KoulLaw

www.koullaw.com

Nazo@Koullaw.com

P (213) 761 – 5484

F (818) 561 – 3938

3435 WILSHIRE BLVD

SUITE 1710

LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

September 30, 2024

<u>Via E-filing:</u>
California Labor & Workforce
Development Agency
455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

<u>Via Certified U.S. Mail:</u>

Far Niente Wine Estates LLC
1350 Acacia Drive
Oakville, CA 94562

FN Cellars, LLC
1350 Acacia Drive
Oakville, CA 94562

Far Niente Wine Estates Management LLC
1350 Acacia Drive
Oakville, CA 94562

Re: **<u>AMENDED</u>** PAGA Notice Pursuant to California Labor Code §2698 *et seq.*

Claimant: Howard Glover
Employers: Far Niente Wine Estates LLC; FN Cellars, LLC; and Far Niente Wine Estates Management LLC

Dear Sir or Madam:

Howard Glover ("Claimant") has retained Nazo Koulloukian, Esq. of Koul Law Firm, APC, to represent Claimant, and all other aggrieved employees, for conditions of employment and wage and hour claims against former employers, Far Niente Wine Estates LLC, FN Cellars, LLC, and Far Niente Wine Estates Management, LLC (hereafter "Employer").

Claimant submits this Amended PAGA Notice to add his additional employer, and Far Niente Wine Estates Management, LLC, as a recipient of this letter and employer against whom Claimant brings his claims.

Employer operates a winery. Claimant worked for Employer from February 14, 2023, to May 31, 2024, as a wine educator at Employer's Oakville, California, facility.

Claimant alleges herein the specific provisions of California law that Employer has violated, requiring this Notice, including but not limited to: California Labor Code sections 201-203, 204, 208, 216, 221-223, 226, 226.2, 226.7, 227.3, 245-248.6, 432, 432.5, 432.6, 432.7, 510, 512, 558, 558.1, 1024.5, 1174, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1198.5, 1199, 2802, 2810.5, and all applicable Wage Orders.

Employer violated, and/or has caused to be violated, several Labor Code provisions and is therefore liable for civil penalties under Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*. We request that your agency investigate the claims alleged below or permit Claimant to seek civil penalties under the Private Attorney General Act ("PAGA"), Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, on behalf of the Labor and Workforce and development Agency ("LWDA") and the State of California in a representative action. This letter will serve as notice of these allegations pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3. Based on information and belief, Employer continues to commit all the violations alleged herein.

Failure to Pay For All Hours Worked, Including Overtime Hours Worked

(Cal. Labor Code §§200, 204, 206, 206.5, 207, 210, 216, 218, 218.6, 221, 223, 351, 510, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698 *et seq.,* IWC Wage Orders)

The Wage Orders define "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and including all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so." Employer has been engaged in many unlawful employment practices which resulted in underpayment for hours worked each pay period, including overtime hours worked, as more fully set forth below. Employer has also failed to pay the required minimum wage for all hours worked, and has failed to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Claimant and aggrieved employees have been employed under conditions prohibited by the wage order, and thus Employer has also violated §§1198 and 1199. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2699 *et seq.*

Unpaid Wages – Rounding

Employer rounds Claimant and aggrieved employee timecards in a manner that favors Employer. Indeed, with Employer's strict policies against arriving to work late, as well as returning from meal periods late, Claimant and aggrieved employees clock in before their start time and this consistently benefitted Employer. However, Claimant's wage statements consistently show hours rounded down.

A review of Claimant's wage statements reveals that Employer rounds employee time to the nearest quarter-hour. Claimant and his coworkers clock in and out using an app on their personal mobile devices which is capable of capturing the exact time they clock in and out. Nonetheless, Employer rounds their entries substantially to the quarter-hour.

California law will permit a "rounding policy only 'if the rounding policy is fair and neutral on its face and 'it is used in such a manner that it will not result, over a period of time, in failure to compensate the employees properly for all the time they have actually worked.'" (*Troester v. Starbucks Corporation*, (2018) 5 Cal. 5th 829, 846, citing *See's Candy*, 210 Cal.App.4th at p. 907.) The policy utilized by Employer is neither fair nor neutral, as it consistently shaved time from Claimant and aggrieved employees' hours worked, resulting in a failure to compensate Claimant and aggrieved employees for all hours worked.

Work Performed During Unpaid Meal Periods

As more fully set forth below, Employer failed to permit Claimant and others to take timely, off-duty, meal breaks of "not less than 30 minutes" for each five consecutive hours of work in violation of Labor Code §§226.7 and 512.

Claimant and aggrieved employees often had meal breaks interrupted with work and sometimes were not able to clock in prior to performing the task for which their meal period interrupted.

