wage order, and thus Employer has also violated §§1198 and 1199. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Off-the-Clock Hours Worked

Claimant and aggrieved employees frequently worked off the clock and were routinely subjected to periods wherein they were under the Employer’s control but not compensated for their time.

Employees are required to undergo a temperature check and change into their uniforms prior to clocking in. Employees were also subject to work-related tasks before clocking in. For example, Claimant’s managers and the vice president would often ask him work-related questions before he had the opportunity to clock in for his shift.

Employees were frequently required to resume working after clocking out for meal breaks. Meal and rest breaks were generally interrupted with work-related questions at least twice a week. Employer would enter the breakroom during meal periods and ask employees work related questions off the clock during their meal periods. Employees also had to return to the time clock early to clock in due to the daily timeclock lines. Finally, Employer would call employees on their personal cell phones with work related questions after employees had clocked out and left the premises.

Off-the-Clock Hours Worked- Waiting in Required Lines

Claimant and aggrieved employees were required to report to the timeclocks to clock in prior proceeding to their workstations. However, numerous employees came on shift at the same time which resulted in many employees waiting in required lines to clock in for work to use the timeclock. This time spent walking and waiting in required lines was required by Employer prior to each shift and when clocking back in for lunch and was essential and required before employees could begin and/or resume working on the clock. Employees had to wait a minimum of two

minutes each time they clocked in or out due to the line for the time clock. Claimant reports an average of six employees in line for the timeclock anytime he was clocking in or out.

Work Performed During Unpaid Meal Periods

As more fully set forth below, Employer failed to permit Claimant and others to take timely, off-duty, meal breaks of “not less than 30 minutes” for each five consecutive hours of work in violation of Labor Code §§226.7 and 512.

Employees’ meals were often short or interrupted by work. Employees frequently had to resume working while clocked out for lunch due to the press of work. Claimant reports that managers would come to the break room to discuss work with employees during their meal breaks. This would happen an average of twice a week. Further, employees’ meal breaks were cut short due to being required to wait in long lines to clock back in at the end of each meal period.

Failure to Pay All Wages Owed Twice Per Month

(Cal. Lab. Code §§204, 210, and 2698 *et seq.*)

Employer was required to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees all wages earned twice during each calendar month pursuant to Labor Code §204(a).

Employer failed to pay all wages earned to employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices discussed herein. As a result of these practices, employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and premium wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Due to these failures, Employer is liable under Labor Code §204, 210 and 2698 *et seq.* for failure to pay wages as required by law.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 200, 218.5, 226, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.2, 1198, 1199, 2698 *et seq.*)

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2 and 1197, it is unlawful for an employer to suffer or permit a California employee to work without paying wages at the proper minimum wage for all time worked as required by the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Employer failed to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees for all hours worked as a result of Employer’s practices described above. Based on Employer’s unlawful conduct described herein, and because Claimant and the aggrieved employees were paid at or near minimum wage, employer’s failure to pay for all hours worked, including overtime, resulted in a payment of less than the minimum wage for all hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §1197, 1197.1, 1199 and the Wage Orders. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Failure to Permit Compliant Meal Periods

(Cal. Labor Code §§226 (a), 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, Wage Order)

Labor Code §512 provides, “[a]n 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...” Labor Code §226.7(a) provides, “[n]o employer shall require an employee to work during any meal... period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.” Paragraph 11 of the Wage Order provides, in pertinent part, “[u]nless an 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.”

Employer failed to permit Claimant and others to take timely, off-duty, meal breaks of “not less than 30 minutes” for each five consecutive hours of work in violation of Labor Code §§226.7 and 512. When meal periods were noncompliant, Employer failed to pay all premium pay to Claimant and aggrieved employees at their regular rates of pay. As a derivative claim, Claimant alleges that pay statements were inaccurate, failing to include required meal period penalties, thus failing the requirements of Labor Code §226(a).

Full, uninterrupted, off-duty, thirty-minute meal periods were not provided because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to meal periods and premium payments for non-compliant meal periods; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant meal period policy; and/or (6) because Employer unlawfully shaved and/or rounded clock in and clock out times for meal periods. Employees were not paid a premium payment, paid as an hour’s wage when meal periods were not given to them in compliance with California law.

Claimant and Claimant’s coworkers frequently missed first and second meal periods. When meal periods were provided, they were often late, short, and/or interrupted. Claimant reports that managers would come to the break room during lunch and discuss work with employees during their meal breaks. This would happen an average of twice a week. Further, employees’ meal breaks were cut short due to being required to wait in long lines to clock back in at the end of each meal period. Employees frequently had to resume working while clocked out for lunch due to the press of work.

