

Eric K. Yaeckel [CSB No. 274608]
yaeckel@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

Ryan T. Kuhn [CSB No. 324538]
ryan@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

Karoline D. Kitlowski [CSB No. 347692]
karoline@sullivanlawgroupapc.com

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC
2330 Third Avenue
San Diego, California 92101
(619) 702-6760 * (619) 702-6761 FAX

Bevin Allen Pike (SBN 221936)
Bevin.Pike@capstonelawyers.com

Daniel S. Jonathan (SBN 262209)
Daniel.Jonathan@capstonelawyers.com

Trisha K. Monesi (SBN 303512)
Trisha.Monesi@capstonelawyers.com

Shealene P. Mancuso (SBN 331740)
Shealene.Mancuso@capstonelawyers.com

Capstone Law APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-4811
Facsimile: (310) 943-0396

Attorneys for Plaintiff YANETH GUZMAN in a Representative capacity only, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE**

YANETH GUZMAN, in a Representative
capacity only, and on behalf of other
members of the general public similarly
situated

Plaintiff

v.

HADLEY DATE GARDENS, INC., a
California Corporation; HADLEY, INC., a
California Corporation; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO. **CVP82404374**

COMPLAINT FOR:

- 1. MEAL AND REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**
- 2. MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**
- 3. OVERTIME VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**
- 4. WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**
- 5. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**
- 6. FAILURE TO PAY WAGES UPON SEPARATION PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2698 et seq.**

COMES NOW Plaintiff YANETH GUZMAN ("Plaintiff"), in a Representative capacity only, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges for her complaint as follows:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter in that all parties are residents of, or do business within, the State of California and the amount in controversy exceeds the statutory minimum limit of this Court. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. Furthermore, there is no federal question at issue as Wage and Hour protections and remedies related thereto are based solely on California Law and Statutes, including the Labor Code, Civil Code, and IWC Wage Order(s). Also, the Ninth Circuit has recently held that, for purposes of establishing federal diversity jurisdiction, penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") may **not** be aggregated. *Urbino v. Orkin Servs. of California, Inc.*, 726 F.3d 1118, 1122 (9th Cir. 2013).
2. Venue before this Court is proper in that certain wrongful acts which gave rise to Plaintiff's injuries occurred in the County of Riverside, State of California.
3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendant HADLEY DATE GARDENS, INC. (Referred to herein as "Defendants" or "HADLEY"), was and is a California Corporation doing business throughout the state, including the County of Riverside, State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendant HADLEY, INC. (Referred to herein as "Defendants" or "HADLEY"), was and is a California Corporation doing business throughout the state, including the County of Riverside, State of California. Accordingly, Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities after the same have been ascertained.
4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the wrongs and damages as herein alleged, and in so acting was functioning as the agent, servant, partner, and employee of the co-defendants,

1 and in doing the actions mentioned below, was acting within the course and scope of his or her
2 authority as such agent, servant, partner, and employee with the permission and consent of the
3 co-defendants. Plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by said
4 defendants. Wherever it is alleged herein that any act or omission was done or committed by
5 any specially named Defendant or Defendants, Plaintiff intends thereby to allege and does
6 allege that the same act or omission was also done and committed by each and every defendant
7 named as a DOE, both separately and in concert with the named Defendant or Defendants.

- 8 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them,
9 including DOES 1 through 10, are and at all times herein mentioned were either individuals,
10 sole proprietorships, partnerships, registered professionals, corporations, alter egos or other
11 legal entities which were licensed to do and/or were doing business in the County of Riverside,
12 State of California at all times relevant to the subject matter of this action.

13 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

- 14 6. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately October 13, 2023 through January
15 29, 2024. Throughout her employment with Defendants, Plaintiff performed her job in a
16 capable, and competent manner.
- 17 7. Throughout the term of their employment, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were,
18 and currently are, denied the benefits and protections of the Labor Code due to Defendants'
19 institutionalized pay practices, standard as to all of Defendants' California-based employees.
- 20 8. On May 8, 2024, counsel for Plaintiff prepared and submitted via online filing a letter to the
21 California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"). A copy of the letter was
22 mailed to Defendants, via USPS Certified Mail. The letter contained the specific provisions
23 of the California Labor Code and Business and Professions Code violated by Defendants, as
24 well as the facts and theories in support of Plaintiff's claims. (Please see **Exhibit 1**, a true and
25 correct copy of this letter.)
- 26 9. The statutory time period for the LWDA to investigate and/or respond, and for the employer
27 to respond, has concluded.

