

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Elyssa Martinez (State Bar No. 355589)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com /
elyssa@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Morresia Byfield

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

06/25/2024 at 02:36:27 PM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Isaiah Irizarry, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

MORRESIA BYFIELD, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated and the
State of California under the Private Attorneys
General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

HILTON HOTEL EMPLOYER LLC; CHH
TORREY PINES TENANT CORP.; and DOES
1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00029661-CU-OE-CTL

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys
General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

1 Plaintiff MORRESIA BYFIELD, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated and
2 the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“Plaintiff”) brings this
3 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants HILTON HOTEL EMPLOYER
4 LLC; CHH TORREY PINES TENANT CORP.; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively
5 “Defendants”), alleging as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This is a representative action complaint brought under the California Private Attorneys
8 General Act (Labor Code sections 2968 *et seq.*)

9 2. Defendants underpaid overtime, paid sick leave, and premiums by failing to include
10 bonuses and all other forms of non-excludable remuneration into the regular rate of pay calculations.

11 3. Defendants failed to pay all regular and overtime hours due to requiring off-the-clock
12 work.

13 4. Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and/or permit the aggrieved employees to take
14 all meal and rest periods to which they were entitled.

15 5. As set forth in the PAGA notice, Defendants failed to maintain lawful meal and rest
16 periods, regular, overtime, and paid sick leave policies. Defendants’ employment policies, practices,
17 and payroll administration systems enabled and facilitated these violations on a company-wide basis
18 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

19 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

20 6. Jurisdiction of this action is proper in this Court under Article VI, Section 10 of the
21 California Constitution as the causes of action are premised upon violations of California law.

22 7. The monetary damages and restitution sought exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of
23 the Superior Court.

24 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
25 Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail
26 themselves to the California economy so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the
27 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9. Venue is proper in this Court under Code of Civil Procedure sections 393(a), 395, and/or 395.5 because, upon information and belief, Defendants conduct business and committed some of the alleged violations in this county.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Morresia Byfield

10. Plaintiff Byfield is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee from about January 2023 to October 2023. Plaintiff worked as a Culinary Supervisor.

11. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action. (*Kim v. Reins Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff files suit is always the real party in interest.”]) To the extent permitted by law, including pursuant *Balderas v. Fresh Start Harvesting, Inc.*, Court of Appeals Case No. B326759 (2nd App. Dist.) ____ Cal. App. 5th ____ (Mar. 20, 2024, *as modified* Apr. 18, 2024), the PAGA claim is brought exclusively as a representative action and does not include arbitrable claims.

B. Defendants

12. Defendant Hilton Hotel Employer LLC is a Delaware limited liability company that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county.

13. Defendant CHH Torrey Pines Tenant Corp. is a Delaware corporation that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county. Defendant CHH Torrey Pines Tenant Corp. does business as Hilton La Jolla Torrey Pines.

14. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or otherwise, of the parties sued as DOES 1 through 50, are presently unknown, unascertainable, or uncertain, and are sued by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Upon information and belief, each of DOES 1 through 50 constitutes a legal employer or is otherwise legally responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein. This Complaint may be amended to reflect their true names and capacities once ascertained.

1 15. Upon information and belief, Defendants in this action are employers, co-employers,
2 joint employers, and/or part of an integrated employer enterprise, as each of the Defendants exercised
3 control over the wages, hours, and working conditions of the employees, suffered and permitted them
4 to work, and otherwise engaged them as employees under California law.

5 16. Upon information and belief, at least some of the Defendants have common ownership,
6 common management, interrelationship of operations, and centralized control over labor relations and
7 are therefore part of an integrated enterprise and thus jointly and severally responsible for the acts and
8 omissions alleged herein, including pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, and 1197.1.

9 17. Upon information and belief, Defendants acted in all respects pertinent to this action as
10 an alter-ego, agent, servant, joint employer, joint venturer, co-conspirator, partner, in an integrated
11 enterprise, or in some other capacity on behalf of all other co-defendants, such that the acts and
12 omissions of each defendant may be legally attributable to all others.

13 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

14 18. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum
15 wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages.

16 19. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice requiring Plaintiff
17 and the aggrieved employees to complete off-the-clock work, resulting in unpaid minimum wages.

