SETAREH LAW GROUP

Wage-and-Hour and Consumer Class Actions and Complex Litigation

Shaun Setareh
Principal
shaun@setarehlaw.com

February 5, 2026

BY ONLINE SUBMISSION

PAGA Administrator
California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
1515 Clay Street, Suite 801
Oakland, California 94612

BY CERTIFIED MAIL

WESTERN REFINING RETAIL, LLC
c/o Legal Department
P.O Box 711
Dallas, TX 75063

MARATHON PETROLEUM COMPANY LP
c/o Legal Department
539 S. Main Street
Findlay, OH 45840

MARATHON PETROLEUM SUPPLY AND TRADING LLC
c/o Legal Department
539 S. Main Street
Findlay, OH 45840

BY CERTIFIED MAIL

WESTERN REFINING RETAIL, LLC
c/o 1505 Corporation
7801 Folsom Blvd. Unit #202
Sacramento, CA 95826

MARATHON PETROLEUM LOGISTICS SERVICES LLC
c/o CT Corporation System
330 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA

MARATHON PETROLEUM SUPPLY LLC
c/o Legal Department
539 S. Main Street
Findlay, OH 45840

Re: Tabitha Marie Black v. Western Refining Retail LLC and Marathon Petroleum Company LLC et al.

To Whom It May Concern:

Pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*), TABITHA MARIE BLACK ("BLACK") hereby provides notice on behalf of herself and on behalf of all other current and former non-exempt employees in California (the "aggrieved employees") who were employed by WESTERN REFINING RETAIL LLC, MARATHON

> work, whether or not required to do so.

Labor Code section 1198 states:

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

Labor Code section 512 states:

> An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

Section 11 of the Wage Order states:

> (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee. Unless the employee is relived of all duty during a 30 minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an "on duty" meal period and counted as time worked. An "on duty" meal period shall be permitted only when the nature of the work prevents an employee from being relieved of all duty and when by written agreement between the parties an on-the-job paid meal period is agreed to. The written agreement shall state that the employee may, in writing, revoke the agreement at any time.
>
> (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

> (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or

(1) For all initial violation of Labor Code section 204, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(2) For all subsequent violation of Labor Code section 204, $200 for each aggrieved employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(3) For all initial violations of Labor Code section 223, that are deemed to be neither willful nor intentional, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 225.5);

(4) For all initial violation of Labor Code section 223 that are deemed to be either willful or intentional, $200 for each aggrieved employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 225.5);

(5) For all subsequent violations of Labor Code section 223, regardless of whether the initial violation of Labor Code section 223 is deemed to be either willful or intentional, $200 for each aggrieved employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 225.5);

(6) For all initial violations of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));

(7) For all subsequent violations of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198, $200 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));

(8) For all initial violations of Labor Code section 512, $50 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 558(a)(1));

(9) For all subsequent violations of Labor Code section 512, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 558(a)(2)).

///

In addition, Labor Code section 226.7 states:

> (b) An employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health.
>
> (c) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

Defendants' written policies failed to advise BLACK and the aggrieved employees of their legal right to take rest period in accordance with California law. Specifically, Defendants have a policy of requiring BLACK and the aggrieved employees to clock in and out for rest periods.

Accordingly, BLACK and the aggrieved employees were not provided with legally mandated rest periods of at least ten minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof.

As a result of these policies and practices, Defendants failed to provide BLACK and the aggrieved employees with net rest periods of at least ten minutes for each four hour work period, or major fraction thereof, and have failed to pay them premium wages at their regular rates of pay on workdays they failed to provide them with required rest periods. Defendants' policies and practices lack adequate safeguards to ensure that employees are relieved of their duties for all required rest periods and are paid additional wages when rest periods are not provided.

Accordingly, BLACK now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that Defendants have committed against her and aggrieved employees as follows:

(1) For all initial violation of Labor Code section 204, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(2) For all subsequent violation of Labor Code section 204, $200 for each aggrieved employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(3) For all initial violations of Labor Code section 223, that are deemed to be neither

Section 4 of the applicable Wage Order states:

(A) Every employer shall pay to each employee wages not less than the following:

(1) Any employer who employs 26 or more employees shall pay to each employee wages not less than the following:

(a) Twelve dollars ($12.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective January 1, 2019; and

(b) Thirteen dollars ($13.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective January 1, 2020;

(2) Any employer who employs 25 or fewer employees shall pay to each employee wages not less than the following:

(a) Eleven dollars ($11.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective January 1, 2019.

(b) Twelve dollars ($12.00) per hour for all hours worked, effective January 1, 2020.

(B) Every 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, place, commission, or otherwise.

Labor Code section 1194 states, in relevant 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.

Labor Code section 1197 states, in relevant part:

The minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission or by any applicable state or local law, is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. This section does not change the applicability of local minimum wage laws to any entity.