Improper Calculation of Overtime Rate – Failure to Pay Overtime Wages

(Cal. Lab. Code §§218, 510 et. seq., 1194)

Employer pays nondiscretionary bonuses to its hourly, non-exempt employees. It is well established that nondiscretionary bonuses, such as the bonuses at issue, retroactively increase the employee's "regular rate" of pay for purposes of calculating overtime. (Labor Code §207) The "regular rate" is calculated by dividing the hours worked in a week by all the compensation earned for that week. When an employee is later paid a bonus that is partly due to work performed in that week, this additional pay must be added into the total compensation for the week, increasing the employee's regular rate of pay. (*Marin v. Costco Wholesale Corp.* (2008) 169 CA4th 804, 807.)

Employer paid bonuses, including nondiscretionary bonuses which increase the employee's regular rate of pay calculation. Employer failed to include this, or any other additional income, into the regular rate calculation resulting in underpaid overtime.

As a result of these unlawful practices, Claimant and other employees have been denied "the unpaid balance of the full amount of this… overtime compensation" as required by Cal. Labor Code. §1194, and Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §2698 *et seq.* Additionally, Employer has violated Cal. Labor Code §218 and §510 and applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders at sections (3)(A)(1) for failure to pay overtime. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §558 and 2698 *et seq.*

Failure to Properly Calculate and Pay Sick Leave Wages- Regular Rate

Cal. Labor Code §§246, 2698 *et seq*

Employers must calculate paid sick leave for non-exempt employees in one of two ways:

> (1) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated in the same manner as the regular rate of pay for the workweek in which the employee uses paid sick time, whether or not the employee actually works overtime in that workweek; [or]
>
> (2) Paid sick time for nonexempt employees shall be calculated by dividing the employee's total wages, not including overtime premium pay, by the employee'stotal hours worked in the full pay periods of the prior 90 days of employment.

Labor Code § 246 (l)

Employer paid bonuses, including nondiscretionary bonuses. Employer failed to include this, or any other additional income, into the regular rate calculation resulting in underpaid sick pay. Claimant and aggrieved employees were paid sick leave wages at their base hourly rates of pay, which is less than required under either of the two alternative methods of calculation provided by Labor Code section 246(l).

Failure to Pay All Wages Owed Twice Per Month

(Cal. Lab. Code §§204, 210, and 2698 *et seq.*)

Employer was required to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees all wages earned twice during each calendar month pursuant to Labor Code §204(a).

Employer failed to pay all wages earned to employees as a result of the unlawful employment policies and practices discussed herein. As a result of these practices, employees were underpaid for hours worked, including overtime and penalty wages, and this underpayment resulted in a failure to pay all wages owed twice per month.

Due to these failures, Employer is liable under Labor Code §204, 210 and 2698 *et seq.* for failure to pay wages as required by law.

Failure to Pay Minimum Wage

(Cal. Labor Code §§ 200, 218.5, 226, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.2, 1198, 1199, 2698 *et seq.*)

Pursuant to Labor Code sections 1194, 1194.2 and 1197, it is unlawful for an employer to suffer or permit a California employee to work without paying wages at the proper minimum wage for all time worked as required by the applicable IWC Wage Order.

Employer failed to pay Claimant and aggrieved employees for all hours worked as a result of Employer's practices described above. Based on Employer's unlawful conduct described herein, and because Claimant and the aggrieved employees were paid at or near minimum wage, employer's failure to pay for all hours worked, including overtime, resulted in a payment of less than the minimum wage for all hours worked, in violation of Labor Code §1197, 1197.1, 1199 and the Wage Orders. Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§558 and 2699 *et seq.*

Failure to Pay Wages Due Upon Termination

(Cal. Lab. Code §§201, 202, 203, 227.3, 256 and 2698 *et seq.*)

An employee who is discharged must be paid all of his or her wages, including accrued vacation, immediately at the time of termination. (Labor Code Sections 201 and 227.3.) As set forth above, Employer knowingly and willfully failed to pay all compensation due and owing to Claimant at the time employment terminated.

Employer willfully failed to pay employees who are no longer employed by it all compensation due upon termination of employment as required by Cal. Lab. Code §§201 and 202. Claimant and similarly situated individuals are now entitled to recover up to thirty (30) days pay as waiting time under the terms of §203. Moreover, Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 *et. seq.*

Claimant did not receive all of his wages due on the date of his termination. Some payments remained due and owing until approximately a week following his termination.

Failure to Permit Compliant Meal Periods

(Cal. Labor Code §§226 (a), 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, Wage Order)

Labor Code §512 provides, "[a]n 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…" Labor Code §226.7(a) provides, "[n]o employer shall require an employee to work during any meal… period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare Commission." Paragraph 11 of the Wage Order provides, in pertinent part, "[u]nless an employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked."

Employer failed to permit Claimant and others to take timely, off-duty, meal breaks of "not less than 30 minutes" for each five consecutive hours of work in violation of Labor Code §§226.7 and 512. Employer failed to pay all penalty pay to Claimant or aggrieved employees for noncompliant meal periods. As a derivative claim, Claimant alleges that pay statements were inaccurate, failing to include required meal period penalties, thus failing the requirements of Labor Code §226(a). As a result of these violations, Employers are liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §558 and §2698 *et. seq.*

Claimant and aggrieved employees often missed meal periods, and meal periods that were permitted were often short or interrupted. Employees were unable to leave the premises during meal periods and when they worked over 10 hours, employees never received second meal periods. Claimant's meal periods were over only between 20-30 minutes, and late due to staffing and the press of work. These conditions applied to all aggrieved employees. Claimant also recalls being called back to work early from meal periods due to inadequate staffing practices. Claimant observed his coworkers missing meal breaks, as well as having meal breaks interrupted or cut short.

