Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Elyssa Martinez (State Bar No. 355589)
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
elyssa@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Brandon Roberts

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
1/2/2026 4:52:59 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By M. Guyot ,Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

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

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MN BP INC. and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 25CU061190C

Judge: Richard S. Whitney
Department: 68

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. Conversion
6. Untimely Payment of Wages
7. Wage Statement Violations
8. Waiting Time Penalties
9. Retaliation
10. Unfair Competition
11. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

Action Filed: November 13, 2025

Plaintiff BRANDON ROBERTS, on behalf of all others similarly situated and the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act ("Plaintiff") brings this FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants MN BP INC. DBA MANNA BBQ and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively "Defendants"), alleging as follows:

INTRODUCTION

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

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

3. Defendants' underpayment of wages was facilitated by their company-wide practices of time editing and requiring off-the-clock work.

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

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

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

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

8. Plaintiff seeks to recover the underpaid damages, plus associated penalties, interests, attorney's fees and costs.

JURISDICTION & VENUE

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

10. The monetary damages and restitution sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court.

11. 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.

12. 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 Brandon Roberts

13. Plaintiff Roberts is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee from about March 2024 to October 2025. Plaintiff worked as a Server.

14. 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., LLC* (2025) 109 Cal.App.5th 69, the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include arbitrable claims.

B. Defendants

15. Defendant MN BP Inc. dba Manna BBQ is a California corporation that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county. Defendant does business as Manna BBQ.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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

20. 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 prior to the filing of this action through date of class certification.

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

22. 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.

23. 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

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

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

26. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of editing (or *timeshaving*) Plaintiff and the class members' time records.

27. For example, Plaintiff and the class members were frequently instructed to clock out at their scheduled times, despite often working past these times. Failure to clock out at this time, resulted in managers manually making these edits without the permission of the class members. This practice was recurring and was implemented to avoid including the prior shift in the next shift's tip pool. Each time Plaintiff and the class members clocked out for the day, but continued working past that time or Defendants manually shaved off time from their hours worked, this resulted in unpaid hours worked.

28. 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.

29. To the extent Defendants' policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work, including requiring the class members clock out for the day but continue working and engaging in unauthorized time editing resulted in unpaid hours worked over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this unlawful practice resulted in unpaid overtime wages.

30. Plaintiff and other class members routinely experienced missed, late, short and interrupted meal periods due to pressure from Defendants to keep up with high demands of the job.

31. For example, Plaintiff would often be required to work in excess of five hours without being allowed to take a compliant meal period. Each time Plaintiff and the class members experienced a noncompliant meal period, they were owed a meal period premium.

32. As a matter of policy and practice, Plaintiff and the class members were not provided meal period premiums in lieu of non-compliant meal periods as required by Labor Code section 226.7.

33. These violations are apparent on the face of the records.

34. For example, Plaintiff's time records show that on November 15, 2024, December 27, 2024, February 1, 2025, and April 5, 2025, Plaintiff experienced missed meal periods in violation of Labor Code 226.7. Here, Plaintiff worked over 6 hours without a compliant meal period.

35. Each time Plaintiff or the class members experienced a non-compliant meal period, Defendants should have, but failed to paid them a meal period premium.

36. Defendants required Plaintiff and the class members to sign a "Meal Break Waiver Agreement" as a condition of employment. Plaintiff expressly waived meal periods only on such occasions where his total day's work would be completed within six hours. Under California law, Defendants were still legally obligated to provide either an unpaid meal break of 30 minutes or a compliant meal premium on the days where Plaintiff or the class members worked in excess of six hours.

37. Additionally, Defendants maintained an unlawful "continued" meal period agreement. The agreement states Defendants agreed to provide "up to (2) hours of continued meal break" for working more than seven hours in a workday. To the extent this agreement is meant to act as an on-duty meal period agreement, this was unlawful because the nature of the work was not one that prevented Plaintiff or the class members from being relieved of their duties. Plaintiff and the class members worked at a restaurant where Defendants could have easily scheduled the shifts in such a way to provide compliant meal periods. Defendants forced Plaintiff to agree to a facially unlawful policy as a condition of employment. Specifically, the express language of the "continued meal break" policy directly contradicts Defendants' legal obligation to provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work as required by Labor Code section 512. Defendants are not excused from providing meal periods or meal premiums as a result of their unlawful policy.