18 20. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees consistently worked through their unpaid meal
19 periods due to understaffing and the high demands of the job.

20 21. Specifically, Plaintiff worked as a Culinary Supervisor in a busy hotel kitchen. Due to
21 meal “rushes” the hotel restaurant would become increasingly busy during Plaintiff’s shift.
22 Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees with adequate staffing where they
23 could step away for a compliant meal period. As a result, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees
24 worked through their unpaid meal periods.

25 22. Defendants actively avoided compensating Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees the
26 minimum wage for all hours worked by instructing them to clock out for an unpaid 30-minute meal
27 period but continue to work or otherwise attest they “voluntarily” missed their meal period or face
28 reprimand.

23. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked through their unpaid meal periods or otherwise completed off-the-clock work, this resulted in unpaid minimum wages.

24. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees' overtime and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

25. First, to the extent that Defendants' unlawful practice requiring off-the-clock work resulted in unpaid hours worked over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid hours worked over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime wages.

26. Second, Defendants failed to pay overtime at the "regular rate of pay."

27. Defendants paid Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees non-discretionary bonuses and other forms of additional non-excludable remuneration that Defendants failed to include in the overtime rate when earned in the same pay period.

28. An illustrative example of this violation is shown on Plaintiff's wage statement in the pay period of March 31, 2023 to April 13, 2023. Here, Plaintiff worked almost 8 overtime hours and earned a bonus/incentive payment of \$250.00, however, Plaintiff's overtime was paid at a straight 1.5x multiple of Plaintiff's base rate instead of the regular rate of pay which should have factored the additional non-excludable payment.

29. Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime "at a rate no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee" and "twice the regular rate of pay" for double time hours as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders.

30. Similarly, to the extent the aggrieved employees earned sick pay in the same pay periods they earned other forms of non-excludable remuneration, Defendants underpaid those wages due to the regular rate violation addressed above.

31. Defendants did not pay the aggrieved employees "in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick leave, whether or not the employee

1 actually worked overtime in that workweek,” as the regular rate should have included bonuses and all
2 other forms of non-excludable remuneration for the reasons aforementioned.

3 32. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and
4 interrupted meal periods in order to keep up with the high demands of the job.

5 33. For example, due to the meal “rushes” Plaintiff experienced from working in a busy
6 hotel kitchen, Plaintiff often took her meal period late (after the fifth hour of work) or missed it
7 entirely.

8 34. Nonetheless, Defendants had a policy and practice of avoiding and failing to pay meal
9 period premiums to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

10 35. Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to clock-out before the fifth
11 hour of work to make it appear as if a compliant meal period was taken.

12 36. Additionally, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were required to “confirm” they
13 were able to take compliant meal periods at the end of every shift, regardless of their ability to do so
14 or face reprimand.

15 37. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced a non-compliant meal
16 period, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay meal period premiums.

17 38. To the extent Defendants paid meal period premiums, based on Defendants failure to
18 pay overtime at the regular rate of pay, Plaintiff believed and alleges Defendants similarly failed to
19 pay premiums at the regular rate of compensation as a matter of common policy and practice.

20 39. Due to the same reasons Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced non-
21 compliant meal periods, like understaffing and the pressure to keep up with the high demands of the
22 job they also experienced non-compliant rest periods.

23 40. Defendants similarly had a policy and practice of not paying rest period premiums to
24 employees who were not authorized to take rest periods.

25 41. To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Plaintiff believes and alleges
26 Defendant violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the correct
27 regular rate of compensation.

1 42. Because of these violations, Defendants failed to provide accurate, itemized wage
2 statements to employees that included accurate gross or net wages earned as employees earned
3 overtime, sick leave, and premiums which were not paid at the lawful rate due to the regular rate
4 violations as well as the off-the-clock violations.

5 43. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on
6 employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of
7 hours worked at that rate, as Defendant failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The
8 amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay
9 stub.

10 44. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list
11 employees' "total hours worked," as the wage statements did not accurately include the
12 uncompensated time Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked due to Defendants' policy and
13 practice of editing time records to reflect meal periods that were not taken.

