

Justin Lo (SBN: 280102)
justin@caworklawyer.com
WORK LAWYERS PC
22939 Hawthorne Blvd., #202
Torrance, CA 90505
Tel: (424) 355-8535
Fax: (424) 355-8335

E-FILED
11/29/2023 4:07 PM
Clerk of Court
Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara
23CV426558
Reviewed By: R. Walker

Attorneys for Plaintiff VICTOR MANUEL PUGA GUTIERREZ, as representative of the State of California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and on behalf of himself and Aggrieved Employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY**

VICTOR MANUEL PUGA GUTIERREZ, on
behalf of himself and all other Aggrieved
Employees,

Plaintiff,

v.

EMPRESAS, MENDEZ, MERAZ INC., DBA
MORGAN HILL FOODS, a California
Corporation and DOES 1- 50, Inclusive,

Defendant,

Case No.

23CV426558

COMPLAINT

1. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA)

1 Plaintiff, VICTOR MANUEL PUGA GUTIERREZ, (“Plaintiff”), as a representative of
2 the State of California and the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), and on
3 behalf of himself and other current or former Aggrieved Employees, complains and alleges as
4 follows:

5 **INTRODUCTION**

6 1. This is a representative action brought by Plaintiff, as a representative of the State
7 of California and the LWDA, and on behalf of himself and other Aggrieved Employees, to collect
8 civil penalties for Defendant’s Labor Code violations.

9 2. Defendant and employer, EMPRESAS, MENDEZ, MERAZ INC., DBA
10 MORGAN HILL FOODS (“Defendants”), violated numerous wage and hour laws with respect
11 to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees by failing to provide, for example: accurate and
12 itemized wages statements, payment for all hours worked (including regular wages and
13 overtime), failure to provide a minimum wage, lawful meal periods, lawful rest periods, timely
14 payment during employment, failure to reimburse for expenses incurred during the course and
15 scope of employment, and payment upon separation of employment.

16 **PARTIES**

17 **The Plaintiff**

18 3. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of California,
19 currently residing in Santa Clara County.

20 4. Aggrieved Employees are all former and/or current non-exempt employees
21 holding various positions and employed by Defendant within California during the relevant time
22 period who were subject to at least one or more Labor Code violations set forth in the PAGA
23 Notice dated September 7, 2023 and attached hereto as **Exhibit A** (“Aggrieved Employees”).

24 **The Defendants**

25 5. Defendant EMPRESAS, MENDEZ, MERAZ INC., DBA MORGAN HILL
26 FOODS is a California corporation which, at all relevant times mentioned herein, existing, doing
27 business and employing individuals in the County of Santa Clara, State of California. Plaintiff is
28

1 informed and thereon alleges that Defendant exercised control over Plaintiff and Aggrieved
2 Employees' wages, hours, and working conditions.

3 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or
4 otherwise of Defendants named herein as DOES 1-50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at this
5 time and therefore said Defendants are sued by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave to
6 amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities of said Defendants when the same
7 become known to Plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that each of
8 the fictitiously-named Defendants are responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein and is
9 therefore liable to Plaintiff as alleged hereinafter.

10 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that at all times
11 relevant hereto, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, employees, managing agents,
12 supervisors, conspirators, parent corporation, joint employers, alter ego, and/or joint ventures of
13 the other Defendants, and each of them, and in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at
14 least in part within the course and scope of said agency, employment, conspiracy, joint
15 employment, alter ego status, and/or joint venture and with the permission and consent of each of
16 the other Defendants.

17 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that Defendants,
18 and each of them, including those Defendants named DOES 1-50, acted in concert with one
19 another to commit the wrongful acts alleged therein, and aided, abetted, incited, compelled,
20 and/or coerced one another in the wrongful acts alleged herein, and/or attempted to do so.
21 Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereupon alleges, that the Defendants, and
22 each of them, including those Defendants named as DOES 1-50, formed and executed a
23 conspiracy or common plan pursuant to which they would commit the unlawful acts alleged
24 herein, with all such acts alleged herein done as part of and pursuant to said conspiracy, intended
25 to and actually causing Plaintiff harm.
26
27
28

1 9. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act or failure
2 to act by a defendant or co-defendant, such allegations and references shall also be deemed to
3 mean the acts and/or failures to act by each defendant acting individually, jointly and severally.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 10. Venue is proper in Santa Clara County, because Defendant maintains its locations
6 and transacts business in this county, the obligations and liability primarily arise in this county,
7 and work was primarily performed by Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in this county.

8 11. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this matter. The individual
9 claims are under the seventy-five thousand dollar (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for
10 federal court and PAGA penalties cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum jurisdictional
11 amount required for diversity removal. Further, there is no federal question at issue as the issues
12 herein are based solely on California statutes and law, including, but not limited to, the California
13 Labor Code, Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders, California Code of Civil Procedure,
14 and California Rules of Court.