28 ///

REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS

10. As more specifically set forth below, Plaintiff brings this action in a representative capacity on behalf of all current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants. Code Civ. Proc. § 2699; *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969, 980-981. Plaintiff is proceeding in a representative capacity under PAGA only. Plaintiff is not seeking individual relief. Throughout the operative limitations period, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were denied the protections and benefits of the Labor Code due to Defendants' standard practices. Throughout their employment, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were and are denied full and accurate compensation, including overtime compensation, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1197. Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were and are denied Meal and Rest Periods and Meal and Rest Period payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512. Defendants failed to furnish accurate itemized wage statements in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 226. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenditures in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 2802. Defendants failed to provide all compensation due at termination of employment in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 201 through 203.
11. Plaintiff brings this action on the grounds that she and other current and former aggrieved employees of Defendants were and are improperly denied the mandated wages resulting from the above-referenced violations. Code Civ. Proc. § 2699; *Arias*, 46 Cal. 4th at 980-981. The number of current and former aggrieved employees is believed to exceed One Hundred (100) members.
12. The approximately One Hundred (100) aggrieved employees are comprised of Defendants' current or former California-based employees.
13. The questions of law and fact common to all aggrieved employees arising from Defendants' actions include, among others, the following:
- a. Whether Defendants failed to pay its employees the proper straight-time, overtime, and double time wages due and owing to them;
 - b. Whether Defendants failed to pay its employees all compensation due and owing at

- 1 termination of employment;
- 2 c. Whether Defendants failed to provide its employees with statutorily-compliant Meal
- 3 and/or Rest Periods, in violation of, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 512 and
- 4 226.7, in that Defendants’ written policies are not compliant with California law, and
- 5 Defendants do not allow its employees duty-free Meal and/or Rest Periods on occasion;
- 6 d. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide Meal and Rest Period Premiums in
- 7 accordance with law;
- 8 e. Whether Defendants failed to properly calculate and pay its employees overtime
- 9 compensation or Meal and Rest Period Premiums in accordance with law by failing to
- 10 properly calculate, into the Regular Rate of Pay, the value of all employee benefits and
- 11 other non-discretionary compensation; and
- 12 f. Whether Defendants failed to properly reimburse its employees for necessary business
- 13 expenditures for, *inter alia*, cell phone costs and other work supplies, in violation of
- 14 Labor Code section 2802.
- 15 14. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants were subject to the Labor Codes and Industrial
- 16 Welfare Commission Wage Orders of the State of California, including, but not limited to,
- 17 California Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*
- 18 15. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants are and were “employers” as that term is used
- 19 within the relevant sections of the California Labor Code.
- 20 16. Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies and pre-filing requirements pursuant to
- 21 California Labor Code section 2699.3, and has also fulfilled all notice requirements under the
- 22 statute.
- 23 17. Throughout the operative limitations period, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees were
- 24 denied the protections and benefits of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order(s) due to
- 25 Defendants’ standard practices. Said violations are set forth below.
- 26 ///
- 27 ///
- 28 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
Meal and Rest Period Violations Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.
Representative Action
(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

18. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 17 as though fully set forth herein.

19. Labor Code section 1198 states:

The maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor fixed by the commission shall be the maximum hours of work and the standard conditions of labor for employees. The employment of any employee for longer hours than those fixed by the order or under conditions of labor prohibited by the order is unlawful.

Defendants violated this section by establishing working conditions below the standard of the applicable Wage Order.

20. Under applicable California law, “An employer may 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 may 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” Lab. Code § 512(a); see also 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11130 (11)(A).

21. Unless the employee is relieved of all duty during a thirty (30) minute Meal Period, the Meal Period shall be considered an “on duty” Meal Period and counted as time worked. 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11130 (11).

22. California law requires employers to provide nonexempt employees with a 10-minute Rest Period for every four hours worked, or “major fraction thereof.” 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11130 (11).

23. An employer who fails to provide Meal or Rest Periods as required by an applicable Wage Order must pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of pay for each workday that the Meal or Rest Period was not provided. Lab. Code § 226.7(b); 8 Cal. Code Regs. § 11130 (11), (12).