14 45. These violations create derivative liability for failure to pay all wages owed each
15 payday or upon separation of employment.

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

18 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.***

19 **(By Plaintiff on Behalf of the State and the Aggrieved Employees Against All Defendants)**

20 46. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

21 47. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
22 the following "aggrieved employees" pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"),
23 codified as Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*:

24 a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in
25 California at any time from one year prior to the postmark date of the initial
26 PAGA notice through date of trial.

27 48. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
28 aggrieved employees, according to proof.

1 49. The State of California, via the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
2 (“LWDA”), is the real party in interest in this action with respect to this cause of action. (*Kim v. Reins*
3 *Int’l California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 5th 73, 81 [The “government entity on whose behalf the plaintiff
4 files suit is always the real party in interest.”])

5 50. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,,
6 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
7 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,
8 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
9 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
10 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3. “

11 51. Labor Code section 2699(f) provides: “For all provisions of this code except those for
12 which a civil penalty is specifically provided, there is established a civil penalty for a violation of these
13 provisions, as follows: ... (2) If, at the time of the alleged violation, the person employs one or more
14 employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period
15 for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
16 each subsequent violation.”

17 52. Any allegations regarding violations of the IWC Wage Orders are enforceable as
18 violations of Labor Code section 1198, which states: “[t]he employment of any employee for longer
19 hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.”

20 53. Labor Code section 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
21 penalties under the PAGA.

22 54. On or about **April 17, 2024**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and provided
23 written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants) of
24 Defendants’ alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
25 violations.

26 55. A true and correct copy of Plaintiff’s written PAGA notice, entitled “Notice of Labor
27 Code Violations” is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference as though fully set
28 forth herein (the “PAGA notice”).

1 56. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received a response to Plaintiff's
2 written PAGA notice from the LWDA.

3 57. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice sent by Plaintiff, neither
4 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
5 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

6 58. Now that at least 65 days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants of these
7 violations, without notice of cure from Defendants or notice from the LWDA of its intent to investigate
8 the alleged allegations and issue the appropriate citations to Defendants, Plaintiff exhausted all
9 prerequisites and commenced this civil action under Labor Code section 2699 *et seq.*

10 59. As set forth in the PAGA notice attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this
11 Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all corresponding civil
12 penalties:

- 13 a. ***Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194,
14 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 15 b. ***Unpaid Overtime.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage
16 Orders.
- 17 c. ***Unpaid Paid Sick Leave.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7.
- 18 d. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512,
19 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 20 e. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516,
21 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- 22 f. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code
23 §§ 204, 204b, 210.
- 24 g. ***Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment.*** Violation of
25 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256.
- 26 h. ***Non-Compliant Wage Statements.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- 27 i. ***Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.*** Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC
28 Wage Orders.

60. Plaintiff seeks to collect all recoverable civil penalties for the Labor Code violations alleged in this Complaint and the PAGA notice (including amendments thereto) against Defendants pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) and (f), in addition to attorneys' fees, costs, and interest to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 2699(g).

PRAAYER

Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. For recovery of damages in amount according to proof;
- b. For all recoverable pre- and post-judgment interest;
- c. For this action to be maintained as a representative action under the PAGA;
- d. For Plaintiff and counsel of record to be provided with all enforcement capability as if the action were brought by the State of California or the California Division of Labor Enforcement;
- e. For recovery of all civil penalties and other recoverable amounts under the PAGA;
- f. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent permitted by law, including (without limitation) under Labor Code § 2699, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and
- g. For such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: June 24, 2024

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

Nicholas J. Ferraro

Nicholas J. Ferraro
Attorney for Plaintiff Morresia Byfield

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

Nicholas J. Ferraro
nick@ferrarovega.com
Lauren N. Vega
lauren@ferrarovega.com

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108

619-693-7727
619-350-6855 fax
ferrarovega.com

April 17, 2023

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

VIA CERTIFIED U.S. MAIL
- Electronic Return Receipt -

Hilton Hotel Employer LLC
7930 Jones Branch Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102

CHH Torrey Pines Tenant Corp.,
14185 Dallas Parkway, Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75254

- PAGA Notice & Filing Fee -
Submitted electronically to the Labor and
Workforce Development Agency

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

This letter serves as written notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 on behalf of **MORRESIA BYFIELD** (“Plaintiff(s)”) and all other “aggrieved employees” of the following “Defendant(s)”:

**HILTON HOTEL EMPLOYER LLC;
CHH TORREY PINES TENANT CORP.
DBA HILTON LA JOLLA TORREY PINES**

Defendant(s) shall mean and include the foregoing in addition to any other related employer entities, individuals under Labor Code sections 558 and 558.1, and all others who may be later added upon further investigation and discovery as liable employers.