38. As a matter of common policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which Plaintiff and the class members were entitled. Due to the reasons explained above, such as understaffing and the pressures to keep up with the continuous demands of the job, Plaintiff and the class members were not always authorized or permitted to take their rest periods.

39. Defendants failed to properly distribute tips and engaged in collecting, taking, or receiving gratuities paid to, given to, or left for Plaintiff and the class members.

40. Plaintiff and the class members earned cash and credit card gratuities from the sale of Defendants' food.

41. First, in violation of Labor Code 350 and 351, Defendants required employees to forfeit

large amounts of tips they earned during their first few weeks of employment as a training requirement. Defendants did not maintain any formal guidelines for how long employees had reduced eligibility to tips during the training process, instead allowing managers that were also receiving a distribution of the tip pool to decide if an employee was sufficiently trained. Defendants did not keep any record of the tips which were essentially incorporated into Defendants' sales for each location.

42. Second, Defendants required the class members to participate in an unlawful mandatory tip pool that was comprised of all credit card gratuities received at each location. Defendants maintained a policy and practice of distributing the gratuities to employees who had "the authority to hire or discharge any employee" or otherwise "supervise, direct or control the acts of employees." This policy and practice allowed for the sharing of gratuities with managerial staff outside the chain of service while simultaneously excusing management from reporting their tips as part of the recordkeeping process reported for tax liability.

43. Plaintiff and the class members were deprived of the wages earned, were not paid gratuities in accordance with statutory requirements and have suffered losses as a result of Defendants' policy and practice.

44. These violations create derivative liability for failure to timely pay all wages owed each payday or upon separation of employment.

45. Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the class members 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.

46. 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.

47. 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 class members worked but was reduced due to Defendants' unauthorized time editing.

48. Plaintiff and other class members 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 class members 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.

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

50. Defendant unlawfully retaliated against Plaintiff after he made complaints to management raising wage and hour concerns.

51. In August 2024, Plaintiff raised concerns about managers being included in the tip distribution and procedures affecting whether employees were eligible for tips they earned during training.

52. Soonafter, Plaintiff was transferred to a different work location in direct response to submitting a complaint.

53. Plaintiff is aware of other class members who are presently experiencing similar retaliatory practices including their hours being regularly cut and Defendant refusing to authorize their requests to cover absent employees' shifts (i.e. pick up additional shifts) in favor of employees who have not filed complaints.

54. Even after being transferred to a new location, Plaintiff continued to face retaliation after he renewed the complaints he made at the first location to his manager at the location he was transferred to, as he immediately noted the same issues occurring between locations and actively protested losing tips he earned during a second training process for the same position. The next week, Plaintiff began receiving significantly reduced hours of work each week, despite being promised that his transfer would make him eligible to work shifts between his original and new locations. Plaintiff

has not been allowed to work shifts outside his current assigned work location, despite management allowing employees who have not filed complaints work at multiple locations.

55. These unlawful retaliatory practices remain ongoing.

<u>FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES OWED

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

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

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

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

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

59. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of minimum, regular and overtime wages in amounts to be determined at trial. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages, plus liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid (and interest thereon), in addition to interest, attorneys'

fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code sections 1194 and 1194.2, 218.6 and any other applicable statutes.

<u>SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

Violation of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194

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

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

62. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to pay Plaintiff and class members no less than one and one-half times their respective "regular rate of pay" for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in one day, 40 hours in one week, or the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek, and no less than twice their respective "regular rate of pay" for all hours over 12 hours in one day and any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek for such hours worked, in violation of Labor Code sections 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Hours and Days of Work" sections of the applicable orders).

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

<u>THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512

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

65. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 226.7, 558 and 512, which require non-exempt employees be provided complaint meal periods (or meal period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an

employer's failure to lawfully provide all meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums at the lawful regular rate of compensation.

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

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

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

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516

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

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

71. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently authorize and permit Plaintiff and class members to receive compliant, duty-free rest periods of not less than ten (10) minutes for every four hours worked (or major fraction thereof) in violation of Labor Code

sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Rest Periods” sections of the applicable orders).

