

September 5, 2025

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

DELICATO VINEYARDS, LLC.
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE STE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

FRANCIS FORD COPPOLA PRESENTS, LLC.
1325 J ST STE 1550
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

Department of Industrial Relations
Labor and Workforce Development Agency
*Via online electronic submission

Re: **Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera v. Delicato Vineyards, LLC. & FRANCIS FORD COPPOLA PRESENTS, LLC., et al.**

**NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS AND DEMAND PURSUANT TO
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 2699 ET. SEQ. AS TO THE INDIVIDUAL
AND OTHER AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES**

To Whom This May Concern:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to the procedures specified in California Labor Code Section 2699.3, et seq., Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and those similarly situated employees (hereinafter "AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES") claim that during the period of September 5, 2024 to the present ("PAGA Period"), Delicato Vineyards, LLC. & FRANCIS FORD COPPOLA PRESENTS, LLC., et al. (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, agents, and executive employees) (hereafter together "EMPLOYER(S)" or "YOU" and/or referred to with "YOUR" and "YOURS") violated California Labor Code Sections as follows, but not limited thereto: 201-203, 204, 206.5, 226, 226(a), 226.2, 226.3, 226.7, 403, 404, 432.5, 432.6, 510, 512, 512(a), 551, 552, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, and 2802, and IWC Wage Orders including *inter alia*, Wage Orders 4-2001, and 5-2001.

With regard to those Labor Code sections for which no Private Attorney General Act (hereinafter "PAGA") notice is required, we provide this correspondence in a further effort to resolve this matter informally without the time and expense of further court proceedings. AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES will seek these penalties on their own behalf and on behalf of YOUR other current and former AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. See *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 209 P.3d 923, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588 (no class certification required for representative action for civil penalties).

The facts and theories which support the violations of these Labor Code provisions are as follows:

FACTS:

The facts of the above named matter include, but are not limited to, the facts named or identified or referenced herein. Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera was an AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEE working for EMPLOYERS during the PAGA Period in the state of California. As discovery is ongoing, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and the other Aggrieved Employees reserve the right to present and/or reference further evidence as it is discovered.

Pursuant to the job duties and policies YOU set forth for Non- Exempt Employees in California, Aggrieved Employee Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and the other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES working during the PAGA Period worked overtime without pay or proper pay, and worked off-the-clock time when asked to perform various duties in and outside their job description.

Additionally, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES did not receive pay for preparing to work and/or cleaning up after their work shifts were complete. It was YOUR practice to have EMPLOYEE perform tasks inside and outside of their normal duties before and after their scheduled shifts, including, cleaning their uniforms and work areas, dressing for work, and other services which were inside and outside their job description for which they were either not on the clock or not compensated for. Therefore, these AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES have accumulated countless unpaid wages.

Additionally, YOU failed to pay EMPLOYEE for off the clock time even though YOU have them do work related duties and other things with regard to their work or related activities. Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked for hours well above and beyond those hours for which they are actually compensated. Moreover, YOUR failure to properly keep records of Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' actual hours worked led directly to YOU failing to keep proper records of Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' records, as required by law.

AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at YOUR work sites are also routinely not provided with ten (10) minute breaks, and if they are, these ten minute breaks are routinely interrupted and/or cut short to work, or by YOU requiring them to be on call to perform YOUR work on demand while on breaks. Additionally, being allowed to use the restroom does not equate to a ten (10) minute break, which unfortunately is also not permitted by YOU.

Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were also forced to either work through their thirty (30) minute meal periods, and/or YOU interrupted their meal periods. Although we understand that some AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES were permitted to eat lunch, requiring them to be on call to perform YOUR work on demand while on breaks or interrupting AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES meal breaks to perform YOUR work, is not a legal uninterrupted meal

break. Thus, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and YOUR other AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES are either working straight through their rest and meal periods, or are not provided with full uninterrupted breaks.

Furthermore, YOU have failed to pay Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES some and/or all overtime compensation for work they performed above and beyond eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week. Many, if not all, of the facts described above occur throughout Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera's employment with YOU.

LEGAL THEORIES:

These legal theories are meant to foster communications in an effort to reach an amenable resolution to this legal matter; they are not intended to be a fully exhaustive list of the Labor violations attributed to YOU and YOUR company.

Labor Code Sections 226, 226.2 and 226.3:

EMPLOYER failed to furnish, at the time of each payment of wages, to Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and each EMPLOYEE, an accurate itemized wage statement for all hours worked by the EMPLOYEE and to do all things required by this statute. YOUR policy and practice is to refuse to furnish to each of YOUR EMPLOYEE, at the time of each payment of wages, an accurate itemized wage statement for all hours worked by the EMPLOYEE, up to and exceeding, 40 hours per week.

YOUR policy and practice violates Labor Code Section 226. Labor Code Section 226 requires the employer to provide a statement with each payment of wages that includes: 1) Gross earnings, 2) Total hours worked, 3) Number of piece rate units earned, 4) Deductions, 5) Net wages, 6) Dates paid for, 7) Name of employee and last four digits of employee's Social Security number, 8) Name and address of the legal entity of the employer, and 9) a list of all hourly rates worked by the employee, up to and exceeding 40 hours per week, in the corresponding period.