24. Within the operative time period, Defendants failed to possess compliant Meal and Rest Period policies.

- 1 25. For example, Defendants do not possess a legal Meal Period policy or legal Rest Period policy,
2 and makes no attempt to ensure that its employees are either timely or wholly provided Meal
3 Periods or Rest Periods. At least once a week Ms. Guzman was required to review her time
4 sheets with a supervisor during her Meal Period in order to receive her paycheck. Moreover,
5 she could not clock in and out for her Meal Periods as Hadley automatically deducted 30
6 minutes per day for Meal Periods. This led to inaccurate reporting and masking of non-
7 compliant Meal Periods. As an example, Hadley Time Records (produced and verified by
8 Hadley) for the date range October 1, 2023 through February 19, 2024 have no record of a
9 Meal Period. The time records indicate that 0.50 hours are unpaid, but there is no record of Ms.
10 Guzman clocking in and out for a Meal Period. (See **Exhibit 2**). Hadley Wage Statements
11 (produced and verified by Hadley) for the pay periods beginning October 8, 2023 and ending
12 January 27, 2024 indicate that no Meal Period Premium was paid. (See **Exhibit 3**).
- 13 26. Defendants would also pressure employees to either skip, or cut short, Meal Periods and Rest
14 Periods, based on workload volume and coverage issues.
- 15 27. In addition, Defendants had notice of Plaintiff working outside of her scheduled and/or
16 reported hours, as well as within Meal and Rest Periods, but failed to provide any
17 compensation for this work-time.
- 18 28. Defendants willfully failed and refused to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees one
19 additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay for all workdays that a Meal or Rest Period
20 was not provided, as required by Labor Code section 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 13 § (11),
21 (12).
- 22 29. Any payments made by Defendants for non-compliant Meal Periods were not paid at the
23 employee's regular rate in violation of Labor Code section 226.7 and the operative IWC Wage
24 Orders. Instead, these payments were made at an employee's base rate and did not include the
25 value of, *inter alia*, all actual compensation owed, and/or all employee benefits such as, for
26 example, non-discretionary compensation and other employee benefits.
- 27 30. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to comply with the foregoing provisions of the Labor
28 Code, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be

1 proven at trial.

2 31. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
3 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
4 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
5 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
6 Prayer For Relief.

7 32. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
8 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

9 33. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
10 section 2699(g)(1).

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
12 **Minimum Wage Violations Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**
13 **Representative Action**
14 **(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)**

15 34. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 33 as though fully set forth
16 herein.

17 35. Defendants failed to pay its employees all compensation due in violation of, among other
18 statutes, Labor Code section 1197. California law holds that the failure to pay for any work
19 time constitutes a violation of minimum wage laws. *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.*, (2005) 135 Cal.
20 App.4th 314, 323. These violations were caused by and through Defendants' failure to
21 maintain accurate Time Records (as required by California law), to the detriment of the
22 employees. Specifically, although Defendants would receive "to-the-minute" start and end
23 times (from their employees' mandated timekeeping practices), Defendants would thereafter
24 alter - and deduct time from - the Time Records, prior to payment of compensation to the
25 employees. Additionally, the right to receive the proper minimum wage compensation was
26 impacted by Defendants knowingly failing to consider other work performed by the employees,
27 including all time employees were under Defendants' control. These actions, and instructions,
28 caused the employees to lose compensation, including proper minimum wage compensation
and overtime compensation.

1 36. As a result of Defendants' failure to comply with the provisions of the Labor Code, Plaintiff
2 and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.

3 37. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
4 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
5 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
6 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
7 Prayer For Relief.

8 38. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
9 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

10 39. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
11 section 2699(g)(1).

12 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
13 **Overtime Violations Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**
14 **Representative Action**
(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

15 40. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 39 as though fully set forth
16 herein.

17 41. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees all compensation,
18 including overtime compensation, due in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code
19 section 510. These violations occurred due to Defendants' illegal policies, referenced above,
20 whereby employees experienced monetary under-compensation. The systematic failure to
21 provide proper overtime compensation is a violation of California law.

22 42. Additionally, Defendants also failed to provide the actual Overtime Rate of Pay by ignoring
23 certain compensation when calculating the Regular Rate of Pay including, but not limited to,
24 various forms of bonus and/or incentive pay, and the value of employee benefits and employee
25 discounts, in violation of Labor Code section 510.

26 43. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to comply with the foregoing provisions of the Labor
27 Code, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be
28 proved at trial.

1 44. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
2 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
3 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
4 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
5 Prayer For Relief.

6 45. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
7 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

8 46. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
9 section 2699(g)(1).

10 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **Wage Statement Violations Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**
12 **Representative Action**
13 **(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)**

14 47. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 46 as though fully set forth
15 herein.

16 48. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees with accurate itemized
17 wage statements in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code section 226. These
18 violations include, but are not limited to, Defendants' failure to accurately identify all
19 applicable regular and overtime (including double-time) rates of pay in violation of section
20 226(a)(9), and providing inaccurate representations of both "gross" and "net wages."
21 Defendants also failed to accurately list "all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
22 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate," in violation of
23 226(a)(9). Defendants also failed to provide an accurate showing of the "total hours worked,"
24 in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(2). For example, Defendants had notice of
25 employees working outside of their scheduled and/or reported hours, as well as within Meal
26 and Rest Periods, but did not provide compensation.

27 49. Further, the Defendants' wage statement listings are confusing and employees cannot readily
28 ascertain their total hours worked, applicable rates, and all gross and net wages. As one
example, Defendants are apparently using a time calculating system other than "minutes", but

1 without explanation to the employees within the wage statement. Without an explanation for
2 how these figures were arrived at, Plaintiff cannot “readily ascertain” her total numbers
3 worked.

4 50. As a direct result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the foregoing provisions of the Labor
5 Code, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be
6 proven at trial.

7 51. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
8 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
9 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
10 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
11 Prayer For Relief.

12 52. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
13 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

14 53. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
15 section 2699(g)(1).

