

February 10, 2026

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

Attn: PAGA Administrator

455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94102

Filed Online

**Re: Written Notice – Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) –
Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**

Jonathan Fausto v. Lineage Logistics Services, LLC, et al.

PAGA Administrator:

Notice is hereby provided that, pursuant to *Labor Code* § 2699.3, Jonathan Fausto (“Employee”) contends that Lineage Logistics Services, LLC, (“Employer”) has violated, and continues to violate, provisions of the *Labor Code* and wage orders promulgated by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC wage order”), including, but not limited to, *Labor Code* §§ 204, 221, 223, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 515, 516, 1174.5, 1182, 1194, 1197, 1198, and the applicable wage order.

In accordance with the required notice under *Labor Code* § 2699.3 of the Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”), this letter shall serve as formal written notice to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”).

Employee worked for Employer in two roles. Upon being hired on January 11, 2021, Employee worked as a salaried exempt ‘Warehouse Supervisor.’ However, Employee and the other Warehouse Supervisors are misclassified as ‘exempt.’ In approximately November 2025, Employee transitioned to working for Employer as a non-exempt ‘Forklift Driver.’

Employee is an “aggrieved employee” as defined in *Labor Code* § 2699(a) and brings this action on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved employees of Employer and seeks penalties under PAGA for Employer’s violations of the *Labor Code*.

Employer is a Delaware Limited Liability Company that does business in California.

Employer Lineage Logistics Services, LLC, is a warehousing and logistics company that provides services such as food processing and manufacturing, cold chain solutions, transportation services, and warehousing solutions of various types.

At all relevant times, Employer issued and maintained uniform, standardized scheduling and timekeeping practices and procedures for all aggrieved, hourly paid employees in California, including Employee and others similarly situated, regardless of their location or position.

Employee and other aggrieved employees seek penalties and other compensation from Employer for the relevant time period because Employer:

1. Failed to Correctly Classify Employees as “Non-Exempt” (*Lab. Code* § 515);
2. Failed to Pay Employees for All Overtime (*Lab. Code* §§ 510, 1198);
3. Failed to Pay Employees for All Hours Worked (*Lab. Code* §§ 221, 223, 1182, 1194, 1197, 1198);
4. Failed to Provide Employees with Compliant Meal Periods (*Lab. Code* §§ 226.7, 512, 516 and 1198);
5. Failed to Provide Employees with Compliant Rest Periods (*Lab. Code* §§ 226.7, 512, 516 and 1198);
6. Failed to Timely Pay Wages During Employment (*Lab. Code* § 204);
7. Failed to Provide Employees and Aggrieved Employees with Accurate, Itemized Wage Statements and Failed to Maintain Accurate Records (*Lab. Code* §§ 226(a), 1174);

Below please find the relevant facts and legal theories to support the aforementioned violations.

Misclassification of “Non-Exempt” Employees as “Exempt” Employees

To qualify as an exempt employee, California requires that an employee must be “primarily engaged in the duties that meet the test of the exemption” and “earns a monthly salary equivalent to no less than two times the state minimum wage for full-time employment. *Labor Code* § 515. This forms the two-part test the employers must establish to properly exempt its employees from overtime laws: (1) the salary basis test and (2) the duties test.

At all times during the Relevant Period, Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees spent over eighty percent (80%) of their working hours performing the duties of non-exempt employees. These duties Employee performed including warehouse duties and reporting to Employer’s higher-ranked supervisors.

These are duties they were expected to perform and thus these positions are not positions which involve work falling within any exception to the above-referenced Labor Code sections, the Unfair Practices Act and/or California Industrial Welfare Commission orders applicable to Employer’s business. Additionally, Employee and the misclassified aggrieved employees failed to meet the exemption requirements of California law. Employee did not customarily and regularly exercise discretion and independent judgment nor have the authority to hire and/or fire employees nor make recommendations that were given particular weight. Employer’s uniform operations

resulted in Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees not exercising independent judgment and discretion nor having the requisite authority to meet the “hire and fire” element.

Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees were “non-exempt” employees and/or misclassified as “exempt” employees and performed their job duties in a “non-exempt” capacity pursuant to California Labor Code § 515.

Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees were required to clock in and out but did not receive overtime, and received a straight salary. Employer failed to properly classify Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees as non-exempt, central to Employee’s position in the conjunctive nature of the test for an exemption in the applicable Wage Order.