Failing to Allow Employees to Leave Premises

“Employers must afford employees uninterrupted half-hour periods in which they are relieved of any duty or employer control and are *free to come and go as they please.*” (*Estrada v. Royalty Carpet Mills, Inc.* (2022) 76 Cal.App.5th 685, 705.)

In this case, Employees remained on the premises during meal periods due to the press of work. Supervisors would come to the breakroom to discuss work with employees on their lunch breaks, preventing them from leaving the premises.

Failure to Provide Rest Breaks

(Cal. Labor Code §§226, 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 et seq., Wage Orders)

Employer failed to maintain a compliant rest period policy and practice that provides its employees with off-duty rest periods as required by California law. Claimant reports that employees frequently missed rest periods as a result of Employer's staffing and business practices, and that rest breaks were not scheduled into daily shifts.

Rest periods were either less than ten minutes, not provided, interrupted or late, "on duty," or not scheduled before and after a meal period for shifts greater than six hours, as prescribed by California law because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to rest breaks and premium payments for non-compliant rest breaks; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; and/or (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant rest break policy.

The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(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 work day that the rest period is not provided"). Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. (*Id.* at 268) (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). *Id.*; see also, *Bufile v. Dollar Fin. Grp., Inc.*, (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

Employer did not authorize or permit all of its hourly employees to take at least a ten minute rest period in which they were relieved of all duties, for every 4 hours of work, or major fraction thereof, as required by Cal. Lab. Code §226.7, §512 and the Wage Orders. When breaks were missed Employer failed to pay the 1-hour premium, as required.

Rest breaks were frequently late, short, and/or interrupted due to the press of work. Managers would often discuss work with employees during their breaks. Additionally, employees were often required to resume working before their ten-minute breaks were complete. For example, Claimant's rest breaks were interrupted at least twice a week.

Failure to Provide Proper Cool-Down Rest Periods

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 1198, 2698 *et seq*)

Labor Code section 226.7, subdivision (c) provides:

If an employer fails to provide an employee a... recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of 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.

Employers required Claimant and aggrieved employees to consistently work in temperatures far exceeding eighty (80) degrees Fahrenheit and did not provide adequate cool down period opportunities.

There was no air conditioning in the work area. Temperatures would exceed 80 degrees, but Claimant and aggrieved employees did not feel safe asking to take a moment of rest if they felt like they were going to pass out from the heat. Employees were required to finish their tasks before taking a rest period. The schedule required employees to work two hours at a time in between meal and rest breaks and employees were not permitted to take a cool down rest period in between despite the lack of air conditioning and the very high temperatures inside.

Failure to Provide Safe Working Conditions – Excessive Heat

(Cal. Labor Code §1198, Wage Order)

Employer's workplaces would get unsafely hot. Claimant and aggrieved employees were forced to work in incredibly hot and unventilated rooms reaching temperatures of over 100 degrees.

Wage Order 1 ¶15 requires:

(A) The temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed.

(B) If excessive heat or humidity is created by the work process, the employer shall take all feasible means to reduce such excessive heat or humidity to a degree providing reasonable comfort.

By violating the wage order, Employer is liable under §1198 for civil penalties pursuant to §2698 *et. seq.*

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements
(Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 2698 *et seq*)

Employer knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Claimant and the aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code §§ 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d).

Derivative of the claims above, the statements provided to Claimant and aggrieved employees, and the records maintained by Employer, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked and the accurate rate of pay for all hours worked, and overtime pay, sick pay at the correct rate, and pay for meal and rest period premium wages.

§226 (a) requires:

An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (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 only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of 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...

Such failures called injury to Claimant and others, by, among other things, impeding them from knowing the total hours worked, and the amount of wages to which they are and were entitled. Employer knowingly and intentionally failed to accurately itemize the gross wages earned, net wages earned, and total hours worked.


Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Finally, Employer has violated Labor Code §432.5 for forcing Claimant and aggrieved employees to sign employment-related contracts and documents that contained unlawful terms of employment, including invalid meal period waivers resulting from a noncompliant meal period policy and/or practice.

Conclusion

Employer has violated a number of California wage and hour laws and is therefore liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §2698 *et seq.* Claimant respectfully requests that the agency investigate the above allegations and hereby provides notice of the allegations pursuant to PAGA's provisions. Alternatively, Claimant requests that the agency inform Claimant if it does not intend to investigate these violations so that Claimant may pursue these claims as a representative action in civil court.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nazo Koulloukian', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Nazo Koulloukian, Esq.
Attorney for Claimant