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

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CONVERSION

Violation of Labor Code § 351

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

74. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants had an obligation to pay all gratuities left for Plaintiff and class members, but instead unlawfully converted employees’ gratuities. *Lu v. Hawaiian Gardens Casino, Inc.* (2010) 50 Cal. 4th 592, 603-604; *Voris v. Lampert* (2019) 7 Cal. 4th 1141, 1154-55.

75. Labor Code section 351 states that no “employer” shall take any gratuity “left for an employee by a patron” and that “[e]very gratuity is hereby declared to be the sole property of the employee or employees to whom it was paid, given, or left for.” Labor Code section 350, subdivisions (a) and (d), specifically define “employer” and “agent” to include “every person other than the employer having the authority to hire or discharge any employee or supervise, direct, or control the acts of employees. Only employees who are involved in the line of service are entitled to participate in what is commonly called a “tip pool.” *Leighton v. Old Heidelberg, Ltd.* (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1062, 1069-70.

76. The gratuities left by patrons belonged to Plaintiff and class members at the time their labor and services were provided to Defendants.

77. Defendants knowingly and intentionally interfered with Plaintiff and class members’ ownership, and right to possess gratuities left by patrons by: (1) keeping all cash tips and (2) unlawfully distributing credit card tips to individuals who should not have been in the tip pool under California law.

78. Defendants converted Plaintiff and class members gratuities as part of an intentional and deliberate scheme to maximize their profits at the expense of employees. As a proximate result of the conversion by Defendants, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to the return of owed gratuities converted by Defendants, in an amount according to proof at trial. Plaintiff and class members were injured by Defendants' conversion and are entitled to all monies converted, with interest thereon, along with interest, attorneys' fees, and costs.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNTIMELY PAYMENT OF WAGES

Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 218

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

80. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, and 210 which require non-exempt employees be timely paid all wages owed each pay period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to comply with this obligation. Labor Code § 218 authorizes individuals to sue directly for wages and penalties due under these sections, including Labor Code § 210(c)'s statutory late payment penalties.

81. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to timely pay all wages, including paid sick leave and meal and rest premiums, earned by Plaintiff and class members twice during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays (for employees paid on a non-weekly basis) and on the regularly-scheduled weekly payday for weekly employees, if any, in violation of Labor Code sections 204 and 204b and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Minimum Wages" sections of the applicable orders).

82. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages, in addition to a statutory penalty in the amount of $100 for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and $200 for all subsequent violations and for all willful or intentional violations for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld under provided in Labor Code § 210, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

<u>SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

Violation of Labor Code § 226

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

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

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

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

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

<u>EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

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

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

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

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

90. 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.

91. 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.

<u>NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u>

RETALIATION

Violation of Labor Code §§ 98.6 and 1102.5

(Alleged by Plaintiff Individually)

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

93. At all times herein mentioned, Labor Code § 98.6 was in full force and effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section prohibits employers from discriminating or retaliating against employees who complain to the Labor Commissioner regarding an employer's violations of wage and hour laws.

94. At all times herein mentioned, Labor Code § 1102.5 was in full force and effect, and was binding upon Defendants. Said section provides that an employer may not retaliate against an employee for reporting or refusing to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of a state or federal statute, rule or regulation.

95. Plaintiff is informed and believes that he was retaliated against after making complaints to management raising wage and hour concerns, including violations of Labor Code § 350.

96. As a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to all damages and penalties allowed by law in amounts to be determined at trial according to proof. Plaintiff also seeks all interest, attorney's fees, and costs allowed by law, including but not limited to, common law and Labor Code §§ 98.6 ,1102.5, and 2699.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

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

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

98. 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.

99. 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.*

100. 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.

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

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

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

106. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), is the real party in interest in this action with respect to this cause of 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."])

107. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law,, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3. "

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

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

110. On or about **October 21, 2025**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and provided written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants) of Defendants' alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

111. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff's written PAGA notice, entitled "Notice of Labor Code Violations" is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein (the "PAGA notice").

112. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received a response to Plaintiff's written PAGA notice from the LWDA.

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

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

115. As set forth in the PAGA notice attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all corresponding civil 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 Gratuities.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 350 *et seq.*

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

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

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

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

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

i. ***Retaliation.*** Violation of Labor Code § 98.6.