Employee alleges that he was classified as an “exempt” employee when he was working for Employer as a ‘Warehouse Supervisor’, however, Employee clocked in and out, and performed his job duties in a “non-exempt” capacity.

Specifically, Employee received a salary per pay statement, even though his hours fluctuated.

Employee did not meet the salary test, or the job duty test imposed by California courts. As such, Employee does not meet an exemption specified under California law, including, the professional exemption. As a result of being misclassified, Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees are entitled to unpaid overtime compensation.

As a matter of company policy, practice, and procedure, Employer has unlawfully, unfairly and/or deceptively treated Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees as exempt employees, failed to pay the required overtime compensation and otherwise failed to comply with all applicable labor laws with respect to Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees.

By reason of this uniform exemption practice, policy and procedure applicable to Employee, Employer committed acts of unfair competition in violation of the Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 by engaging in a company-wide policy, practice and procedure which failed to properly classify Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees and thereby failed to pay them overtime wages for documented overtime hours worked.

The proper classification of Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees is Employer’s burden. Employer had no business policy, practice, or procedure to ensure that Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees were properly classified as exempt, and in fact, as a matter of corporate policy erroneously and unilaterally misclassified many employees. As a result of Employer’s intentional disregard of the obligation to meet this burden, Employer’s failed to pay all required overtime compensation for work performed by Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees and violated the California Labor Code and regulations promulgated thereunder as herein alleged.

Additionally, Employer failed to provide all the legally required off-duty meal breaks to the misclassified aggrieved employees, including Employee, as required by the applicable Wage Order and Labor Code. As a result of its willful misclassification, Employer did not have a practice of providing meal and rest breaks to Employee and the other misclassified aggrieved employees.

Failure to Pay Overtime

During the Relevant Time Period, upon information and belief, Employer had, and continues to have, a company-wide policy of discouraging and impeding Employee and other aggrieved employees from recording hours worked that were outside of their scheduled shifts in order to limit the amount of overtime employees could accrue. On information and belief, this policy of limiting overtime, led Employee and other aggrieved employees to work off-the-clock before and after their scheduled shift times.

At all times, Employee and other aggrieved employees remained under the control of Employer.

Employer knew or should have known that as a result of these company-wide practices and/or policies, Employee and other aggrieved employees were performing assigned duties off-the-clock and were suffered or permitted to perform work for which they were not paid. Because Employee and other aggrieved employees worked shifts of eight (8) hours a day or more or forty (40) hours a week or more, some of this off-the-clock work qualified for overtime premium pay.

California *Labor Code* §§ 510 and 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) wage order require employers to pay employees working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek at the rate of one-and-one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek. The applicable IWC wage order further provides that employers are required to pay employees working more than twelve (12) hours in a day overtime compensation at a rate of two (2) times their regular rate of pay. An employee’s regular rate of pay includes all remuneration for employment paid to, or on behalf of, the employee, including nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive pay.

Accordingly, Employer regularly failed to pay overtime wages to Employee and other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked in violation of *Labor Code* §§ 510 and 1198. Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 1197.1 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Failure to Pay All Wages

As stated above, during the relevant time period, as a result of Employer’s policy of limiting the amount of overtime employees could accrue, Employee and other aggrieved

employees were forced to work off-the-clock before and after their scheduled shift times as alleged above.

For example, Employer's Warehouse Supervisors are required to work at least fifty (50) hours per week, and Employee regularly worked sixty (60) hours a week. Employee was also not able to always take proper meal and rest breaks.

Thus, Employer did not pay at least minimum wages for all hours worked by Employee and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code § 1194(a) provides in relevant part: “[n]otwithstanding any agreement to work for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage ... is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of this minimum wage ... including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.”

Labor Code § 1194.2(a) provides in relevant part: “[i]n any action under § 1193.6 or § 1194 to recover wages because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage fixed by an order of the commission, an employee shall be entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.”

Labor Code § 1197 provides: “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a less wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.”

Employee is informed and believes, and therefore alleges, that Employer's compensation schemes do not fairly compensate Employee and aggrieved employees for all hours spent performing their job duties.