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed

by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants, as Plaintiff experienced one or more of the alleged violations during the relevant statutory period, which continue through the present date. *Cf. Johnson v. Maxim Healthcare Servs., Inc.*, 281 Cal. Rptr. 3d 478, 481 (Cal. Ct. App. 2021).

Through this notice, Plaintiff requests that Defendants complete an internal investigation and audit of the wage and hour and employment practices at issue and make a good faith effort to correct any violations. Plaintiff attempts to identify the non-compliant policies and practices affecting the aggrieved employees so that the parties may resolve the underlying damages and penalties in judgment or settlement approved by the Superior Court of California under Labor Code section 2699(k). Defendants are notified that any attempt to resolve this case should be conducted in coordination with Plaintiff’s counsel to protect the interests of Plaintiff, the aggrieved employees, and the State of California via the LWDA. Plaintiff advises Defendants this letter should be also considered a reasonable attempt at settlement of this matter, subject to an exchange of additional documents and information. *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp.* (2004) 24 Cal. 4th 553, 561.

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Culinary Supervisor from about January 2023 to October 2023. During their employment Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

Through this notice, Plaintiff informs the LWDA of the Labor Code violations set forth herein. The “aggrieved employees” include Plaintiff and the following individuals:

All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in the State of California during one-year period preceding the date of this notice through the current date and the date of trial in any pending action (the “aggrieved employees” and the “PAGA Period”).

Plaintiff reserves the right to expand or narrow the definition of the “aggrieved employees” in the forthcoming civil action. Furthermore, Plaintiff seeks all recoverable civil penalties for Defendants’ violations and reserves the right to supplement this notice as further investigation is completed and further facts, witnesses, and violations are uncovered.

- PAGA CLAIMS -

Unpaid Hours Worked/Minimum Wage Violation of Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1198, along with the California Minimum Wage Order, the applicable local minimum wage ordinances, and the “Hours and Days of Work” and “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal minimum wage for hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1197 further mandates that “[t]he minimum wage for employees fixed by the commission is the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.” Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The California Minimum Wage Order and the applicable sections of the IWC Wage Orders further require payment of minimum wages for all hours worked. The “Minimum Wages” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that “[e]very employer shall pay to each employee, on the established payday for the period involved, not less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked in the payroll period, whether the remuneration is measured by time, piece, commission, or otherwise.” The foregoing California wage laws require payment of “not less than the applicable minimum wage *for all hours worked* in the payroll period” and California law does not allow averaging of pay over the hours worked in the pay period, even if the total pay results in an average above the minimum wage. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.* (2005) 135 Cal. App. 3d 314, 324.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at the lawful minimum wage rate for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid minimum wages. Specifically, Defendants engaged in an unlawful policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to complete off-the-clock work, resulting in unpaid minimum wages.

Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees consistently worked through their unpaid meal periods due to understaffing and high demands of the job. Defendants actively avoided compensating Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees the minimum wage for all hours worked by instructing them to clock out for a 30-minute unpaid meal period but continue to work.

Additionally, at the end of their shift Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to confirm they received compliant meal periods. Plaintiff and, on information and belief, the other aggrieved employees feared they would be reprimanded if they failed to confirm all meal periods were compliant, despite consistently working through them.

Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees worked through their unpaid meal period or otherwise completed off-the-clock work, this resulted in unpaid minimum wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 558 (\$50/\$100), 1197.1 (\$100/\$250), 1199 / “Penalties” section of the IWC Wage Orders (\$50/\$100), and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Unpaid Overtime **Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198, along with the “Hours and Days of Work” sections of the applicable IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 510 requires “[a]ny work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of 12 hours in one day shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee;” and “any work in excess of eight hours on any seventh day of a workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.” Labor Code section 1194 renders it unlawful for an employee to receive less than the legal overtime rate for overtime hours worked in California. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders further require payment of overtime wages for all overtime hours worked, including the “Hours and Days of Work” sections.

Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees overtime wages and the lawful rate of pay for overtime hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime wages.

First, as stated in the “Unpaid Hours Worked” section above, Plaintiff periods engaged in off-the-clock work. To the extent that this practice resulted in unpaid hours worked over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week, this resulted in unpaid overtime wages.

Second, Defendants failed to pay overtime at the regular rate of compensation. Defendants paid aggrieved employees sign-on bonuses and other forms of additional remuneration that Defendants failed to include in the overtime rate in the pay periods when earned in the same pay period.

Defendants unlawfully paid overtime to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees at 1.5x their straight hourly rate. For each overtime hour worked during the period in which Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees earned the additional forms of remuneration, Defendants should have (but failed to) pay overtime “***at a rate no less than one and one-half times the regular***

rate of pay for an employee” and “twice the regular rate of pay” for double time hours as required by the plain language of Labor Code section 510(a) and the IWC Wage Orders.

An illustrative example of this violation is shown below:

CO Employee ID 000000-000000
SVH 2154556
Byfield
Dept: 68100-Kitchen #1
Hilton Hotel Employer LLC
755 Crossover Lane
Memphis, TN 38117

Earnings Statement
Page 001 of 001
Period Beg/End: 03/31/2023 - 04/13/2023
Advice Date: 04/20/2023
Advice Number: 0000005244
Batch Number: SCGOMAKSM9P

Byfield, Morresia
[REDACTED]

Job Title:Supv-Kitchen
Total Hours Worked: 81.77
Basis of Pay: Hourly
FEIN:842067873 Location #: 858-558-1500

Earnings	Rate	Hours	This Period	Year-to-Date
Incentive			250.00	175.00
Missed Lunch			0.00	175.00
Missed Rest			0.00	25.00
Overtime	25.0000	5.78	72.26	1262.50
Overtime Pre	12.5000	2.00	29.63	635.92
Regular Hour	25.0000	79.77	1994.25	13378.25
Gross Pay			2323.95	15727.74

Other Benefits and Information

	This Period	Year-to-Date
PTO come		
Basic Life Insura	0.07	0.07
PTO		Balance
PTO		49.56

Direct Deposits
Checking XXXXXXXX2052 1767.53

Extract of Plaintiff's Wage Statement with the Pay Period 4/20/2023

Here, Plaintiff worked 7.78 hours of overtime and earned a bonus/incentive payment of \$250.00, however, Plaintiff's overtime was paid at a straight 1.5x multiple of Plaintiff's base rate instead of the regular rate of pay which should have factored the bonus/incentive payment.

To the extent the aggrieved employees earned non-discretionary, non-excludable additional forms of remuneration in the same pay periods they earned overtime, each must be factored into the regular rate of pay. Defendants violated the Labor Code accordingly.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 558 (\$50/\$100), 1199 / "Penalties" section of the IWC Wage Orders) (\$50/\$100), and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Unpaid Paid Sick Leave **Violation of Labor Code §§ 246 through 248.7**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 246 through 248.7 with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 246 requires employers to provide paid sick leave to its workforce on the terms set forth in the statute. Employers must comply with the accrual, use, and notice provisions of Labor Code sections 246, 246.5, 247, and must further ensure that they maintain the paid sick leave records required by Labor Code section 247.5. Employers have the option of providing 24 hours of paid sick leave to employees or to allow employees to accrue paid

sick leave each pay period. If an employer chooses the accrual method, employees must accrue sick leave at a rate of one hour for every thirty hours worked in a given pay period as set forth in Labor Code section 246(b)(1). Under the accrual method, employees must begin accruing paid sick leave at the commencement of employment.

Employers must pay sick leave in accordance with one of the three permissible methods provided in Labor Code section 246(l): (1) “the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek;” (2) “by dividing the employee’s total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee’s total hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days;” or (3) “for exempt employee ... in the same manner as the employer calculates wages for other forms of paid leave time.” Labor Code sections 248.6 and 248.7 similarly require paid sick leave to be paid at a regular rate-based calculation in excess of the base hourly rate and at the lawful accrual rate.