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

116. 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: January 2, 2026

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

Nicholas J. Ferraro

Nicholas J. Ferraro
Attorneys for Plaintiff Brandon Roberts

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

October 21, 2025

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

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

MN BP Inc.
4653 Da Vinci St
San Diego, California 92130,

- 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 **BRANDON ROBERTS** ("Plaintiff(s)") and all other "aggrieved employees" of the following "Defendant(s)":

MN BP INC.
dba MANNA BBQ

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 Server from about March 2024 to Present. 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 "<u>aggrieved employees</u>" and the "<u>PAGA Period</u>").

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 -

<u>Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage</u>
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.

<u>Labor Code section 1194</u> renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. <u>Labor Code section 1197</u> 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 editing (or timeshaving) Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees' time records. For example, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were frequently instructed to clock out at their scheduled times, despite often working past these times. Failure to clock out at this time, resulted in managers manually making these edits without the permission of the aggrieved employee. This practice was recurring and was implemented to avoid them being including in the next shift's tip pool. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees clocked out for the day, but continued working past that time or Defendants manually shaved off time from their hours worked, this resulted in unpaid hours worked.

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.

As discussed above, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not paid for all hours worked. To the extent Defendants' policy and practice of requiring off-the-clock work, including requiring the aggrieved employees clock out for the day but continue working and engaging in unauthorized time editing resulted in unpaid hours worked over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this unlawful practice resulted 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 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.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short and interrupted meal periods due to pressure from Defendants to keep up with high demands of the job. For example, Plaintiff would often be required to work in excess of five hours without being allowed to take a compliant meal period. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced a noncompliant meal period, they were owed a meal period premium.

As a matter of policy and practice, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not provided meal period premiums in lieu of non-compliant meal periods as required by Labor Code section 226.7. An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

36	Tue	11/12/2024	6:33 PM	Tue	########	9:28 PM		2.92	0	0	2.92
37	Fri	11/15/2024	4:29 PM	Fri	########	10:34 PM	09:03 PM0	6.08	0	0	6.08
38	Sun	11/17/2024	12:02 PM	Sun	########	3:36 PM		3.57	0	0	3.57
39	Sun	11/17/2024	4:05 PM	Sun	########	5:02 PM		0.95	0	0	0.95
40	Mon	11/18/2024	5:03 PM	Mon	########	8:14 PM		3.18	0	0	3.18
41	Mon	11/18/2024	8:45 PM	Mon	########	9:20 PM		0.58	0	0	0.58
42	Tue	11/19/2024	4:54 PM	Tue	########	9:53 PM	08:01 PM0	4.98	0	0	4.98
43	Thu	11/21/2024	4:58 PM	Thu	########	10:06 PM	09:14 PM0	5.13	0	0	5.13
44	Sun	11/24/2024	11:58 AM	Sun	########	3:12 PM		3.23	0	0	3.23
45	Sun	11/24/2024	3:42 PM	Sun	########	5:11 PM		1.48	0	0	1.48
46	Sat	11/30/2024	5:02 PM	Sat	########	11:02 PM	09:39 PM0	6	0	0	6
47	Mon	12/2/2024	5:00 PM	Mon	12/2/2024	6:30 PM		1.5	0	0	1.5
48	Sat	12/7/2024	5:03 PM	Sat	12/7/2024	10:45 PM	09:41 PM0	5.7	0	0	5.7
49	Sun	12/8/2024	11:02 AM	Sun	12/8/2024	12:50 PM		1.8	0	0	1.8
50	Sun	12/8/2024	1:21 PM	Sun	12/8/2024	5:09 PM		3.8	0	0	3.8
51	Sun	12/8/2024	5:12 PM	Sun	12/8/2024	5:13 PM		0.02	0	0	0.02
52	Tue	12/10/2024	11:03 AM	Tue	########	2:09 PM		3.1	0	0	3.1
53	Tue	12/10/2024	2:40 PM	Tue	########	4:00 PM	03:57 PM0	1.33	0	0	1.33
54	Fri	12/27/2024	5:00 PM	Fri	########	11:03 PM	09:33 PM0	6.05	0	0	6.05

Extract from Plaintiff's Time Records from 11/12/2024 - 12/27/2024.