The failure to pay at least minimum wages to Employee and aggrieved employees for each and every hour worked violates *Labor Code* §§ 1182.11-1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and 1197; the applicable IWC wage order.

The failure to pay designated wages to Employee and aggrieved employees for each and every hour worked violates *Labor Code* §§ 221 and 223; and the applicable IWC wage order.

Accordingly, Employer regularly failed to pay at least minimum wages to Employee and other aggrieved employees for all of the hours they worked in violation of *Labor Code* §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198. Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 1197.1 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Breaks

Meal breaks were typically missed, late or interrupted. Employee and aggrieved employees would work more than five hours without a meal period.

Under the foregoing, California employers must provide meal periods and authorize and permit rest periods to all employees during their shifts. In *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, the California Supreme Court reaffirmed that the required meal and rest periods must be “off-duty,” which means that employees must be relieved of “all work-related duties,” including the duty to remain “on call,” and they must be “free from employer control” over how they “spend their time.” *Id.* at 264, 269. Employees must have the freedom to use meal and rest periods for their own purposes. *Id.* at 270; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1038-39.

When employees must either “remain at the ready and capable of being summoned to action,” “respond when the employer seeks contact with [them],” “perform other work if the employer so requires,” and/or remain “on call” during their meal and rest periods, the employees have not been “relieve[d] ... of all work-related duties and employer control.” *Augustus, supra*, 2 Cal.5th at 270. Such a meal or rest period is not “off duty” and therefore is “impermissible.” *Ibid.*

The Supreme Court’s decision in *Augustus* is just the latest in a series of meal and rest break cases that have affirmed California’s broad, protective standard for employees.

Moreover, as the mere existence of a facially lawful meal and rest break policy is unavailing if there are practical constraints and pressures on employees to perform their duties in ways that omit breaks. *See Brinker, supra*, 53 Cal.4th at 1040.

Yet, Employer did and does not provide Employee and aggrieved employees with meal periods during which they are completely relieved of duty for at least thirty (30) minutes by the fifth hour of work and again by the tenth hour of work. Employee regularly had to skip his meal breaks or cut them short in order to meet the pressuring demands by Employer to get back to work.

Thus, Employer has failed to perform its obligations to provide Employee and aggrieved employees with off-duty meal periods by the end of the fifth hour of work and a second meal period by the end of the tenth hour of work. Employer also has failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate for each off-duty meal period that they have been denied.

On July 15, 2021, the California Supreme Court issued a decision in *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858 where the court unanimously held that employers must pay premium payments to employees for missed meal, rest, and recovery breaks at the employee’s “regular rate of pay” instead of their base hourly rate. The regular rate of pay may be higher than the base hourly rate because the regular rate of pay must include all nondiscretionary incentive payments, including nondiscretionary bonuses.

Employer knew or should have known that as a result of its policies and/or practices, that Employee and aggrieved employees were not actually relieved of all duties to take timely, uninterrupted meal periods. Employer further knew or should have known that it did not pay Employee and aggrieved employees all meal period premiums when meal periods were missed, late, short, and/or interrupted. Furthermore, Employer has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying meal period premiums owed when compliant meal periods are not provided. Because of this practice and/or policy, Employee and aggrieved employees have not received all premium pay for missed, interrupted, or late meal periods. Accordingly, Employer failed to provide all meal periods in violation of *Labor Code* §§ 226.7, 512(a), 516, and 1198.

Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Breaks

Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the applicable IWC Wage Order require employers to provide rest periods and to pay an employee one (1) additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each work day that a meal or rest period is not provided. *Labor Code* § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC. The applicable IWC wage order, section 11 provides that "[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

To comply with its obligation to authorize and permit rest periods under *Labor Code* § 226.7 and the applicable IWC wage order, an employer must "relinquish any control over how employees spend their break time, and relieve their employees of all duties—including the obligation that an employee remain on call. A rest period, in short, must be a period of rest." *Augustus et al. v. ABM Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257, 269-270.

During the relevant time period, Employer regularly failed to authorize and permit Employee and other aggrieved employees to take a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked or major fraction thereof. Employee alleges that he regularly had to skip any chances at taking his rest breaks during his shifts, or cut them short of the 10-minute timeframe. Again, for the purposes of getting back to work sooner due to the pressure placed on him by Employer to do so.

