

June 25, 2026

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: PAGA Notice Letter on Behalf of MARCO ANTONIO FLORES
ORNELAS and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor Code
section 2699.3

Via Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested:

BLACK BEAR DINER SAN JOAQUIN
VALLEY CORPORATION; BLACK BEAR
DINER – MADERA, LP; BLACK BEAR
DINER – VISALIA L.P.; BLACK BEAR
DINER LOS BANOS, L.P.; BLACK BEAR
DINER SLO L.P.; BLACK BEAR DINER-
HANFORD LIMITED PARTNERSHIP;
BLACK BEAR DINER-PORTERVILLE
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; BLACK BEAR
DINER-TULARE L.P.
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643582429807)

BLACK BEAR DINER – MADERA, LP
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067379)

BLACK BEAR DINER LOS BANOS, L.P.
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067324)

BLACK BEAR DINER SAN JOAQUIN
VALLEY CORPORATION
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067225)

BLACK BEAR DINER – VISALIA L.P.
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643582429852)

BLACK BEAR DINER SLO L.P.
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067485)

BLACK BEAR DINER-HANFORD
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067577)

BLACK BEAR DINER-PORTERVILLE
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067539)

BLACK BEAR DINER-TULARE L.P.
c/o KIAH JORDAN, REGISTERED AGENT
1224 COAST VILLAGE CIRCLE, SUITE 11
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93108
(CMRR Tracking
#9414809898643083067706)

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time this PAGA Notice was submitted electronically to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice concerns MARCO ANTONIO FLORES ORNELAS’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employers: BLACK BEAR DINER SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CORPORATION; BLACK BEAR DINER – MADERA, LP; BLACK BEAR DINER – VISALIA L.P.; BLACK BEAR DINER LOS BANOS, L.P.; BLACK BEAR DINER SLO L.P.; BLACK BEAR DINER-HANFORD LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; BLACK BEAR DINER-PORTERVILLE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; BLACK BEAR DINER-TULARE L.P. (collectively “Employer”). Employee is a non-exempt hourly employee and works for Employer as a kitchen manager at, without limitation, 1161 East Tulare Avenue, Tulare, California 93274. Employee has worked for Employer from approximately January of 2022 through the present. Employee’s duties include, but are not limited to, managing kitchen operations including making supply lists, creating employee schedules, training new employees, and supervising kitchen staff.

Employee seeks to represent all “Aggrieved Employees” that worked for Employer during the PAGA Period. The “PAGA Period” covers the three years preceding the date this letter was initially submitted to the LWDA and continues past that date into perpetuity. Specifically, in connection with any alleged claims for violations of Labor Code sections 200, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 227.3, 245, 246, 432.5, 1198, 1198.5. Employee seeks to represent *all* employees that worked for Employer during the PAGA Period. On all other claims mentioned herein, Employee seeks to represent only non-exempt employees that worked for Employer during the PAGA Period. Collectively, these employees are referred to herein as “Aggrieved Employees.”

///

Unpaid Minimum and Overtime Wages:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked at the proper rates of pay. Employer knew, or should have known, that Employee and Aggrieved Employees were entitled to receive wages for all time worked, including regular, overtime, and double times wages, yet failed to pay Employee and Aggrieved Employees all wages owed for work that was required to be performed.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains a practice or policy of failing to track all minutes actually worked by Employee and Aggrieved Employees by engaging, suffering, or permitting Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock. Specifically, Employer engaged, suffered, or permitted Aggrieved Employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to clock out and continue working to avoid paying double-time wages. Employer also instructed Employee not to clock-in on certain shifts to avoid paying double-time wages. Specifically, Employer required Employee to cook for a banquet after he was already clocked-out and he was not paid for this time.

In addition, Employer failed to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses – by way of a 2.5 percentage of profits for kitchen staff and a 7.5 percentage of profits for the general managers—into the regular rate of pay during pay periods where overtime was worked. Moreover, upon information and belief, Employer detrimentally edited and/or manipulated time entries so the hours recorded were less than the hours actually worked. By way of example, Employer would retroactively alter Employee’s time punches to reduce the amount of overtime recorded and would add compliant meal-breaks where one was not otherwise provided.

Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the minimum wage and overtime laws (including sick pay and premium pay laws as it pertains to regular rate), Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the minimum wage and overtime laws, if any of these should be found. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 223, 246, 510, 551, 552, 1197, 1198, 1182.12, and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum and overtime wages for all hours worked. Thus, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2, and 1198. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer’s conduct was malicious, fraudulent, or oppressive. Thus, Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1197.1, 1199 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer’s conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Non-Compliant Meal Periods:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees during the PAGA Period to work excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day, without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof. By way of example, Employer regularly denied Employee and Aggrieved Employees lawful meal periods by, without limitation, interrupting meal periods; failing to provide meal periods all together; not providing timely meal periods; and failing to provide second meal periods. For example, Employee's meal periods were constantly interrupted by Employer to ask questions about work-related matters. Sometimes Employer would even go out to the parking lot, where Employee was resting in his car during his meal period, to ask him to get back to work before the 30-minute period had concluded. Moreover, Employer never provided more than one meal period, regardless of the duration of the shift. Employee regularly worked over 10 hours without a second meal period provided; Employer would also alter Employee's timesheets to show compliant 30-minute meal periods where one was not otherwise taken. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the meal period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the meal period laws, including potential violations for auto-deducted meals and meals for which Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 512, 1198 and applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and therefore each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer is thus liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1199 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Non-Compliant Rest Periods:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the Aggrieved Employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation, by interrupting rest periods; by failing to provide rest periods all together; not providing rest periods in a timely fashion; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. For example, Employee would often work shifts up to 16 hours long with only a single 10-minute rest period

provided. Given Employee personally suffered these violations of the rest period laws, Employee also seeks to represent Aggrieved Employees in connection with other violations of the rest period laws, including potential violations for rest periods where Aggrieved Employees are required to clock-out and rest periods for which Aggrieved Employees were not permitted to leave the premises, if any of these should be found. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated the applicable Wage Order(s) each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period, and that, thus each Aggrieved Employee was owed one hour of premium pay at their regular rate of pay for each day worked during the PAGA Period under Labor Code section 226.7. Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay, in violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 1198. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1199 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods and for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Inaccurate and Inadequate Recordkeeping Practices:

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer failed and continues to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employer also failed to provide all documents requested by Employee on May 8, 2026, in violation of these Labor Code sections, including but not limited to wage statements in violation of Labor Code section 226 and time records in violation of Labor Code section 1174. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees personally suffered these violations, which in turn entitles Employee and other Aggrieved Employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, 1199, and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Inaccurate Itemized Wage Statements:

Both independently and as a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policies or practices, Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish Employee and Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Employer failed to provide wage statements as requested under Labor Code section

226 and Employee does not recall the wage statements including this information. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 226 and 1198 each day for each Aggrieved Employee during the PAGA Period. Employee and each Aggrieved Employee personally suffered these violations and was owed penalties under Labor Code section 226 for each pay period worked during the PAGA Period. However, Employee is informed and believes that those penalties under Labor Code section 226 were not paid for these violations of Labor Code sections 226. Employee would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, 1199, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Reimburse Employees:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees, for their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas) to attend required business meetings and complete supply runs; the use of personal cellular phones for work purposes including communications regarding work orders and supply purchases; and the purchase of supplies at stores including Smart & Final and Cisco when supplies ran short, as required by Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations and Employer is liable to reimburse Employee and other Aggrieved Employees for the costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1199 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Comply with Sick Pay Laws:

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other Aggrieved Employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 221, 223, 233, 234, 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Employee is thus informed and believes that Employer violated these Labor Code sections, as well as Labor Code section 1198. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered violations under these sections and Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code sections 1198 and 2699. Employee is further informed and believes,

and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages Owed:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay Employee and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and does not pay Employee and other Aggrieved Employees every day and every workweek in accordance with Labor Code sections 204 and 1198 due to, among other things, the violations set forth above, the derivative nature of which is an implicit consequence of the rationale in *Camp v. Home Depot USA, Inc.* (2022) 84 Cal.App.5th 638. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code section 204. Employee and other Aggrieved Employees have personally suffered these violations. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558, 1199 and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

Unlawful Terms and Conditions:

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer, including its agents, managers, superintendents, and/or officers, required Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees to agree, in writing, to terms and conditions known by Employer (and its agents, managers, superintendents and/or officers) to be prohibited by law, including, without limitation, terms known to be illegal in purported arbitration agreements, and other written documents presented for signature and/or assent to Employee and/or Aggrieved Employees by Employer. Indeed, as a condition of employment, Employer required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to sign an agreement that either waived their right to file and pursue a civil action in court or required Employee and Aggrieved Employees to affirmatively opt out to preserve their right to file a civil action in court, in violation of Labor Code section 432.6. This includes requiring an employee to opt out of a waiver. As a result, Employee is informed and believes that Employer violated Labor Code sections 432.5, 432.6 and 1198. Thus, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5, 432.6, 1199, and 2699, or injunctive relief under sections 2699(e)(1) and 2699(k). Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer's conduct was malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, making Employer subject to heightened civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii).

To the extent Employer previously used the notice and cure provision of Labor Code section 2699.3 within the last twelve months, under section 2699.3(d), Employer is not eligible to cure the violations discussed herein under section 2699.3 or otherwise use the early evaluation conference process pursuant to section 2699.3(f).

In the event that Employer is determined to have satisfied sections 2699(g), 2699(h), or otherwise 2699(d)(1), Employer is also, in the alternative, liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(j), 2699(e)(2), and 2699(f)(2).

In the event that Employer is determined to have, prior to this notice or a request for records pursuant to Labor Code section 226, 432, or 1198.5, from Employee or his/her counsel, adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to section 2699(g)(1)-(3).

In the event that Employer is deemed to have adequately taken all reasonable steps to be in compliance with all provisions identified in this notice within 60 days of receiving this notice, Employer is still liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(h)(1)-(3).

If the LWDA or a court issued a finding or determination to the Employer within five (5) years of any of violations described above, that Employer's policy or practice giving rise to such violations was unlawful, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(i), 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), and is **not** eligible for reduced penalties under either Labor Code sections 2699(g) or 2699(h) for remedying violations either prior to or after the serving of this notice. Regardless, as set forth above, Employee alleges Employer's conduct giving rise to the violations as detailed herein was and is malicious, fraudulent, and/or oppressive, particularly given, among other reasons, Employer has been sued for these violations in the past. Thus, Employer is additionally subject to increased penalties under Labor Code section 2699(f)(2)(B)(ii) and, per Labor Code sections 2699(g)(3) and 2699(h)(3), is **not** eligible for reduced penalties for remedying violations either prior to or after the Employer's receipt of this notice.

/ / /

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivisions (a)(2)(A), (c)(1)(D)-(E), and/or (c)(2)(A)-(B), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties or for injunctive relief under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Sarah Cohen

Sarah Cohen