WorkRight Law, APC

Ash Bhargava
3925 Tipperary Court
Yorba Linda, CA
(562) 760-8803
Ash@WorkRightLaw.com
www.workrightlaw.com

July 3, 2026

VIA PAGA ONLINE FILING ONLY
California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
https://dir.tfaforms.net/308

Re: ***Martha Alvarez v. Prince Hospitality, LLC***
Notice of Private Attorneys General Act Claim

Dear PAGA Administrator:

This office has been retained by aggrieved employee Martha Alvarez ("Plaintiff") concerning a representative action pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq*. ("PAGA") against Prince Hospitality, LLC (including any and all affiliates, subsidiaries, parents, directors, officers, managing agents, and executive employees) (collectively referred to as "Defendants") for violations of California wage and hour laws. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and all other remedies available under PAGA.

Plaintiff seeks these remedies on behalf of the State of California and "aggrieved employees," as defined herein. This letter is sent in compliance with the notice requirements of Labor Code § 2699.3.

Defendants own and operate hotels, including the Homewood Suites by Hilton Santa Clarita located at 28700 Newhall Ranch Road, Santa Clarita, California 91355. Defendants operate throughout Los Angeles County. Defendants employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 9, 2025 through December 17, 2025. The "aggrieved employees" that Plaintiff seeks civil penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the above-referenced entities within the State of California.

Based on the following facts and theories, Defendants violated and/or continue to violate, among other provisions of the Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code §§ 226, 226.7, 512, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, and applicable IWC Wage Orders.

Labor Code § 512 mandates that an employer shall 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. An employer shall not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

Labor Code § 226.7 provides that an employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health. It further provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee a meal or rest or recovery period in accordance with a state law, including, but not limited to, an applicable statute or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, or the Division of Occupational Safety and Health, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal or rest or recovery period is not provided.

During the relevant time period, Defendants maintained policies and practices that prevented Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees from taking compliant meal periods. Specifically, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees regularly worked shifts of eight hours per day, which exceeded five hours, but were not provided with timely, uninterrupted, off-duty 30-minute meal periods. Defendants provided meal periods that were shorter than 30 minutes, failed to relieve Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees of all duty during meal periods by requiring them to remain available for work-related tasks, or interrupted their meal periods for work-related matters. Defendants failed to pay the meal period premiums owed for these noncompliant meal periods.

Labor Code § 1194 authorizes an employee paid less than the legal minimum wage or overtime to recover the unpaid balance, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and § 1194.2 entitles an employee who proves a minimum-wage underpayment to liquidated damages equal to the unpaid minimum wages plus interest. The applicable Wage Order defines "hours worked" as "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." See §2 of all applicable Wage Orders. Therefore, employers are required to pay employees for all time spent subject to the control of the employer and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to work. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked, including all time they were suffered or permitted to work.

Labor Code § 1197 prohibits an employer from paying any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by the IWC. Labor Code § 1197.1 provides for civil penalties for violations of minimum wage requirements.

During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees minimum wage for all hours worked. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to complete mandatory onboarding activities before their first day of work, including completing employment paperwork, reviewing employee handbook policies, completing safety training modules, and filling out tax and benefit enrollment forms, but did not compensate them for the time spent completing these mandatory activities. Defendants had actual knowledge that this work was performed off the clock because Defendants required the activities and provided the materials and instructions for their completion.

Labor Code § 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to furnish accurate itemized wage statements that listed all hours worked, including time spent performing mandatory off-the-clock onboarding activities, and failed to include the premium payments owed for missed meal periods. The wage statements the aggrieved employees received from Defendants were in violation of Labor Code § 226(a). These omissions prevented Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees from learning of Defendants' unlawful pay practices.

Defendants failed to keep accurate time and wage records as required by Labor Code § 1174, including failing to maintain records of all hours worked by Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees, including the time they spent performing mandatory off-the-clock onboarding activities and their meal periods.

Applicable IWC Wage Orders require that each workday an employee is required to report for work and does report, but is not put to work or is furnished less than half said employee's usual or scheduled day's work, the employee shall be paid for half the usual or scheduled day's work, but in no event for less than two hours nor more than four hours, at the employee's regular rate of pay.

During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay reporting time pay to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as required. Specifically, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were regularly scheduled to work eight-hour shifts but were on occasion sent home after working approximately three hours when business was slow, having been furnished with less than half of their scheduled day's work, yet Defendants failed to pay them reporting time pay for those occasions.

California Code of Regulations, Title 8, § 11050(7)(A)(3) requires employers to maintain accurate records which includes time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded. Employers must maintain these records for a period of at least three years and make them available for inspection by the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement upon request. Furthermore, Labor Code § 2699.3(c) permits Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees to bring a PAGA action for violations of the Wage Orders.

During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to maintain accurate time records as required by California Code of Regulations, Title 8, § 11050(7)(A)(3). Specifically, Defendants failed to record all hours worked by Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees, including the time they spent performing mandatory off-the-clock onboarding activities, and failed to accurately record the start and end times of their meal periods. As a result, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were deprived of accurate records documenting their hours worked, thereby facilitating Defendants' wage and hour violations.

Therefore, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, Plaintiff seeks all applicable penalties arising out of the above-referenced wage, hour, and payroll practices, or which could be assessed and collected by the LWDA, for violation of the Labor Code pursuant to PAGA. Labor Code § 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter (i.e. this letter) to the employer in question and file an online claim to the LWDA setting forth the claims and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the LWDA and employer an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action they deem appropriate. If the LWDA and Defendants elect not to take any action with respect to any of the foregoing claims, Plaintiff will seek these penalties in a civil action on behalf of all aggrieved employees within one year of the date of this letter as allowed by law.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the phone number or address above.

Very truly yours,

Ash Bhargava
Attorney for Plaintiff