As a result of Employer's practices and policies, Employee and other aggrieved employees worked shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, in excess of 6 hours, and/or in excess of 10 hours without receiving all uninterrupted 10-minute rest periods to which they were entitled.

Employer also has engaged in a company-wide practice and/or policy of not paying rest period premiums owed when compliant rest periods are not authorized and permitted. Because of this practice and/or policy, Employee and other aggrieved employees have not received premium pay for all non-compliant rest periods.

Accordingly, Employer failed to authorize and permit all rest periods in violation of *Labor Code* §§ 226.7, 516, and 1198. Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

California *Labor Code* § 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month.

California *Labor Code* § 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. Alternatively, California *Labor Code* § 204 provides that the requirements of this section are deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven (7) calendar days following the close of the payroll period.

During the Relevant Time Period, Employer willfully failed to pay Employee and the aggrieved employees all wages due including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premiums, within the time periods specified by California *Labor Code* § 204.

Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney's fees, costs, and interest thereon, pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 210 and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Failure to Provide Accurate, Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) requires employers make, keep, and provide true, accurate, and complete wage records. Employer has not provided Employee and other aggrieved employees with properly itemized wage statements. *Labor Code* § 226(e) provides that if an employer fails to comply with providing an employee with properly itemized wage statements as set forth in 226(a), then the employee is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed \$4,000. Further, *Labor Code* § 226.3 provides that any employer who violates § 226(a) shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of \$250 per employee per violation in an initial citation and \$1,000 per employee for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the

employer fails to provide the employee a wage statement or fails to keep the required records pursuant to § 226(a).

During the relevant time period, Employer has knowingly and intentionally provided Employee and other aggrieved employees with uniform, incomplete, and inaccurate wage statements. Employer issued uniform wage statements to Employee and other aggrieved employees that fail to correctly list: gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, including rates of pay for overtime wages and/or meal and rest period premiums, and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

Employer violated §§ 226(a)(1), 226(a)(2), 226(a)(5), and 226(a)(9). Because Employer did not record the time Employee and other aggrieved employees spent working off-the-clock, Employer did not list the correct amount of gross wages and net wages earned by Employee and other aggrieved employees in compliance with § 226(a)(1) and § 226(a)(5), respectively. For the same reason, Employer failed to accurately list the total number of hours worked by Employee and other aggrieved employees, in violation of § 226(a)(2), and failed to list the applicable hourly rates of pay in effect during the pay period and the corresponding accurate number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of § 226(a)(9). For the same reason, Employer also failed to list the correct amount of net wages in violation of § 226(a)(5). Employer also failed to correctly list all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, namely, correct rates of pay for overtime wages and/or meal and rest period premiums, in violation of § 226(a)(9).

As a result of not having kept accurate records, Employee and aggrieved employees suffered injuries in the form of confusion over whether they received all wages owed to them, and difficulty and expense in reconstructing pay records in addition to other injuries which may come to light during the discovery process.

Labor Code § 1198 provides that the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor shall be those fixed by the Labor Commissioner and as set forth in the applicable IWC wage order. § 1198 further provides that “[t]he employment of any employees for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.” Pursuant to the applicable IWC wage order, employers are required to keep accurate time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period and meal period.

Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to recover civil penalties, attorney’s fees, costs, and interest thereon pursuant to *Labor Code* §§ 226.3, 1174.5, and/or 2699(a), (f)-(g).

Conclusion

Enclosed please find a copy of the class action complaint that is in the process of being filed in the Superior Court for the State of California, Riverside County. Employee respectfully requests that the LWDA notify this office within sixty (60) days if it wishes to investigate this

LWDA – PAGA Notice

Jonathan Fausto v. Lineage Logistics Services, LLC, et al.

February 11, 2026

Page 10

matter further. A copy is being sent via certified mail to Employer. Should you have any questions or concerns or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'M. Bradley', is written over the typed name.

Marcus J. Bradley, Esq.

cc: **LINEAGE LOGISTICS SERVICES, LLC**

46500 HUMBOLDT DRIVE

NOVI, MI 48377

REGISTRED AGENT FOR LINEAGE LOGISTICS SERVICES, LLC

1505 CORPORATION – CSC – LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE

KOY SAECHAO

2710 GATEWAY OAKS DRIVE

SACRAMENTO, CA 95833