WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC
660 S. Figueroa St., Sky Lobby
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 381-9988
Fax: (213) 381-9989
wilshirelawfirm.com

Sean Paisan, Esq.
John Yslas, Esq.
Tyler Woods, Esq.
Nicol Hajjar, Esq.
Thiago Coelho, Esq.
Benjamin Haber, Esq.

July 22, 2026

LWDA
Attn. PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801
Oakland, CA 94612
(*Via Online Submission*)

Chedraui USA, Inc.
600 Citadel Drive
Commerce, CA 90040
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489009000276780524268

C T Corporation System
Agent for Service of Process for:
Chedraui USA, Inc.
330 N Brand Blvd., Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203
(Via Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)
#9489009000276780524251

Re: ***Jesus Martin v. Chedraui USA, Inc., et al.***
Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Jesus Martin ("Employee") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Chedraui USA, Inc. (collectively "Employers"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Employers engaged in with respect to Employee and all of Employers' Aggrieved Employees.

Employee wishes to pursue this action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, as well as on behalf of all other persons who worked for Employers in California as a non-exempt or hourly-paid employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

<u>Employee's Employment with Employers</u>

Employers own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including San Bernardino County. As such and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Employers' business in California, Employers are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

Employee is a California resident who worked for Employers as a supervisor in San Bernardino County, California, as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately February 2025 to July 2025. During Employee's employment for Employers, Employers paid Employee an hourly wage and classified him as non-exempt from overtime. Employers typically scheduled Employee to work at least five days in a workweek and at least eight hours per day, but Employee regularly worked more than eight hours in a workday and/or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

Throughout Employee's employment, Employers failed to pay for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), failed to provide Employee with legally compliant meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Employee to take rest periods, failed to timely pay all final wages to Employee when Employers terminated his employment, failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Employee, and failed to indemnify Employee for expenditures. As discussed below, Employee's experience working for Employers was typical and illustrative.

<u>Employers Failed to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Minimum, Straight Time, and Overtime Wages</u>

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the IWC is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers maintained a policy and practice of not paying Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages. Employers required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to work "offthe-clock", uncompensated, by, for example, requiring Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to perform work after clocking out for the workday.

Employee and others had to always carry their personal cell phones and sometimes a company walkie-talkie during shifts, including meal and rest breaks. Employee and others had their supervisors always call them and were expected to answer work-related questions and follow work-related instructions. If they did not answer right away, they would be reprimanded and told to be available. Some of this unpaid work should have been paid at the overtime rate. In failing to pay for all hours worked, Employers also failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Employee and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers wrongfully failed to include non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials in the calculation of Employee's and the other Aggrieved Employees' regular rate of pay used to calculate their overtime rate for the payment of overtime wages. Employee and the other Aggrieved Employees earned non-discretionary bonuses, commissions, incentive pay, production pay, performance pay, and/or shift differentials and overtime wages in the same pay periods where they worked overtime hours. Accordingly, Employers failed to compensate Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime compensation they were owed.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Employers wrongfully failed to provide Employee and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Employers regularly, but not always, required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Instead, Employers continued to assert control over Employee and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory meal periods, or by denying Employee and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a meal period. Employee and others had to always carry their personal cell phones and sometimes a company walkie-talkie during shifts, including meal and rest breaks. Employee and others had their supervisors call them at all times and were expected to answer work-related questions and follow work-related instructions. If they did not answer right away, they would be reprimanded and told to be available.

Accordingly, Employer's policy and practice was not to provide meal periods to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Employee and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Employers, however, regularly failed to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

<u>Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods</u>

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of ten uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is six hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Throughout the statutory period, Employers have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to take legally compliant rest periods. Employers regularly required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Employers authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, uninterrupted, duty-free rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Instead, Employers continued to assert control over Employee and the Aggrieved Employees by requiring, pressuring, or encouraging them to perform work tasks which could not be completed without working in lieu of taking mandatory rest periods, or by denying Employee and the Aggrieved Employees permission to take a rest period. Employee and others had to always carry their personal cell phones and sometimes a company walkie-talkie during shifts, including meal and rest breaks. Employee and others had their supervisors call them at all times and were expected to answer work-related questions and follow work-related instructions. If they did not answer right away, they would be reprimanded and told to be available.

Accordingly, Employer's policy and practice was not to authorize and permit Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance with California law.

Employee and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Employers, however, regularly failed to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month

Based on its failure to pay Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Employer also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for overtime hours worked. However, during all such times, Employers systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Employers, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Employers, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Employers owe employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Employee and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods

Employee seeks penalties under California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Employers, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Employee and the Aggrieved Employees.

Employers' failure to provide and maintain records required by the California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Orders deprived Employee and the Aggrieved Employees of the ability to know, understand, and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Employers' records. Therefore, Employee and the Aggrieved

Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Employers. As a direct result, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages, and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Employers to fully perform their obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Employers' knowing failure to comply with the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination

Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Employee and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e., was terminated by quitting or being discharged, and the employment of others will be terminated. However, during the relevant time period, Employers failed, and continue to fail, to pay Employee and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Employers' employment. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum, straight time, and overtime wages), missed meal period premium wages, and missed rest period premium wages.

Employers' conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage from the due date, and at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

Accordingly, Employee and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Employers their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to thirty (30) days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (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 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: "An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars ($50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars ($100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars ($4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney's fees." (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Throughout the statutory period, Employers failed to furnish Employee and the Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, and correct wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law).

Because Employers violated Labor Code § 226, Employee and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights. Accordingly, Employee and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Employers the greater of their actual damages caused by Employers' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars ($4,000) per employee.

Moreover, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures

Labor Code § 2802(a) provides that employers shall indemnify their employees for all necessary business expenditures or losses that have been incurred by the employees in direct discharge of their duties. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, Employers wrongfully required Employee and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Employers. Employee and the Aggrieved Employees regularly paid out-of-pocket for necessary employment-related expenses, including, without limitation, work attire and use of personal cell phones. Employee and the Aggrieved

Employees incurred substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Employers, but Employers failed to indemnify Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

As a result, Employers are liable to Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 2802 and 2699(f)(2) for failing to indemnify Employee and the Aggrieved Employees for necessary business expenditures.

Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA

In light of the above, Employee alleges that Employers violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month;
5. California Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to indemnify for necessary expenditures.

Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Employee seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

Employee has placed Employers on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence, as indicated on the first page. Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILSHIRE LAW FIRM

Christina M. Le

Christina M. Le, Esq.