15 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 12. Defendant operates a grocery and produce store for retail consumers. Defendant
17 employed Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees in California during the relevant PAGA period.
18 Aggrieved Employees are all former and/or current non-exempt employees holding various
19 positions and employed by Defendant within California during the relevant time period who
20 were subject to at least one or more Labor Code violations set forth in the PAGA Notice dated
21 September 7, 2023, and attached hereto as **Exhibit A**

22 13. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as a baker from about March 2023 to
23 August 9, 2023. Plaintiff's primary duties included making bread, stocking ingredients for bread
24 production and restocking bread on store shelves.

25 14. The position required Plaintiff to work more than 8 hours a day and/or 40 hours
26 per week without lawful compensation. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were regularly not
27 paid for minimum wages and overtime for compensable work time spent under the control of
28

1 Defendant, including off-the-clock work which was in excess of regularly scheduled, eight-hour
2 daily shifts.

3 15. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were subject to not having all their
4 compensable work time recorded due to Defendant's lack of adequate staffing. Not all of Plaintiff
5 and Aggrieved Employees' compensable work time spent under the control of Defendant was
6 accounted for and compensated. Specifically, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant
7 (1) adjusted clock in and clock out times to the disadvantage of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
8 Employees by rounding up clock-in times when Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees clocked-in
9 before the scheduled start of their respective shifts and rounded down clock-out times when
10 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees worked past the scheduled end time for their shifts, as well
11 as (2) requiring Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to continue working when ostensibly on
12 duty-free meal periods, or requiring them to return to work before the end of their thirty-minute
13 meal periods but prohibiting them from clocking back in until the legally required thirty-minute
14 mark.
15

16 16. Defendant failed to authorize and permit all required meal and rest periods for
17 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees because, upon information and belief, Defendant maintained
18 unlawful meal/rest period policies and practices. In order to curtail labor costs, Defendant
19 regularly did not staff enough employees to provide sufficient coverage to maintain their
20 business operations so Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees could not both complete their
21 assigned daily duties and take complete, timely and uninterrupted meal and rest breaks.
22 Defendant prioritized completion of daily duties and customer satisfaction ahead of meal and
23 rest period compliance. Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees with an
24 additional hour of premium pay at the regular rate of pay for each meal/rest period violation, as
25 required by Labor Code section 226.7.
26

27 17. As a result of the violations described above, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
28 experienced collateral or derivative violations. Specifically, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff
and Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized wage statements in writing in compliance with

1 Labor Code section 226 and failed to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all
2 wages owed at the time employment with Defendant had ended.

3 18. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), any provision of the Labor
4 Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its
5 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code
6 may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on
7 behalf of himself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in
8 Labor Code section 2699.3.

9 19. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
10 specifically provided, Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f) imposes upon Defendant a
11 penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the
12 initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
13 for each subsequent pay period in which Defendant violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

14 20. Defendant's conduct during the PAGA period with respect to Plaintiff and
15 Aggrieved Employees violates numerous Labor Code sections as detailed herein.

16 21. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant has engaged in a systematic pattern of wage and
17 hour violations under the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

18 22. At all relevant times herein, Defendant employed Plaintiff and Aggrieved
19 Employees who were subject to the employment policies described herein, in whole or in part,
20 and therefore suffered at least one or more of the violations set forth herein.

21 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
22 or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive wages
23 for all hours worked, including the applicable minimum, regular, and overtime wages, and that
24 they were not receiving all wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation
25 of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved
26 Employees for all hours worked. Accordingly, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved
27 Employees all earned minimum, regular, and/or overtime compensation.
28

1 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
2 or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
3 required meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and Aggrieved
4 Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty meal
5 period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant had a pattern, practice,
6 and policy of not providing timely meal periods. Defendant failed to pay an additional hour of
7 pay to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for late meal periods. As a result of Defendant's
8 unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did not receive all meal periods
9 or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' regular
10 rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted 30 minute off-duty meal period.

11 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
12 or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive all
13 required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and Aggrieved
14 Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted off-duty rest
15 period. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Defendant had a pattern, practice,
16 and policy of not providing timely rest periods. Defendant failed to pay an additional hour of
17 pay to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for each rest periods were not provided or was
18 interrupted. As a result of Defendant's unlawful policy and practice, Plaintiff and Aggrieved
19 Employees did not receive all required rest periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
20 at Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely,
21 uninterrupted 10 minute off-duty rest period.

22 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
23 or should have known that Plaintiff and certain Aggrieved Employees were entitled to timely
24 payment of wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff
25 and certain Aggrieved Employees did not receive payment of all wages due, within permissible
26 time periods, upon separation of employment.