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
17 **Failure to Reimburse Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**
18 **Representative Action**
(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)

19 54. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 53 as though fully set forth
20 herein.

21 55. Defendants failed to reimburse their employees for all necessary business expenditures
22 incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties in violation of, among other
23 statutes, Labor Code section 2802. These expenditures are the result of, *inter alia*, Defendants’
24 standard policies which require its employees to incur mileage and to use their own cell phones
25 for work-related purposes, without reimbursement.

26 56. As a direct result of Defendants’ failure to comply with the foregoing provisions of the Labor
27 Code, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be
28 proven at trial.

1 57. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
2 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
3 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
4 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
5 Prayer For Relief.

6 58. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants
7 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

8 59. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
9 section 2699(g)(1).

10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **Failure to Pay Wages Upon Separation Pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 et seq.**
12 **Representative Action**
13 **(By Plaintiff against Defendants and DOES 1 through 10)**

14 60. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 59 as though fully set forth
15 herein.

16 61. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with all wages earned and
17 unpaid at termination in violation of, among other statutes, Labor Code sections 201 through
18 203. These violations resulted from, among other unlawful actions, Defendants' willful failure
19 to provide accurate and complete compensation to aggrieved employees under Labor Code
20 sections 226.7, 510, 512, 1197, and 2802, as set forth above.

21 62. As a direct result of Defendants' failure to comply with the foregoing provisions of the Labor
22 Code, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount to be
23 proven at trial.

24 63. As California Labor Code Section 2699 provides for civil penalties recoverable by Plaintiff on
25 behalf of herself and all other aggrieved employees by and through Labor Code section 2699.3,
26 and as Plaintiff has complied with all pre-filing requirements, Plaintiff may recover these
27 penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, as more specifically set forth in the below
28 Prayer For Relief.

64. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory civil penalties for each underpaid employee of Defendants

1 pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a) for each of these employees.

2 65. Plaintiff also seeks an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code
3 section 2699(g)(1), and interest, pursuant to Labor Code section 218.6.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of all aggrieved employees, prays for judgment as follows:

- 6 1. For an award of attorneys' fees and costs of suit herein pursuant to Labor Code section
7 2699(g)(1);
8 2. For an award of statutory civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(f)(2); and
9 3. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

10
11 Dated: July 12, 2024

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL LAW GROUP, APC


12 
13 _____
14 Eric K. Yaeckel
15 Ryan T. Kuhn
16 Karoline D. Kitlowski
17 Attorneys for Plaintiff YANETH GUZMAN in a
18 Representative capacity only, and on behalf of other
19 members of the general public similarly situated
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 1

SULLIVAN & YAECKEL
LAW GROUP

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

2330 THIRD AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

PHONE 619-702-6760
FACSIMILE 619-702-6761

May 8, 2024

Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn. PAGA Administrator

Submitted Via Online Filing

Re: **Yaneth Guzman v. Hadley Date Gardens, Inc.; and Hadley, Inc.**
Our File No.: 7423

Dear Administrator:

Please allow this correspondence to serve as “written notice,” as required by California Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(1), of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code believed to have been violated by Hadley Date Gardens, Inc.; and Hadley, Inc. (hereinafter collectively referred to as “HDG”), in the above referenced matter. This “written notice” is filed on behalf of Yaneth Guzman (hereinafter “Ms. Guzman”) and all current and former non-exempt employees employed by HDG. Thank you for your assistance and instruction on this issue.

The specific provisions alleged to have been violated by HDG are as follows:

CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTIONS 201-203, 204, 226, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1197.1 and 2802, as well as IWC Wage Order 13, codified as Title 8, California Code of Regulations, section 11130 *et seq.*, or any other applicable wage orders.

Facts and theories supporting the allegations: Ms. Guzman was employed as a non-exempt employee for HDG from approximately October 13, 2023 through January 29, 2024.

Throughout the term of Ms. Guzman’s employment, HDG required Ms. Guzman and all other non-exempt employees to experience actions illegal under the California Labor Code, including the following:

///

Minimum Wage and Overtime Violations

- HDG failed to provide all compensation, including minimum wage and overtime compensation, as well as compensation for work performed inside of Meal and Rest Periods, to its employees in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 1194, 204, 510, IWC Wage Order 13, and/or any other applicable wage orders. This illegal action is due, in part, to HDG's policies of (1) failing to properly retain accurate Time Records, in violation of California law, and (2) failing to provide compensation (including both minimum and overtime compensation) for all time worked by the employees, or in control of the employer. For instance, HDG would instruct Ms. Guzman to report scheduled (as opposed to *actual*) work hours, resulting in a loss of compensation. Additionally, HDG would often require Ms. Guzman to work extended hours (beyond scheduled hours), without compensation. Finally, HDG would require Ms. Guzman (and other employees) to "Round" their hours to the nearest 15-minute increment, as the Time Logs would not allow for accurate (*i.e.* to the minute) recording of time. This served to deny the employees proper compensation.
- Additionally, among other issues, HDG has notice of Ms. Guzman, and others, working outside of their scheduled and/or reported hours, as well as *within* Meal and Rest Periods, but fails to provide any compensation for this work-time. Ms. Guzman was frequently scheduled to be "On Call" outside of when her work shifts ended, but was never compensated for this time. Further, HDG failed to properly calculate and pay overtime at the actual overtime rate of pay, as HDG ignores certain compensation when calculating the Regular Rate of Pay.

Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Periods

- HDG failed to provide compliant Meal Periods or requisite Meal Period penalty payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order 13, and/or any other applicable wage orders. For example, HDG does not possess a legal Meal Period policy and makes no attempt to ensure that its employees are either timely or wholly provided Meal Periods. The employees would often either miss a Meal Period entirely, or be provided a short or untimely Meal Period. Whether or not an employee was provided a Meal Period was often contingent upon how busy the employees were on a given day.
- HDG would pressure its employees to either skip, or cut short, a Meal Period as employees were expected to respond to supervisors and/or work related emergencies at all times. HDG has never provided a compliant Meal Period penalty payment to any employee as to the above referenced issues. Finally, on the rare occasions when employees *were* paid Meal Period penalties (*i.e.* California Meal Period Premiums), such payments do not "cure" the stated Labor Code violation under section 226.7.

The California Supreme Court held that “An employer’s failure to provide an additional hour of pay does not form part of a section 226.7 violation, and an employer’s provision of an additional hour of pay does not excuse a section 226.7 violation. The failure to provide required meal and rest breaks is what triggers a violation of section 226.7.” *Kirby v. Immoos Fire Protection, Inc.* (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1244, 1256, italics added. Even more recently, a 2020 California Supreme Court ruling stated that, “The remedy for a Labor Code violation, through settlement or other means, is distinct from the fact of the violation itself. For example, employers can pay an additional hour of wages as a remedy for failing to provide meal and rest breaks. (§ 226.7, subd. (c).) But we have held that payment of this statutory remedy ‘does not excuse a section 226.7 violation.’” *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.*, (2020) 9 Cal.5th 73. To be clear, payment of a Meal Period penalty to employees does not rectify the violation, it is in fact an admission of a Labor Code violation. Finally, HDG failed to pay Meal Period Premiums at the proper rate, as HDG fails to either (1) pay a full hours worth of pay, or (2) properly calculate the regular rate of pay for purposes of determining the premium rate owed. *Ferra v. Loews Hollywood Hotel, LLC*, (2021) 11 Cal.5th 858.

- HDG required its employees to constantly monitor their cell phones and be “on-call” at all times, specifically during Meal Periods. On occasion, HDG would interrupt, or cut short, its employees’ Meal Periods and require them to return to work. At least once a week Ms. Guzman was required to review her time sheets with a supervisor during her Meal Period in order to receive her paycheck. Moreover, she could not clock in and out for her Meal Periods as HDG automatically deducted 30 minutes per day for Meal Periods.
- HDG illegally retained control over its employees during Meal Periods. For example, HDG required its employees to “remain on the premises,” and to remain “On Call” (*i.e.* monitor their phones and radios) at all times, including during Meal Periods.

Failure to Provide Compliant Rest Periods

- HDG failed to provide compliant Rest Periods or requisite Rest Period penalty payments, in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, and IWC Wage Order 13, and/or any other applicable wage orders. For example, HDG does not possess a legal Rest Period policy, as its Rest Period policy lacks required language under California law. HDG makes no attempt to ensure that its employees are either timely or wholly provided Rest Periods. The employees would often either miss a Rest Period entirely, be provided a short or untimely Rest Period, or be provided only one Rest Period, even when they were working in excess of 6.5 hours a day. HDG would pressure its employees to either skip, or cut short, a Rest Period as employees were expected to respond to supervisors and/or work related emergencies at all times. HDG has never provided a compliant Rest Period penalty payment to any employee

as to the above referenced issues. Finally, on the rare occasions in which HDG would provide a Rest Period penalty, it would pay said penalty at an improper (and *lesser*) rate, due to the failure to properly calculate the Regular Rate of Pay.

- HDG required its employees to constantly monitor their cell phones and be “on-call” at all times, specifically during Rest Periods. On occasion, HDG would interrupt, or cut short, its employees’ Rest Periods and require them to return to work. Ms. Guzman was required to respond to supervisors during her Rest Periods.
- Finally, HDG illegally retained control over its employees during Rest Periods. For example, HDG required its employees to “remain on the premises,” and to remain “On Call” (*i.e.* monitor their telephones and radios) at all times, including during Rest Periods.