7	Mon	1/27/2025	5:47 PM	Mon	1/27/2025	7:00 PM		1.22	0	0	1.22
8	Mon	1/27/2025	7:31 PM	Mon	1/27/2025	9:08 PM		1.62	0	0	1.62
9	Sat	2/1/2025	4:30 PM	Sat	2/1/2025	11:25 PM	10:12 PM1	6.92	0	0	6.92
0	Sun	2/2/2025	11:32 AM	Sun	2/2/2025	12:49 PM		1.28	0	0	1.28
1	Sun	2/2/2025	1:19 PM	Sun	2/2/2025	5:18 PM		3.98	0	0	3.98

Extract from Plaintiff's Time Records from 01/27/2025 - 2/2/2025.

ue	4/1/2025	4:57 PM	Tue	4/1/2025	8:17 PM	08:06 PM0	3.33	0	0	3.33
at	4/5/2025	4:59 PM	Sat	4/5/2025	11:21 PM	10:18 PM1	6.37	0	0	6.37
un	4/6/2025	11:33 AM	Sun	4/6/2025	1:29 PM		1.93	0	0	1.93
un	4/6/2025	1:59 PM	Sun	4/6/2025	5:00 PM		3.02	0	0	3.02
lon	4/7/2025	4:57 PM	Mon	4/7/2025	9:49 PM	08:34 PM0	4.87	0	0	4.87

Extract from Plaintiff's Time Records from 04/1/2025 - 4/7/2025.

Here, Defendant required Plaintiff to work more than five hours without being granted a compliant meal period on November 15 and December 27, 2024, as well as February 1 and April 5, 2025. Plaintiff should have earned a meal premium in the amount of $16.50 for each instance where he was not granted a compliant meal period. However, Defendants failed to pay a meal premium to Plaintiff on any of the occasions where Defendants did not provide him with a meal break.

Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to sign a "Meal Break Waiver Agreement" as a condition of employment. Plaintiff expressly waived meal periods only on such occasions where his total day's work would be completed within six hours. Under California law, Defendants were still legally obligated to provide either an unpaid meal break of 30 minutes or a compliant meal premium on the days where Plaintiff or the aggrieved employees worked in excess of six hours.

Additionally, Defendants maintained an unlawful "continued" meal period agreement. The agreement states Defendants agreed to provide "up to (2) hours of *continued* meal break" for working more than seven hours in a workday. To the extent this agreement is meant to act as an on-duty meal period agreement, this was unlawful because the nature of the work was not one that prevented Plaintiff or the aggrieved employees from being relieved of their duties. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked at a restaurant where Defendants could have easily scheduled the shifts in such a way to provide compliant meal periods. Defendants forced Plaintiff to agree to a facially unlawful policy as a condition of employment. Specifically, the express language of the "continued meal break" policy directly contradicts Defendants' legal obligation to provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work as required by Labor Code section 512. Defendants are not excused from providing meal periods or meal premiums as a result of their unlawful policy.

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.

<u>Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages</u>
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 faction 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.

As a matter of common policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were entitled. Due to the reasons explained in the "Unpaid Meal Period" section above, such as understaffing and the pressures to keep up with the continuous demands of the job, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were not always authorized or permitted to take their rest periods.

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 Gratuities
Violation of Labor Code §§ 350 *et seq.*

Defendants failed to properly distribute and keep records of tips left for Claimant and the aggrieved employees, in violation of Labor Code sections 351, 353, and 354. Defendants also violated Labor Code section 351, which prohibited Defendants from collecting, taking or receiving any gratuity that is paid to, given to, or left for Claimant and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 351 states that no "employer" shall take any gratuity "left for an employee by a patron" and that "[e]very gratuity is hereby declared to be the sole property of the employee or employees to whom it was paid, given, or left for." Labor Code section 350, subdivisions (a) and (d), specifically define "employer" and "agent" to include "every person other than the employer having the authority to hire or discharge any employee or supervise, direct, or control the acts of employees. Only employees who are involved in the line of service are entitled to participate in what is commonly called a "tip pool." *Leighton v. Old Heidelberg, Ltd.* (1990) 219 Cal.App.3d 1062, 1069-70. Labor Code section 353 requires employers to "keep accurate records of all gratuities received" and that "[s]uch records shall be open to inspections at all reasonable hours[.]" Labor Code section 354 renders violation of this statute a misdemeanor.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned cash and credit card gratuities from the sale of Defendants' food. When Customers paid for their food by credit card, they were given the option to leave a tip. Customers also left cash tips.