Under Labor Code section 246(i), employers must provide employees “with written notice of the amount of paid sick leave available ... for use on either the employee’s itemized wage statement ... or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with the employee’s payment of wages.”

Defendants failed to comply with California’s paid sick leave laws with respect to the aggrieved employees. To the extent aggrieved employees earned sick pay in the same pay period they earned other forms of non-excludable remuneration, Defendants underpaid those wages due to the regular rate violations addressed above. Specifically, Defendants did not pay the aggrieved employees sick leave “in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick leave, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek,” as the regular rate should have included bonuses, and all other forms of non-excludable remuneration for the reasons aforementioned.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders**

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and 1198, along with the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 512 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers provide an uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work. *See Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Superior Court* (2012) 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1049. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a meal period is late, missed, short, or interrupted, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee’s

“regular rate” of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 (“We hold that the terms are synonymous: “regular rate of compensation” under section 226.7(c), like “regular rate of pay” under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages”). “[T]ime records showing noncompliant meal periods raise a rebuttable presumption of meal period violations, including at the summary judgment stage.” *Donobue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 58, 61. Labor Code section 1198 renders “employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 11 (Meal Periods), further require one uninterrupted 30-minute meal period after no more than five hours of work and a second meal period after no more than 10 hours of work and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant meal period is not provided. Pursuant to Section 11(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, the California Supreme Court has held that the on-duty meal period exception is “exceedingly narrow” and applies only when (1) “the nature of the work prevents the employee from being relieved of all duty” and (2) *both* “the employer and employee have agreed, in writing, to the on-duty meal period.” *Augustus v. AMB Security Services, Inc.* (2016) 2 Cal. 5th 257, 266-276 (emphasis added). If these two requirements are not met, then the employer owes the employee one hour of premium pay for each non-compliant meal period taken under the purported on-duty meal arrangement. *Naranjo v. Spectrum Security Services, Inc.* (2019) 40 Cal. 5th 444, 459.

First, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted meal periods in order to keep up with the high demand of the job. Nonetheless, Defendants had a policy and practice of avoiding and failing to pay meal premiums to Plaintiff and, on information and belief, other aggrieved employees.

As discussed in the unpaid minimum wage section above, Defendants required Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to confirm they were able to take compliant meal periods at the end of each shift. Plaintiff and, on information and belief, the aggrieved employees feared they would be reprimanded by Defendants for failure to do so. As a result, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were forced to confirm compliant meal periods were taken, regardless of their ability to do so.

Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced a non-compliant meal period, Defendant should have (but failed to) pay meal period premiums.

Second, to the extent that Defendants paid meal period premiums, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees a meal period premium at the “regular rate of compensation” because premiums paid did not factor in all forms of remuneration including bonuses, and/or other forms of remuneration, instead electing to pay aggrieved employees at their base hourly rate.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699

(\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226.7, 516, and 1198, and the related sections of the IWC Wage Orders with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code sections 226.7 and 516 and the IWC Wage Orders require that employers authorize and permit an uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) that an employee works. Labor Code section 226.7 requires that if a rest period is non-compliant, the employer must pay one additional hour of pay at the employee's "regular rate" of compensation. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal. 5th 858, 862 ("We hold that the terms are synonymous: "regular rate of compensation" under section 226.7(c), like "regular rate of pay" under section 510(a), encompasses all nondiscretionary payments, not just hourly wages"). Labor Code section 1198 renders "employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]" unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

On information and belief, Defendants had a policy and practice of not paying rest period premiums to employees who were not authorized to take rest periods. To the extent Defendants ever paid a rest period premium, Defendants violated Labor Code section 226.7 because such premiums were not paid at the correct regular rate of compensation to the aggrieved employees, which would have factored in bonuses and other forms of compensation. As discussed throughout this correspondence, Defendants had a non-compliant policy and practice of miscalculating and underpaying the regular rate of pay applicable to overtime. Based on this practice, Plaintiff alleges that rest period premiums were equally deficient with respect to payments made to the aggrieved employees.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and/or 204b and 210, as applicable, with respect to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 204(a) requires payment of “all wages” for non-exempt employees at least twice each calendar month. Labor Code section 204(d) states all wages due must be paid “not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.” Labor Code section 204b applies to employees paid on a weekly basis and also requires the payment for all labor within the required pay periods. Labor Code section 210 provides “every person who fails to pay the wages of an employee as provided in Section ... 204 ... shall be subject to a civil penalty” of \$100 for an initial violation and \$200 plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld for a subsequent violation.

