

June 20, 2024

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter of Juan Francisco Andino Villagra on Behalf of Himself
and Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employer: Cookunity, Inc.
630 Flushing Avenue, 3rd Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11206

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter shall constitute notice under Labor Code section 2699.3 (hereinafter “PAGA Notice”). The \$75 filing fee for the PAGA Notice was paid online by credit card at the time this PAGA Notice was submitted online to the Department of Industrial Relations.

This PAGA Notice concerns of Juan Francisco Andino Villagra’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employer: Cookunity, Inc. Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Cookunity, Inc., at without limitation, 1324 E 15th St, Los Angeles, CA 90021, with duties that included, but were not limited to, picking, packing and labeling products, ingressing products into the system, checking out products and inventory, from approximately December of 2022 through approximately April of 2024. In connection with the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7, 432.8, 1102.5, 1197.5, 1198.5, 1527, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, Employee seeks to represent all employees of Cookunity, Inc., and each of them, as well as their parents, subsidiaries and affiliates (hereinafter, collectively, “Employer”). On all other claims mentioned herein, Employee seeks to represent only non-exempt employees of Employer.

Employee and other aggrieved employees are covered by Labor Code section 510 and applicable Wage Orders. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of requiring its employees to work more than eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer’s control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off

the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock, and/or go through security screenings and/or temperature checks off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, mask allowances, gift cards and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay, and by attempting but failing to properly implement an alternative workweek schedule (“AWS”) (including, without limitation, by failing to implement a written agreement designating the regularly scheduled alternative workweek in which the specified number of work days and work hours are regularly recurring; failing to adopt the AWS in a secret ballot election, before the performance of work, by at least a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the affected employees in the work unit; failing to follow the notice/disclosures procedures prior to any AWS election; and/or failing to register an AWS election with the State of California, as required by Labor Code section 511 and applicable Wage Orders) all to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and applicable Wage Orders based on its practice of providing total compensation that is less than the required legal overtime compensation for the overtime worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of failing to compensate Employee and other aggrieved employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Employer’s control as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to come early to work and leave late work without being able to clock in for all that time, to suffer under Employer’s control due to long lines for clocking in, to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to clock out for rest periods, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries; editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; and failing to pay split shift premiums. In addition, Employee and other aggrieved employees were required to report to work, and did report, but were not put to work and/or were furnished less than half their usual or scheduled day’s work without being paid for half the usual or scheduled work at their regular rate of pay. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code sections 221, 223, 1197, 1182.12, Cal. and applicable Wage Orders based on its continued failure to pay minimum wages for all hours worked, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to actual and liquidated damages under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 1194 and 1194.2. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a policy or practice of compelling its employees to work in excess of five (5) and ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation: by interrupting meal periods; not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal periods; and auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which employees worked. Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated Labor Code section 512, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant meal periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant meal periods, as well as for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of compelling its non-exempt employees, including, without limitation, Employee, to work over four-hour periods (or major fractions thereof) without authorizing and permitting Employee and other aggrieved employees to take uninterrupted, timely, and complete ten-minute rest periods in which the employees are completely relieved of all of their duties, including, without limitation: by failing to provide rest periods all together; requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods not providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to relief under, without limitation, Labor Code section 226.7. However, Employee is informed and believes that those premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 were not made, either, for these non-compliant rest periods, either at all or at the proper regular rate of pay. Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699 for both failing to authorize the taking of compliant rest periods, as well as for failing to provide premium pay under Labor Code section 226.7.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer maintains policies or practices of failing to permit Employee and other aggrieved employees from taking cooldown rest periods as required under California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395 and premium pay in lieu thereof under Labor Code section 226.7. As a result, Employer would be liable for civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

In addition to the above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and continue to fail to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code

section 1198.5, and time records under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Employee and other aggrieved employees to calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments. Employer also failed to provide these documents to Employee and other aggrieved employees upon request. This would entitle Employee and other aggrieved employees to penalties prescribed by Labor Code sections 226 and 1198.5. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5 and 2699.

As a result of, among other things, Employer's herein-described policy or practice of failing to: accurately record time; failing to pay overtime and minimum wages; provide meal periods; provide rest periods; and provide compensation in lieu of meal or rest periods; as described above, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also intentionally failed and continues to fail to furnish aggrieved employees, including, without limitation, Employee, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect: gross wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee; the legal name and address of the other; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a). Specifically, Employer intentionally failed to furnish employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect the hours worked by Employee and other aggrieved employees and the rates of pay at which they were or should have been paid (including due to failure to pay at the proper regular rate), thus resulting in a failure to reflect gross and net wages earned and paid at each rate, as well. Consequently, since Employer would have failed to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a), Employee and other aggrieved employees would be entitled to recover penalties under, without limitation, Labor Code section 226, subdivision (e). Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 226.3, 558, and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer also failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse, to timely pay compensation to Employee and other terminated or resigned employees, including but not limited to, all overtime wages owed; all minimum wages owed; all paid sick leave, vacation pay and paid time off; and all premium pay owed as set out above, including, without limitation, for failure to pay at the proper regular rate of pay, among other things. Consequently, Employer would be liable for waiting time penalties for having violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of unlawfully deducting wages by issuing in payment of wages due, or to become due, or as an advance on wages to be earned: an order, check, draft, note, memorandum, gift card, or other acknowledgement of indebtedness, (unless it was negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of business in the state), the name and address of which must but did not appear on the instrument, and at the time of its issuance and for a reasonable time thereafter, which must be but was not at least 30 days, the maker or drawer did not have sufficient funds in, or credit, arrangement, or understanding with the drawee for its payment or any scrip, coupon, cards, or other thing redeemable, in merchandise or purporting to

be payable or redeemable otherwise than in money. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that such wages were not compensated at the “regular rate” of compensation as provided under Labor Code sections 226.7 and 510, subsection (a). Consequently, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employee and other aggrieved employees are entitled to relief under, without limitation, Labor Code sections 212, 213, 226.7, and 510 subsection (a). Employer would thus be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 2699.