Wage Statement Violations

- HDG violated Labor Code section 226(a)(2) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of all hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Ms. Guzman and other employees were not compensated for all hours worked (due in part to HDG’s requirement that employees list only *scheduled* work-times, not actual work-times.)
- HDG violated Labor Code section 226(a)(5) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of the net wages earned by its employees. For example, HDG (a) would not provide compensation for all hours and minutes worked, (b) would use an improper (and lesser) Overtime Rate of Pay, and (c) would fail to pay Meal and/or Rest Period penalties when due. Further, on the rare occasions in which HDG would provide a Meal or Rest Period penalty, it would pay said penalty at an improper (and lesser) rate, due to the failure to properly calculate the Regular Rate of Pay.
- HDG violated Labor Code section 226(a)(9) by failing to furnish an accurate showing of all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. HDG does not explain how its system describes “time worked” on the Wage Statement itself. As such, Ms. Guzman cannot “readily ascertain” what these figures mean. This is because HDG is apparently using a time-calculating system other than “minutes,” but without explanation to the employees within the wage statement. As minutes are measured on a scale of 1 through 60, it is not apparent what these figures (*i.e.* “.75”) are meant to represent. Without an explanation for how these figures were arrived at, employees cannot “readily ascertain” their total hours worked. Therefore, HDG failed to provide an accurate showing of the “total hours worked” by its employees pursuant to section 226(a)(2), due to all the aforesaid reasons.

Failure to Provide Compliant Expense Reimbursement Payments

- HDG failed to provide compliant expense reimbursement payments in violation of, *inter alia*, Labor Code section 2802, by failing to provide payments for expenses incurred by Ms. Guzman, and other non-exempt employees, including expenses for uniforms, cell-phone costs, and mileage.

Willful Failure to Provide All Compensation to Ex-Employees

- HDG failed to provide all compensation upon termination of employment in violation of Labor Code sections 201-203, due, in part, to the fact that HDG failed to provide proper compensation for all hours worked, and failed to pay full Meal or Rest Period penalties, as discussed above.

To confirm, HDG is a “person” as defined within California Labor Code section 18.

Again, thank you for your assistance and instruction throughout this matter. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Very Truly Yours,



Karoline D. Kitlowski, Esq.

Via Certified U.S. Mail

MELINDA DOUGHERTY
Agent of Service of Process for
HADLEY DATE GARDENS, INC.
83555 Airport Blvd
Thermal, CA 92274

MELINDA DOUGHERTY
Agent of Service of Process for
HADLEY, INC.
83555 Airport Blvd
Thermal, CA 92274

Exhibit 2

ordered by: Name

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc.

Tuesday 02/20/2024

ate range: 10/01/2023 - 02/19/2024

TIME CARD REPORT

09:22

Page: 1

Code	Name											
05200	Guzman, Yaneth											
	DATE	DAY	CTGY.	START	STOP	HOURS	REG	OT1	OT2	OT3	UNPAID	TOTAL DOLLAR
	10/16/2023	MON	WORK	06:00	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:32	1.00						
	10/17/2023	TUE	WORK	05:53	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	10/18/2023	WED	WORK	05:54	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:31	1.00						
	10/19/2023	THU	WORK	05:56	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:33	1.00						
	10/20/2023	FRI	WORK	05:57	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	10/21/2023	SAT	WORK	05:54	12:00	6.00	0.00	8.00			0.50	8.50
			WORK	12:00	14:32	2.50						
	10/23/2023	MON	WORK	05:53	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	10/24/2023	TUE	WORK	05:54	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:32	1.00						
	10/25/2023	WED	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	7.25				0.50	7.75
			WORK	13:30	13:41	0.25						
	10/26/2023	THU	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:32	1.00						
	10/27/2023	FRI	WORK	05:56	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	10/28/2023	SAT	WORK	05:55	12:15	6.25	0.75	5.00			0.50	6.25
	10/30/2023	MON	WORK	05:56	14:34	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	10/31/2023	TUE	WORK	05:58	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/01/2023	WED	SDO	00:00			0.00					0.00
	11/02/2023	THU	WORK	05:56	14:35	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/03/2023	FRI	WORK	05:57	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/04/2023	SAT	WORK	05:56	10:30	4.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	10:30	14:30	4.00						
	11/06/2023	MON	WORK	05:56	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:30	1.00						
	11/07/2023	TUE	WORK	05:55	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/08/2023	WED	WORK	05:56	14:33	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/09/2023	THU	SDO	00:00			0.00					0.00
	11/10/2023	FRI	WORK	05:57	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/11/2023	SAT	WORK	05:55	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/13/2023	MON	WORK	05:56	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/14/2023	TUE	WORK	05:55	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:31	1.00						
	11/15/2023	WED	WORK	06:00	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:30	1.00						
	11/16/2023	THU	WORK	05:54	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/17/2023	FRI	WORK	05:54	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/18/2023	SAT	ABSE	00:00			0.00					0.00
	11/20/2023	MON	WORK	05:57	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/21/2023	TUE	WORK	05:55	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/22/2023	WED	WORK	05:55	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/23/2023	THU	HOL	00:00		8.00	8.00					8.00
	11/24/2023	FRI	HOL	00:00		8.00	8.00					8.00
	11/27/2023	MON	WORK	05:55	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
	11/28/2023	TUE	WORK	05:54	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:30	14:30	1.00						
	11/29/2023	WED	WORK	05:53	13:00	7.00	8.00				0.50	8.50
			WORK	13:00	14:30	1.50						
	11/30/2023	THU	WORK	05:54	13:00	7.00	8.00				0.50	8.50

ordered by: Name

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc.