First, Defendants maintained a practice of keeping cash tips that were left for Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees, in violation of Labor Code 350 and 351. Defendants required employees to forfeit large amounts of tips they earned during their first few weeks of employment as a training requirement. Defendants did not maintain any formal guidelines for how long employees had reduced eligibility to tips during the training process, instead allowing managers that were also receiving a distribution of the tip pool to decide if an employee was sufficiently trained. Defendants did not keep any record of the tips which were essentially incorporated into Defendants' sales for each location.

Second, Defendants required the aggrieved employees to participate in an unlawful mandatory tip pool that was comprised of all credit card gratuities received at each location. Defendants maintained a policy and practice of distributing the gratuities to employees who had "the authority to hire or discharge any employee" or otherwise "supervise, direct or control the acts of employees." Additionally, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of sharing such gratuities with managerial staff outside the chain of service while simultaneously excusing management from reporting their tips as part of the recordkeeping process reported for tax liability.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were deprived of the wages earned, were not paid gratuities in accordance with statutory requirements and have suffered losses as a result of Defendants' policy and practice.

Labor Code section 353 requires employers to keep accurate records of all gratuities received by the employer (whether direct or indirect) and to make those records open to inspection upon request. Defendants failed to maintain proper recordkeeping of gratuities received by the employees, particularly with respect to the cash tips that employees were forced to relinquish to managerial staff that was included as part of the tipping pool.
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, 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, in addition to having failed to also 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.

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.

<u>Non-Compliant Wage Statements</u>
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).

<u>Labor Code section 226(a)</u> 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 time editing.

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.

<u>Retaliation</u>
Violation of Labor Code §§ 98.6

Defendants violated Labor Code section 98.6 by unlawfully retaliating against Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees for making complaints regarding unlawful workplace practices, including being transferred to different work locations and being actively hindered from earning regular wages by having their hours cut.

Labor Code Section 98.6 provides that an employer shall not "discriminate, retaliate, or take any adverse action against any employee or applicant for employment because the employee or applicant engaged in any conduct delineated in this chapter, including the conduct described in subdivision (k) of Section 96, and Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 1101) of Part 3 of Division 2, or because the employee or applicant for employment has filed a bona fide complaint or claim or instituted or caused to be instituted any proceeding under or relating to their rights that are under the jurisdiction of the Labor Commissioner, made a written or oral complaint that they are owed unpaid wages, or because the employee has initiated any action or notice pursuant to Section 2699, or has testified or is about to testify in a proceeding pursuant to that section, or because of the exercise by the employee or applicant for employment on behalf of themselves or others of any rights afforded them."

Defendants unlawfully retaliated against Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees after making complaints to management raising wage and hour concerns.

Specifically, Plaintiff submitted a formal complaint in August 2024 raising concerns, including about managers being included in the tip distribution and procedures affecting whether employees were eligible for tips they earned during training. Plaintiff was soon after transferred to a different work location in direct response to submitting a complaint. Plaintiff is aware of other aggrieved employees who are presently experiencing similar retaliatory practices including their hours being regularly cutand Defendant refusing to authorize their requests to cover absent employees' shifts (i.e. pick up additional shifts) in favor of employees who have not filed complaints.
Plaintiff continued to face retaliation even after he was transferred to a new location. For example, in August 2024, Plaintiff renewed the complaints he made at the first location to his manager at the location he was transferred to, as he immediately noted the same issues occurring between locations and actively protested losing tips he earned during a second training process for the same position. The next week, Plaintiff began receiving significantly reduced hours of work each week, despite being promised that his transfer would make him eligible to work shifts between his original and new locations. Plaintiff has not been allowed to work shifts outside his current assigned work location, despite management allowing employees who have not filed complaints work at multiple locations. These unlawful practices remain ongoing.

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 <u>must be suspended immediately</u>.

- 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,

Elyssa Martinez

Elyssa Martinez

Cc Plaintiff Brandon Roberts

David Mongan – Counsel of Record
mongand2000@yahoo.com