

December 1, 2023

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Filed Online

Re: Written Notice – Private Attorney General Act (“PAGA”) –
Labor Code section 2698 et seq.
Griselda Pena v. United Employment Solutions, Inc. et al.

PAGA Administrator:

Notice is hereby provided that, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, Griselda Pena (“Employee”) contends that United Employment Solutions, Inc., and Arevalo Tortilleria, Inc. (collectively “Employer”) have violated, and continue to violate, provisions of the Labor Code and wage orders promulgated by the Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC wage order”), including, but not limited to, Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 210, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1174, 1182, 1197, 1198, 2802, and the applicable wage order.

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

Employee was hired by Employer in approximately August 2020. Employee worked for Employer in Montebello, California until her date of separation of approximately September 26, 2023. Employee was employed in production earned approximately \$15.25 per hour.

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

United Employment Solutions, Inc. is a California corporation that does business in California.

Arevalo Tortilleria, Inc. is a California corporation that does business in California.

United Employment Solutions, Inc. is an employment agency headquartered in Rancho Cucamonga, California. United Employment Solutions, Inc., assigned employees to work at Arevalo Tortilleria. Arevalo Tortilleria, Inc., is a manufacturer of flour and corn tortillas headquartered in Montebello, California. United Employment Solutions, Inc., and Arevalo Tortilleria, Inc. jointly employed Employee and other aggrieved employees.

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

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

1. Failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees for all overtime (Lab. Code, §§ 510, 1198);
2. Failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees for all hours worked (Lab. Code, §§ 1182, 1194, 1197, 1198);
3. Failed to provide Employee and aggrieved employees with compliant meal periods (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512);
4. Failed to provide Employees and aggrieved employees with compliant rest periods (Lab. Code, §§ 226.7, 512);
5. Failed to provide Employees and aggrieved employees with accurate, itemized wage statements and failed to maintain accurate records (Lab. Code, §§ 226(a), 1174);
6. Failed to timely pay Employee and aggrieved employees' wages during employment (Lab. Code, §§ 204, 210);
7. Failed to timely pay Employees and aggrieved employees all final wages in a timely manner (Lab. Code, §§ 201-203);
8. Failed to pay accrued vacation wages (Lab. Code, § 227.3);
9. Failed to minimize excessive indoor heat (Lab. Code § 226.7);
10. Failed to provide one day of rest in seven (Lab. Code, §§ 551, 552); and
11. Failed to reimburse business expenses (Lab. Code Lab. Code § 2802).

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

Failure to Pay Overtime

During the Relevant Time Period, upon information and belief, Employer had, and

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

At all times, Employee and other aggrieved employees remained under the control of Employer. Employer could have recorded this off-the-clock work but refused to do so to avoid paying Employee and aggrieved employees overtime wages. Employee and aggrieved employees would have to arrive at least five (5) minutes before their shift starting time because they were required to wait in an inspection line before clocking-in. Moreover, during the Covid-19 pandemic, Employer required employees to undergo an off-the-clock temperature check prior to clocking-in.

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

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

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

Failure to Pay All Wages

As stated above, during the relevant time period, as a result of Employer’s policy of limiting the amount of overtime employees could accrue, Employee and other aggrieved employees were forced to work off-the-clock before their scheduled shift times.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Breaks

Meal breaks were short and late because Employee would have to walk two (2) minutes each way from the time clock to the breakroom. Employee would also have to wait in line to clock back in. Moreover, meal breaks were regularly interrupted by management.

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

and rest periods for their own purposes. *Id.* at 270; *Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1004, 1038-39.

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

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

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

Yet Employer did and does not provide Employee and aggrieved employees with meal periods during which they are completely relieved of duty for at least thirty (30) minutes by the fifth hour of work and again by the tenth hour of work.

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

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

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

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

Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Breaks

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

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

During the relevant time period, Employer regularly failed to authorize and permit Employee and other aggrieved employees to take a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked or major fraction thereof. Employee alleges that rest breaks were short and late as a result of having to walk two (2) minutes each way from the work area to the breakroom.

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

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

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

Wage Statements

Labor Code section 226(a) requires employers make, keep, and provide true, accurate, and

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

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

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

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

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

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

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

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

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

During the Relevant Time Period, Employer willfully failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees all wages due including, but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal and rest period premiums, within the time periods specified by Labor Code section 204. The violation of Labor Code § 204 also constitutes a predicate violation for PAGA, and under Labor Code § 210, penalties are alternatively recoverable under the provisions of PAGA.

Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages Upon Termination

As a pattern and practice, Employer regularly failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees their final wages pursuant to Labor Code sections 201-203.

Labor Code sections 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.