Tuesday 02/20/2024

ate range: 10/01/2023 - 02/19/2024

TIME CARD REPORT

09:22

Page: 2

Code	Name												
05200	Guzman, Yaneth (Continued)												
	DATE	DAY	CTGY.	START	STOP	HOURS	REG	OT1	OT2	OT3	UNPAID	TOTAL	DOLLAR
	11/30/2023	THU	WORK	13:00	14:30	1.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/01/2023	FRI	WORK	05:53	13:15	7.25	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:15	14:30	1.25							
	12/04/2023	MON	WORK	05:54	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/05/2023	TUE	WORK	05:54	09:00	3.00	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	09:00	13:30	4.50							
			WORK	13:30	14:30	1.00							
	12/06/2023	WED	WORK	05:53	13:00	7.00	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:00	14:31	1.50							
	12/07/2023	THU	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:30	14:33	1.00							
	12/08/2023	FRI	SDO	00:00			0.00					0.00	
	12/09/2023	SAT	WORK	05:53	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/11/2023	MON	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:30	14:31	1.00							
	12/12/2023	TUE	WORK	05:54	13:00	7.00	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:00	14:30	1.50							
	12/13/2023	WED	WORK	05:54	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/14/2023	THU	WORK	05:53	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/15/2023	FRI	WORK	05:53	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/18/2023	MON	WORK	05:53	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/19/2023	TUE	WORK	05:55	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/20/2023	WED	WORK	05:54	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/21/2023	THU	WORK	05:54	14:28	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	12/22/2023	FRI	WORK	05:53	12:29	6.50	6.00				0.50	6.50	
	01/02/2024	TUE	WORK	05:53	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/03/2024	WED	WORK	05:53	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/04/2024	THU	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:30	14:30	1.00							
	01/05/2024	FRI	WORK	05:53	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/06/2024	SAT	WORK	05:54	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/08/2024	MON	WORK	05:55	14:32	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/09/2024	TUE	WORK	05:53	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/10/2024	WED	WORK	05:53	14:33	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/11/2024	THU	WORK	05:53	14:35	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/12/2024	FRI	WORK	05:54	14:30	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/15/2024	MON	WORK	05:53	13:30	7.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
			WORK	13:30	14:32	1.00							
	01/16/2024	TUE	WORK	05:53	14:31	8.50	8.00				0.50	8.50	
	01/17/2024	WED	SDO	00:00			0.00					0.00	
EMPLOYEE TOTALS							494.00	13.00	0.00	0.00	31.00	538.00	0.00

EMPLOYEE

SUPERVISOR

Exhibit 3

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15325 10/27/23 Period: 10/08/23-10/21/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Social Sec.	49.97	49.97
					Medicare	11.69	11.69
					Local	7.25	7.25
Regular	40.00	15.50	620.00	620.00			
Overtime	8.00	23.25	186.00	186.00			
Gross Pay			806.00	806.00	Net Pay	737.09	737.09

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

15325

10/27/23 ***3224

\$737.09

Yaneth Guzman
84851
Bagdad Ave Apt 115
Coachella CA 92236

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15325 10/27/23 Period: 10/08/23-10/21/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Social Sec.	49.97	49.97
					Medicare	11.69	11.69
					Local	7.25	7.25
Regular	40.00	15.50	620.00	620.00			
Overtime	8.00	23.25	186.00	186.00			
Gross Pay			806.00	806.00	Net Pay	737.09	737.09

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15396 11/10/23 Period: 10/22/23-11/04/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	51.91	51.91
					Social Sec.	84.09	134.06
					Medicare	19.67	31.36
					CA 2	14.49	14.49
					Local	12.21	19.46
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	1860.00			
Overtime	5.00	23.25	116.25	302.25			
Gross Pay			1356.25	2162.25	Net Pay	1173.88	1910.97

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

15396

11/10/23 ***3224

\$1173.88

Yaneth Guzman
 84851
 Bagdad Ave Apt 115
 Coachella CA 92236

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15396 11/10/23 Period: 10/22/23-11/04/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	51.91	51.91
					Social Sec.	84.09	134.06
					Medicare	19.67	31.36
					CA 2	14.49	14.49
					Local	12.21	19.46
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	1860.00			
Overtime	5.00	23.25	116.25	302.25			
Gross Pay			1356.25	2162.25	Net Pay	1173.88	1910.97