Labor Code section 1198 states, in relevant part:

///

Meal Periods

As a result of their failures to provide meal periods in accordance with California law and to accurately record the starting and stopping times of all work periods, Defendants failed to compensate BLACK and the aggrieved employees with all hourly and overtime wages for time spent working during unpaid meal periods.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice of requiring BLACK and the aggrieved employees to clock out for their meal periods even though they continued to work off-the-clock. Defendants also automatically deducted one-half hour from the timecards of BLACK and the aggrieved employees on every workday for a meal period, regardless of whether or not they were permitted to take such a meal period. As a result of this "auto-deduct" policy, BLACK and the aggrieved employees routinely performed off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they were performing.

Off-the-Clock Work

During the applicable limitations period, BLACK and the aggrieved employees had to work off-the-clock because they were not paid for all hours worked including, but not limited to, Defendants failing to pay them for travel time, automatically deducting time taken out of their paychecks whether or not they took meal periods, were required to wear protective and/or sanitary gear in the regular course of business. Defendants failed to pay BLACK and the aggrieved employees for time spent putting on and taking off the protective and/or sanitary gear at the beginning and end of each work shift. This process could take as long as fifteen to twenty minutes per day – time which was unpaid by Defendants.

Accordingly, BLACK now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that Defendants have committed against her and aggrieved employees as follows:

(1) For all initial violation of Labor Code section 204, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(2) For all subsequent violation of Labor Code section 204, $200 for each aggrieved employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld from each aggrieved employee, per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 210);

(3) For all initial violations of Labor Code section 223, that are deemed to be neither willful nor intentional, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 225.5);

without compensation for forfeited days at the applicable rates required by law.
Labor Code section 227.3 states, in relevant part:

> Unless otherwise provided by a collective-bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to her as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination. The Labor Commissioner or a designated representative, in the resolution of any dispute with regard to vested vacation time shall apply the principles of equity and fairness.

At all relevant times during the applicable limitations period, Defendants maintained a policy or practice that provide for the unlawful forfeiture of vested vacation pay in violation of *Suastez* and Labor Code section 227.3.

Accordingly, BLACK now seeks civil penalties for these Labor Code violations that Defendants committed against her and aggrieved employees as follows:

(1) For all initial violations of Labor Code section 227.3, $100 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2));

(2) For all subsequent violations of Labor Code section 227.3, $200 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)).

<u>FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE WRITTEN WAGE STATEMENTS</u>
(Lab. Code § 226)

Labor Code section 226(a) states, in pertinent part:

> (a) An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee

(9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee and, beginning July 1, 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3, the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary services assignment.

By failing to accurately record all hours worked, including "off-the-clock" work described above, by failing to pay employees meal and rest period premiums in accordance with California law, by subjecting vested vacation pay to unlawful forfeiture, and by failing to reimburse employees for all necessary business expenses, Defendants have failed to provide BLACK and the aggrieved employees with written wage statements that comply with the requirements of Labor Code section 226(a). The wage statements of BLACK and the aggrieved employees have not accurately reflected their applicable rates of pay, hours worked, and the amounts of their gross and net wages.

Accordingly, BLACK now seeks civil penalties for Defendants' violations of the Labor Code as follows:

(1) For all violations of Labor Code section 226(a) if a civil action filed in accordance with the procedures set forth in Labor Code section 2699.3 results in an initial citation or its equivalent, $250 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 226.3);

(2) For all violations of Labor Code section 226(a) if a civil action filed in accordance with the procedures set forth in Labor Code section 2699.3 results in a subsequent citation or its equivalent, $1000 for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each violation (penalties set by Labor Code section 226.3).

LATE OR PARTIAL PAYMENT OF FINALWAGES FOLLOWING SEPARATION
(Lab. Code §§ 201, 202 and 203)

Labor Code section 201 requires an employer to pay all earned and unpaid wages to a discharged employee immediately at the time of discharge.

Labor Code section 202 requires an employer to pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who quits after giving at least seventy-two hours' notice at the time of quitting.

Labor Code section 202 requires an employer to pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who quits after giving less than seventy-two hours noticed within seventy-two hours of giving notice of quitting.

Labor Code section 203 provides that an employee's wages shall continue as a penalty from when they first became due at the same rate until paid for up to thirty days when an employer

(a) Requires or causes any employee to work for longer hours than those fixed, or under conditions of labor prohibited by an order of the commission.

(b) Pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of the commission.

(c) Violates or refuses or neglects to comply with any provision of this chapter or any order or ruling of the commission.

By failing to timely furnish BLACK and aggrieved employees with unpaid wages, including, but not limited to, all earned and unpaid hourly, overtime, vacation and/or premium wages at the regular rate of pay, Defendants criminal conduct has violated Labor Code section 1199.

Accordingly, for all violations of Labor Code section 1199, Defendants are liable for a misdemeanor and are punishable by a fine of $100 or by imprisonment for not less than thirty days or by both.

CONCLUSION

As noted above, this letter constitutes the required notice under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*). Insofar as this letter is directed to Defendants, please be advised that BLACK will seek both reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2699(g)(1) in a civil action should the Labor and Workforce Development Agency decline to pursue this matter.

Very truly yours,

SETAREH LAW GROUP

Shaun Setareh, Esq.