On information and belief, Employer has a company-wide practice or policy of failing to pay all accrued wages to departing employees and don't adhere to the time requirements set forth in Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Employer willfully failed to pay Employee and aggrieved employees the earned and unpaid wages set forth above, including but not limited to, overtime wages, minimum wages, and/or meal rest period premiums, either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Employer's employ.

Failure to Pay Accrued Vacation Wages

Labor Code section 227.3 sets forth requirements pertaining to vacation pay. The provision states the following: "whenever a contract of employment or employer policy provides for paid vacations, and an employee is terminated without having taken off his vested vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages at his final rate in accordance with such contract of employment or employer policy respecting eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or employer policy shall not provide for forfeiture of vested vacation time upon termination."

As a matter of uniform corporate policy, procedure and practice, Employer violated Labor Code section 227.3 by failing to pay Employee and aggrieved employees all vested vacation wages at the end of their employment. For example, Employer failed to accrue Employee's vacation wages for August to September 2023.

Labor Code section 227.3, prohibits employers from forfeiting payment of the vested vacation wages of their employees.

As a direct and proximate result of the acts and/or omissions of Employer, Employee and aggrieved employees have been deprived of accrued vacation wages.

Failure to Minimize Excessive Indoor Heat

California Labor Code § 226.7(a) states "As used in this section, "recovery period" means a cooldown period afforded an employee to prevent heat illness." Section 226.7(c) states "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."

The applicable Wage Order section 15(A) provides the following: "The temperature maintained in each work area shall provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for the nature of the process and the work performed." Section 15(B) states "If excessive heat or humidity is created by the work process, the employer shall take all feasible means to reduce such excessive heat or humidity to a degree providing reasonable comfort."

Employer failed to comply with California Labor Code § 226.7(a), and the applicable Wage Order, by maintaining an excessively hot working environment, with no relief from the heat. As a result, Employer has failed to maintain a safe indoor working environment.

Failure to Provide One Day of Rest in Seven

At all relevant times herein, California Labor Code section 551 provides that every person employed in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day's rest in seven. Additionally, California Labor Code section 552 prohibits employers from requiring employees to work more than six consecutive days without a day of rest.

At all relevant times herein set forth, California Labor Code section 556 exempts an employer from the day-of-rest requirement when the total hours worked by an employee do not exceed 30 hours in any week or six hours in any one day thereof.

During the relevant time period, on information and belief, Employer sometimes scheduled Employee and aggrieved employees to work eight (8) or more hours per day and more than six (6) consecutive days in a workweek. Because Employee and aggrieved employees worked over 30 hours per week and over six (6) hours per day in a workweek, they were not exempt from the day-of-rest requirement. To the extent that Employee and aggrieved employees may have signed purported waivers of their right to a day's rest in seven, such waivers are invalid.

Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses

Labor Code section 2802 requires employers to pay for all necessary expenditures and losses incurred by the employee in the performance of his or her job. The purpose of Labor Code section 2802 is to prevent employers from passing off their cost of doing business and operating expenses on to their employees. *Cochran v. Schwan's Home Service, Inc.* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1137, 1144.

The applicable IWC wage order provides that: “[w]hen tools or equipment are required by the employer or are necessary to the performance of a job, such tools and equipment shall be provided and maintained by the employer, except that an employee whose wages are at least two (2) times the minimum wage provided herein may be required to provide and maintain hand tools and equipment customarily required by the trade or craft.”

During the Relevant Time Period a company-wide policy whereby management would require Employee and aggrieved employees to purchase non-slip shoes, white shirts, and white pants.

Employer failed to reimburse them for this cost. Employer could have compensated Employee and aggrieved employees. Instead, Employer passed these operating costs off onto Employee and aggrieved employees. Thus, Employer had, and continues to have, a company-wide

policy and/or practice of not reimbursing employees for expenses necessarily incurred in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

Conclusion

Enclosed please find a copy of the class action complaint that is in the process of being filed in the Superior Court for the State of California, Los Angeles County. Employee respectfully requests that the LWDA notify this office within sixty (60) days if it wishes to investigate this matter further. A copy is being sent via certified mail to Employer. Should you have any questions or concerns or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

BRADLEY/GROMBACHER, LLP



Marcus J. Bradley, Esq.

cc: ALEJANDRA SANDOVAL
AGENT FOR:
UNITED EMPLOYMENT SOLUTIONS, INC.
10803 FOOTHILL BLVD STE 190
RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA 91342

AREVALO TORTILLERIA, INC.
1537 W MINES AVE
MONTEBELLO, CA 90640

JOSE LUIS AREVALO
AGENT FOR
AREVALO TORTILLERIA, INC.
1537 W MINES AVE
MONTEBELLO, CA 90640