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15476 11/24/23 Period: 11/05/23-11/18/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	37.96	89.87
					Social Sec.	76.88	210.94
					Medicare	17.98	49.34
					CA 2	9.38	23.87
					Local	11.16	30.62
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	3100.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
Gross Pay			1240.00	3402.25	Net Pay	1086.64	2997.61
Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00							

15476

11/24/23 ***3224

\$1086.64

Yaneth Guzman
84851
Bagdad Ave Apt 115
Coachella CA 92236

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15476 11/24/23 Period: 11/05/23-11/18/23							
#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	37.96	89.87
					Social Sec.	76.88	210.94
					Medicare	17.98	49.34
					CA 2	9.38	23.87
					Local	11.16	30.62
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	3100.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
Gross Pay			1240.00	3402.25	Net Pay	1086.64	2997.61
Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00							

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15500 12/08/23 Period: 11/19/23-12/02/23

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15500 12/08/23 Period: 11/19/23-12/02/23

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15500 12/08/23 Period: 11/19/23-12/02/23					
#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD	
					Fed - Single 37.96 127.83
					Social Sec. 76.88 287.82
					Medicare 17.98 67.32
					CA 2 9.38 33.25
					Local 11.16 41.78
Regular	64.00	15.50	992.00	4092.00	
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25	
HOLIDAY	16.00	15.50	248.00	248.00	
Gross Pay			1240.00	4642.25	
Hours Available/YTD Used:	PSL	0.00/0.00			
				Net Pay	1086.64 4084.25

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15581 12/22/23 Period: 12/03/23-12/16/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	37.96	165.79
					Social Sec.	76.88	364.70
					Medicare	17.98	85.30
					CA 2	9.38	42.63
					Local	11.16	52.94
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	5332.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
HOLIDAY	0.00	15.50	0.00	248.00			
Gross Pay			1240.00	5882.25	Net Pay	1086.64	5170.89

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

15581

12/22/23 ***3224

\$1086.64

Yaneth Guzman
 84851
 Bagdad Ave Apt 115
 Coachella CA 92236

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15581 12/22/23 Period: 12/03/23-12/16/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	37.96	165.79
					Social Sec.	76.88	364.70
					Medicare	17.98	85.30
					CA 2	9.38	42.63
					Local	11.16	52.94
Regular	80.00	15.50	1240.00	5332.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
HOLIDAY	0.00	15.50	0.00	248.00			
Gross Pay			1240.00	5882.25	Net Pay	1086.64	5170.89

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15670 12/27/23 Period: 12/25/23-12/25/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
Christmas			100.00	100.00	Fed - Single	0.00	165.79
					Social Sec.	6.20	370.90
					Medicare	1.45	86.75
					CA 2	0.00	42.63
					Local	0.90	53.84
Regular	0.00	15.50	0.00	5332.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
HOLIDAY	0.00	15.50	0.00	248.00			
Gross Pay			100.00	5982.25	Net Pay	91.45	5262.34

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

15670

12/27/23 ***3224

\$91.45

Yaneth Guzman
 84851
 Bagdad Ave Apt 115
 Coachella CA 92236

Hadley Date Gardens, Inc. 83-555 Airport Blvd Thermal CA 92274
 Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15670 12/27/23 Period: 12/25/23-12/25/23

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD		Period	YTD
Christmas			100.00	100.00	Fed - Single	0.00	165.79
					Social Sec.	6.20	370.90
					Medicare	1.45	86.75
					CA 2	0.00	42.63
					Local	0.90	53.84
Regular	0.00	15.50	0.00	5332.00			
Overtime	0.00	23.25	0.00	302.25			
HOLIDAY	0.00	15.50	0.00	248.00			
Gross Pay			100.00	5982.25	Net Pay	91.45	5262.34

Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15738 01/05/24 Period: 12/17/23-12/30/23

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15738 01/05/24 Period: 12/17/23-12/30/23

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15738 01/05/24 Period: 12/17/23-12/30/23							
#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD	Period	YTD	
					Social Sec.	36.52	36.52
					Medicare	8.54	8.54
					Local	5.30	5.30
Regular	38.00	15.50	589.00	589.00			
Gross Pay			589.00	589.00	Net Pay	538.64	538.64
Hours Available/YTD used: PSL 0.00/0.00							

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15853 01/29/24 Period: 01/14/24-01/27/24

Guzman, Yaneth Check# 15853 01/29/24 Period: 01/14/24-01/27/24

#5200	Qty	Rate	Period	YTD	Period	YTD
					Fed - Single	0.00 38.83
					Social Sec.	15.87 131.75
					Medicare	3.71 30.81
					CA 2	0.00 9.77
					Local	2.82 22.20
Regular	16.00	16.00	256.00	2125.00		
Gross Pay			256.00	2125.00	Net Pay	233.60 1891.64
Hours Available/YTD Used: PSL 0.00/0.00						