27 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant knew
28

1 or should have known that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive itemized
2 wage statements that accurately showed their actual hours worked, total hours worked, number
3 of hours worked at each hourly rate, gross and net wages earned, and correct employer
4 information in accordance with California law. As a result of the wage violations specified
5 above, and in violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not provided
6 with accurate itemized wage statements that accurately reported their gross and net wages
7 earned, total hours worked, each applicable rate of pay in effect during the pay period with the
8 corresponding number of hours worked, and the address of the legal entity that is the employer,
9 among other things.

10 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
11 should have known that Defendant was required to maintain accurate records of the hours
12 worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees. In violation of the Labor Code, Defendant failed
13 to maintain accurate records of hours worked by Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees due to its
14 off-the-clock and/or unfair rounding practices, among other things.

15
16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act,**
18 **Labor Code § 2699 et seq., For Violations of the Labor Code)**

19 29. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this
20 Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

21 30. By this complaint, Plaintiff brings this case as a representative action seeking
22 penalties for himself, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California in a representative
23 capacity, as provided by the PAGA, Labor Code sections 2698 et seq. Plaintiff is an Aggrieved
24 Employee who was employed by Defendant and subject to at least one of the Labor Code
25 violations set forth in Labor Code section 2699.5. Plaintiff specifically alleged the following in
26 their notice to the LWDA and Defendants: violation of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204,
27 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198.

28 31. Under Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a), a plaintiff may bring a cause

of action under PAGA only after giving the LWDA and the employer notice of the Labor Code sections alleged to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate, or after 65 days have passed without notice from the LWDA.

32. Prior to filing this complaint, on September 7, 2023, Plaintiff gave written notice of the specific provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, as required by Labor Code section 2699.3 to Defendant EMPRESAS, MENDEZ, MERAZ INC., DBA MORGAN HILL FOODS. The written notice was given via certified mail to Defendant, and the LWDA by electronically filing the notice via the Department of Industrial Relations website. Plaintiff was given an LWDA case number of LWDA-CM-980147-23. True and correct copies of Plaintiff's notices to the LWDA and Defendant are attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

33. The LWDA has not provided Plaintiff with any notice that it intends to investigate the violations as alleged in Plaintiff's notices, and more than 65 calendar days have elapsed since the postmark date on the latter notice.

34. California Labor Code §§2698-2699.5, in relevant part provides, "any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency...for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an Aggrieved Employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3."

35. As an Aggrieved Employee, Plaintiff brings this civil action to recover civil penalties for Defendant's Labor Code violations.

First Violation

(Failure to Provide Meal Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 512)

36. Under California Labor Code §512(a), "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.”

37. Defendant violated Labor Code § 512 by failing to provide Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who worked shifts of greater than five hours, uninterrupted and/or timely meal periods within the first five hours of the shifts worked. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees one hour’s pay at their regular rate of pay for each day Defendant failed to provide a meal period in compliance with section 512.

Second Violation

(Failure to Provide Rest Periods, in Violation of Labor Code Section 226.7)

38. Under California Labor Code §226.7(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”

39. Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) provides, “Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized 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.”

40. Defendant failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods and mandated by the Wage Order.

41. Under §226.7(c), an employer who violates §226.7(b), “...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.”

42. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees who were not provided rest periods one hour of pay at their regular rate of pay.

Third Violation

(Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements, in Violation of Labor Code Section 226)

43. Under California Labor Code §226(a), an employer is legally obligated to provide

1 its employees, semi-monthly or at the time of payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement
2 in writing...”

3 44. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
4 for Defendant’s Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney’s fees and costs, under
5 Labor Code § 2699.

6 **Fourth Violation**

7 **(Failure to Pay Overtime Wages)**

8 45. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and IWC Wage Orders, an
9 employer is required to compensate employees for all overtime, which is calculated at one and
10 one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per
11 day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive
12 workday, with double time for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday
13 and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive day of work in
14 any workweek.

15 46. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
16 for Defendant’s Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney’s fees and costs, under
17 Labor Code § 2699.

18 **Fifth Violation**

19 **(Failure to Pay Minimum Wages)**

20 47. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and IWC Wage Orders,
21 payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in a
22 payroll period is unlawful.

23 48. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
24 for Defendant’s Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney’s fees and costs, under
25 Labor Code § 2699.

26 ///

27 ///

1 **Sixth Violation**

2 **(Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment)**

3 49. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
4 and 15th days of any calendar month, an employer is required to pay its employees between the
5 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed. California Labor Code §
6 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th days of any calendar
7 month, Defendant was required to pay their employees between the 1st and 15th day of the
8 following calendar month. In addition, California Labor Code § 204 provides that all wages
9 earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday of the
10 next regular payroll period.

11 50. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
12 for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
13 Labor Code § 2699.