YOUR policy and practice also violates Labor Code Section 226.2 as it did not comply with the requirements therein.

YOUR policy and practice of failing to furnish to each EMPLOYEE an accurate itemized wage statement for all hours worked by the EMPLOYEE, according to law, places you in violation of Labor Code Section 226. Further, Labor Code Section 226.3 states that any employer who violates subdivision (a) of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226. YOU are in violation of Labor Code Section 226; therefore, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and YOUR AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES will be pursuing penalties pursuant to Labor Code Section 226.3.

Labor Code Section 226.7 and 512:

YOUR policies and practices are to refuse to allow each EMPLOYEE meal and/or rest periods as detailed above. Labor Code Section 512 requires the employer to provide an uninterrupted thirty (30) minute meal break to AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES who work more than five (5) hours per day and a second (2ND) thirty (30) minute meal break to those working ten (10) or more hours per day. YOU regularly mandated that YOUR EMPLOYEE work through meal breaks. Therefore, YOUR policies and practices violate Labor Code Section 512.

Similarly, Labor Code Section 512 provide that an employer must provide a ten (10) minute paid rest break for every four (4) hours worked or fraction thereof. It is YOUR policy and practice to fail to provide EMPLOYEE with the required uninterrupted ten (10) minute rest period per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof. YOUR policies and practices of refusing to allow each EMPLOYEE to take meal and/or rest periods, according to law, places you in violation of these Labor Code and California Code Regulation provisions. Labor Code 226.7 states in pertinent part that:

If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the meal or rest period is not provided.

Thus, EMPLOYER owes meal period and rest period premiums to Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and its AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. As such, we intend to file civil claims for violations of Labor Code Sections 226.7.

Labor Code Sections 510, 1102.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1198 and 558:

EMPLOYER violated Labor Code Section 510 by not compensating Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and its AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES at the premium overtime rate for overtime hours Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and its AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES worked. EMPLOYER is thus subject to a civil penalty as set forth under this Labor Code Section 558. YOUR policies and practices are to refuse to compensate each EMPLOYEE at the premium overtime rate for overtime hours worked by AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES. YOUR policies and practices violate Labor Code Sections 510 and 1198. Labor Code Section 1198 prohibits employers from having EMPLOYEE work beyond the hours fixed by the Commission or under conditions prohibited by the Commission. Labor Code Section 510 sets forth the order of the Commission and thus requires the employer to compensate EMPLOYEE at the rate of no less than one and one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for an employee who works in excess of eight (8) hours in one (1) workday, works in excess of forty (40) hours in any one (1) workweek, or works on the seventh (7th) day of the workweek.

Labor Code Section 510 further requires that an employer compensate an employee at no less than twice the regular rate of pay for work in excess of ten (10) hours in any work day and for work on the seventh (7th) day of the work week in excess of eight (8) hours. YOUR policies and practices of refusing to

compensate each EMPLOYEE at the premium overtime rate, in accordance with the law, places you in violation of Labor Code Section 510.

Labor Code Section 1194 states in pertinent part:

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

Furthermore, Labor Code Section 558 states:

(a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages.

Furthermore, Labor Code Section 1102.5 States:

(a) An employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer, shall not make, adopt, or enforce any rule, regulation, or policy preventing an employee from disclosing information to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with authority over the employee, or to another employee who has authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, or from providing information to, or testifying before, any public body conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry, if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee's job duties.

(b) An employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer, shall not retaliate against an employee for disclosing information, or because the employer believes that the employee disclosed or may disclose information, to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with authority over the employee or another employee who has the authority to

investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, or for providing information to, or testifying before, any public body conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry, if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee's job duties.

We therefore intend to file civil claims for violations of Labor Code Sections 510, 1102.5, 1194, 1194.2, 1198 and 558 for penalties, attorneys' fees, interest, and costs of suit.

Labor Code Sections 1174 and 1174.5:

EMPLOYER failed to maintain records as required by Labor Code Section 1174. Labor Code Section 1174 requires that every person employing labor in this state shall keep in a central location, whereby it shall be accessible to the Commissioner, accurate and complete records of the following: a list of employee names and addresses and of minors under subsection (c), employment records, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid pursuant to subsection (d), and the number of piece rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, EMPLOYEE employed at the respective plants or establishments.

According to YOUR policies and practices, YOU failed to maintain Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES' records as required by Labor Code Section 1174. Pursuant to Labor Code Section 1174.5, YOU are subject to penalties for failure to maintain AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES contact information and/or accurate and complete payroll records. Therefore, AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES shall pursue said penalties for failure to comply with Labor Code Section 1174.

Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802:

EMPLOYER failed to reimburse Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES for business related expenses as required by Labor Code Sections 2800 and 2802. California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

During the PAGA Period, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, and AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Olive Garden. These costs include, but are not limited to, the use of personal phones for business-related tasks.

Please be advised that, upon expiration of the time periods set forth in California Labor Code Section 2699.3, Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera, on behalf of himself and other similarly situated AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES, will proceed to file a civil complaint including causes of action for civil penalties as provided under PAGA.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the information above if you require any further information with respect to these claims. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Shoham Solouki, Esq.,

Attorneys for Maria Guadalupe Lopez aka Ma Guadalupe Meza Herrera and other Aggrieved
Employees

cc: Client