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Employer, the name of the employer, including any “doing business as” names used, the name, address and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Employer under Labor Code section 2810.5. Employee is informed and believes that failure to provide such information, including rates of pay that are in effect, has permitted Employer to pay employees at rates of pay that were not agreed upon and violate minimum wage and overtime wage laws in California. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 2810.5 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. Among other relief, employees may collect from Employer in connection with these violations’ civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer also failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without limitation, Employee and other aggrieved employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits, separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment, and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Employer, as required by Labor Code section 2802, and other statutory and common law offenses. As a result, Employer are liable to reimburse Employee and other aggrieved employees for these costs incurred in furtherance of work duties. In addition, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to reimburse deposits made, including uniform deposits together with all interest owed at the separation of employment in violation of Labor Code section 404, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages in the amount of the deposit and accrued interest. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties under Labor Code sections 558 and 2699.

Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer has or had a policy or practice of failing to provide Employee and other aggrieved employees with all rights afforded to them under the Healthy Workplace Healthy Families Act of 2014, codified at Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, including, without limitation, the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws. Employee is further informed and believes that the sick pay was not provided at the proper regular of pay as required under California law due to failure to properly calculate the regular rate. Employee is further informed and believes that Employer also did not permit its use upon request by Employee and other aggrieved employees as contemplated under California and local laws. Employee is additionally informed and believes that the notice requirement of Labor Code section 245 and 246 involves a mandatory payroll or workplace injury reporting. As such, Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of the paid sick leave regulations under Labor Code section 2699, as well as equitable, injunctive, or restitutionary relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3 and applicable Wage Orders. As such, Employer would be liable for civil penalties for violation of Labor Code section 227.3 under Labor Code section 558 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to pay aggrieved employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month." Employee is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Employer did not and do not pay Employee and other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code Section 204. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code section 204. Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 558 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy of failing to provide all temporary workers with owed wages weekly by not later than the regular payday of the following week. As a result, pursuant to Labor Code section 201.3, Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 201.3.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of failing to provide all working employees with suitable seats when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats. Employee is further informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer has failed to place an adequate number of seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and/or permitted employees to use such seats when it does not interfere with the performance of their duties when employees are not engaged in the active duties of their employment and the nature of their work requires standing.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and/or other aggrieved employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge and experience they obtained at Employer for purposes of competing with Employer, including, without limitation, preventing Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Employer and under what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. As such, Employee is informed and believes that this violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k). Employer would be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and/or other aggrieved employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Employer to their managers or outside Employer to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section 1102.5. In addition, Employee is informed and believes that these policies and/or practices prevent Employee and/or other aggrieved employees from disclosing information about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5. These violations of the Labor Code would expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer had and has a policy or practice of preventing Employee and/or other aggrieved employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k). Employee is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of Employee and/or other aggrieved employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty and would thus expose Employer to liability for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Employer violated Labor Code sections 1527, 3366, 3457 and 8397.4 by failing to provide adequate and readily accessible sanitation facilities; a regular schedule for servicing, cleaning, and supplying each facility to ensure it is maintained in a clean, sanitary and serviceable condition; an adequate supply of suitable cleansing agents, water, single-use towels or blowers; and a sufficient number of toilets to be used by each sex of employee.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees prior to making a conditional offer. Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees to disclose their conviction history before Employer made a conditional

offer of employment; inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Employer made any conditional offers of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the detriment of Employee and other aggrieved employees. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.7 and Government Code section 12952, entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.7, 432.8, and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Employer's application for employment, an inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation, compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.3 entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.3 and 2699.

Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer had and has a practice or policy of requiring Employees to agree in writing to confidentiality policies that unlawfully restrain trade by prohibiting Employees from speaking with prospective employers about their work with Employer, including but not limited to their wages and working conditions. Employer also required Employees to inform prospective employers of Employer's restrictions of Employee's freedom to work. This is a violation of Labor Code section 432.5. As such, Employee is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Employer violated, without limitation, Labor Code section 432.5 entitling Employee and other aggrieved employees to damages. Employer would also be liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 432.5 and 2699.

Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), please advise within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmarked date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate the violations alleged above. Our office understands that if we do not receive a response within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the postmark date of this PAGA Notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations, Employee may immediately thereafter file a civil complaint against Employer to allege causes of action for civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act for the herein-described alleged violations of the Labor Code.

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
June 20, 2024
Page 9

Very truly yours,

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

/s/ Katherine Willis

Katherine Willis

cc: Cookunity, Inc.
(via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)