14 **Seventh Violation**

15 **(Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees)**

16 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 201, 202, and 203, Defendant is required to
17 pay all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. California Labor Code §
18 201 mandates that if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and
19 unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

20 52. Plaintiff, on behalf of the State of California and the LWDA, seeks civil penalties
21 for Defendant's Labor Code violations alleged herein, as well as attorney's fees and costs, under
22 Labor Code § 2699.

23 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**


24 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- 25
- 26 1. For penalties in an amount according to proof;
 - 27 2. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to PAGA; and
 - 28 3. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

1
2 Dated: November 29, 2023
3
4

Respectfully Submitted,

WORK LAWYERS PC

5  _____

Justin Lo, Esq.

6 Attorney for Plaintiff VICTOR MANUEL PUGA
7 GUTIERREZ and Aggrieved Employees
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A



NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS - PAGA
(Labor Code § 2699.3)

DATE September 7, 2023

DELIVERY Online Filing and Certified U.S. Mail

RECIPIENTS California Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

SUBJECT: *Victor Manuel Puga Gutierrez v. Empresas Mendez, Meraz Inc., dba Morgan Hill Foods.; ET AL* — NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER CAL. LABOR CODE §2699.3

Dear Representative:

The office represents Victor Manuel Puga Gutierrez (“Mr. Gutierrez”) with respect to his claims against Empresas Mendez, Meraz Inc., dba Morgan Hill Foods. (“Employer”) for violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified mail. The above-named Employers are joint employers as they engaged Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees as there was sufficient control over wages, working conditions, whether directly or indirectly. Employers are a corporation doing business in the State of California. Employer employed Mr. Gutierrez from approximately March 2023 to approximately August 9, 2023, as a non-exempt/hourly employee. During his employment with Employer, Mr. Gutierrez was employed as a baker at Employers’ grocery business located at 225 W Main Ave Morgan Hill, CA, 95037.

Mr. Gutierrez intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, et seq., the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”). Mr. Gutierrez is seeking penalties on behalf of himself and in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt/hourly employees of any of the Employers (“Aggrieved Employees”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employers violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Mr. Gutierrez employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC Wage Order”) including inter alia, IWC Wage Order No. 5. The claims made on behalf of Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees are based upon the following facts and theories:



1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION.

Employers have engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

First, Employers regularly required Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employers and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Moreover, this off-the-clock work typically caused Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in week, resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation.

In addition to requiring Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation, Employers also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in a failure to pay Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employers failed to pay overtime to Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employers have failed to pay Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.



2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employers failed to provide Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant 30-minute meal periods. Employers required Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than five (5) hours per day but were not provided with uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employers regularly required Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal periods after their tenth (10th) hour of work. On the occasions that Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short.

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employers required Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), 512(a) and 1198.



Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS.

Employers failed to authorize and permit Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees take legally compliant 10-minute periods. Employers required Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Moreover, Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were never completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employers' policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employers did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employers' management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employers failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employers failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employers required Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to in person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employers' policy and culture prevented Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees' right to receive rest periods.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.



Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 226.7(a), and 1198.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT.

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE TO DISCHARGED AND QUTTING EMPLOYEES.

As to each pay period, Employers have failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, inter alia, overtime compensation, straight time wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 201(a), 202(a) and 203(a).

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS.

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees never included the actual hours worked, the name and address of the legal employing entity, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employers violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS.

Employers have failed to maintain accurate records relating to Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per



payroll period. Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Wage Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d). As a result of Employers illegal and detrimental time rounding policy, Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees compensable work time was improperly recorded depriving them of all their earned compensable work time.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of her or her job duties or in direct consequence of her or her obedience to the directions of the employer. IWC Wage Order No. 5 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employers. These costs include but are not limited to the use of Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees of their personal cell phone to send and receive messages and calls with supervisors to understand their duties and the scope of work.

Accordingly, Employers violated IWC Order No. 5 and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 5; and attorneys' fees and costs.

9. FAILURE TO PAY VACATION TIME.

Pursuant to California Labor Code section 227.3, “. . .whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off her vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at her final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served.” During the relevant time period, Employers failed to pay Mr. Gutierrez and other Aggrieved Employees for all earned and unused and accrued vacation time at their final rate of pay at the time of termination of their employment. Accordingly, Employers have violated California Labor Code section 227.3.

Mr. Gutierrez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; California Labor Code section 227 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.



Sincerely,

Justin Lo
JUSTIN LO ESQ.

Notice provided to Employers via Certified Mail

Empresas Mendez, Meraz Inc., dba Morgan Hill Foods
Human Resources/ Legal Department
225 W Main Ave
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Antonio Mejia
Agent for Service of Process for
Empresas Mendez, Meraz Inc., dba Morgan Hill Foods
225 W Main Ave
Morgan Hill, CA 95037