Because Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums in each pay period in which such wages were earned at the lawful rate, Defendants violated Labor Code section 204 and/or 204b (for weekly employees, as applicable). Defendants violated Labor Code sections 204 and 204b by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed on the regular pay days scheduled each pay period within seven calendar days of the close of the payroll period, as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Indeed, Defendants failed to pay all premiums, overtime, regular, sick leave, and other earnings on time each payday.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, and Labor Code section 210 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment
Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to pay all wages and premiums owed upon termination of employment.

Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer fires an employee, the wages must be paid immediately. Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee quits without providing 72 hours’ notice, his or her wages must be paid no later than 72 hours thereafter. Labor Code section 202 states that if an employee provides 72 hours’ notice, the final wages are payable upon his or her final day of employment. Labor Code section 203 requires an employer who fails to comply with Labor Code sections 201 or 202 to pay a waiting time penalty for each employee, up to a period of 30 days additional compensation.

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing

employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties on behalf of aggrieved employees and the State of California as provided under Labor Code section 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Non-Compliant Wage Statements
Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 226(a) and 226.3 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to furnish itemized wage statements each pay period that accurately list all information required by Labor Code section 226(a)(1) through (9).

Labor Code section 226(a) requires an employer to furnish wage statements to employees semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, “an accurate itemized statement in writing showing:” (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked, (3) the number of piece rate units earned and applicable piece-rate in effect, (4) all deductions, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name of the employee and last four digits of SSN or an EIN, (8) the name and address of the legal name of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to the aggrieved employees each pay period as a result of the policies and practices set forth in this notice. Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(1) and (5) by not listing the correct “gross wages earned” or “net wages earned,” as the employees earned wages and premiums that were not paid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection, and recording of “gross wages earned” on those wage statements. Likewise, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate reflection on the pay stub.

Defendants violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to accurately list employees’ “total hours worked,” as the wage statements did not accurately include the uncompensated time Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees worked work off-the-clock during uncompensated meal periods and required training.

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were

owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code sections 226.3 (\$250/\$1,000) and 2699 (\$100/\$200) per violation per pay period per employee, along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Failure to Maintain Accurate Records
Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders

Defendants violated Labor Code sections 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate employee payroll records with respect to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees.

Labor Code section 1174 requires that employers maintain accurate “payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments.” Section 7(A) of the IWC Wage Orders, which may be enforced through Labor Code section 1198, mandates similar recordkeeping obligations.

Because of the policies and practices set forth in this notice, including the failure to accurately account for wages earned or hours worked, Defendants failed to accurately maintain records in accordance with Labor Code section 1174 and the IWC Wage Orders.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, as provided under Labor Code section 1174.5 (\$500) and 2699 (\$100/\$200), along with all other civil penalties permitted by law.

Attorneys’ Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(g)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other aggrieved employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(g).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants’

written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

If you have any questions regarding the scope of your obligations to preserve evidence, please consult your legal counsel and always err on the side of caution. Periodic or regularly scheduled purges or deletions of information covered by this hold must be suspended immediately.

- CONCLUSION -

If the LWDA does not pursue enforcement, Plaintiff intends to bring representative claims on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees seeking civil penalties for violations of the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders, along with attorneys' fees, costs, interest, and other appropriate relief.

Please advise if the LWDA intends to investigate any of the factual or legal allegations set forth in this notice. Defendants may contact Plaintiff's counsel with any questions regarding this letter or the forthcoming lawsuit.

Sincerely,



Nicholas J. Ferraro

Cc Plaintiff Morresia Byfield
HR Representative - neena.maneklal@hilton.com
Defense Counsel - ashley.Cypher@hilton.com