Full, uninterrupted, off-duty, thirty-minute meal periods were not provided because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to meal periods and premium payments for non-compliant meal periods; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods; (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant meal period policy; and/or (6) because

Employer unlawfully shaved and/or rounded clock in and clock out times for meal periods. Employees were not paid a premium payment, paid as an hour's wage when meal periods were not given to them in compliance with California law.

Rounding Meal Period Time Entries

Meal periods were also noncompliant because Employer rounded and thus altered timeclock entries for meal periods so that they do not show a meal period violation. Our Supreme Court has recently re-emphasized the importance of fully compliant meal periods, holding that employers must record meal period time entries to the exact minute, prohibiting rounding or shaving time for employee meal periods. (*Donohue v. AMN Services, LLC* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 58, 67.)

Employer rounded all clock in and out entries, including those for meal periods.

Failure to Provide Rest Breaks

(Cal. Labor Code §§226, 226.7, 512, 558, 1198, 2698 et seq., Wage Orders)

Employer failed to maintain a compliant rest period policy and practice that provides its employees with off-duty rest periods as required by California law. Claimant reports that employees frequently missed rest periods as a result of Employer's staffing and business practices, and that rest breaks were not scheduled into daily shifts.

Claimant explains that he never received a rest break while working for Employer. Claiamnt and aggrieved employees were expected to work straight through their shifts with the only break in the day a meal break, which was often not complaint.

Rest periods were either less than ten minutes, not provided, interrupted or late, "on duty," or not scheduled before and after a meal period for shifts greater than six hours, as prescribed by California law because Employer: (1) did not account for all hours worked that were unaccounted for on their timecard; (2) did not adequately inform and train employees about their rights to rest breaks and premium payments for non-compliant rest breaks; (3) did not adequately inform and train employees about when, where and how to take timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; (4) because Employer did not staff enough people to schedule all timely and uninterrupted ten-minute rest breaks; and/or (5) because management at various levels, affecting all hourly, non-exempt employees, refused to offer, permit, or enforce a lawfully compliant rest break policy.

The rest period requirement obligates employers to permit and authorize employees to take off-duty rest periods, meaning employers must relieve employees of all duties and relinquish control over how employees spend their time. *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, (2016) 5 Cal.5th 257, 269. Employers must pay employees an additional hour of wages at the employee's regular rate of pay for each missed or improper rest period (e.g., less than 10 minutes, interrupted rest period, rest period(s) at improper time(s) during shift(s). Lab. Code §226.7; applicable IWC Wage Order, §12(B) ("If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided"). Moreover, under California law rest periods must be a "net" ten minutes in a suitable rest area. (*Id.* at 268) (relying on January 3, 1986 and February 22, 2002 DLSE Letters wherein the DLSE ruled that the net ten-minute language for rest periods means ten minutes of time in a rest area and cannot include time it takes to get to and from the rest area). The employer must show that it clearly articulates the right to a net ten minutes, which means it must clearly communicate what "net" ten minutes means (i.e., regardless of what happens along the way to and from a rest area, employees are entitled to a full ten minutes of rest in the rest area). *Id.*; *see also, Bufil v. Dollar Fin. Grp., Inc.*, (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199 (the "onus is on the employer to clearly communicate the authorization and permission [to take rest periods] to their employees.").

Employer did not authorize or permit all of its hourly employees to take at least a ten minute rest period in which they were relieved of all duties, for every 4 hours of work, or major fraction thereof, as required by Cal. Lab. Code §226.7, §512 and the Wage Orders. When breaks were missed Employer failed to pay the 1-hour penalty, as required. Because Employer violated the Wage Order, Employer is liable under Labor Code §1198. As a result of these violations, Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code §2698 *et. seq.*

Failure to Reimburse for Required Business Expenses

(Cal. Labor Code §§1198, 2802, 2699 *et seq.*)

Labor Code §2802 requires employers to indemnify employees for necessary expenditures or losses incurred by employees in direct consequence of the discharge of duties. Accordingly, Employers are liable for civil penalties under PAGA §2699 *et seq*.

Claimant and aggrieved employees clocked in and out using an app on their mobile phones, although Employers did not reimburse them in any way for the expense of their personal cell phone use as required by the Labor Code.

Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements
(Cal. Labor Code §§ 226, 1174, 2699 *et seq*)

Employer knowingly and intentionally failed to provide timely, accurate, itemized wage statements to Claimant and the aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code §§ 226 and keep accurate records as required by §1174(d).

The statements provided to Claimants and aggrieved employees, and the records maintained by Employer, have not accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, including pay for all hours worked and the accurate rate of pay for all hours worked, and overtime pay, sick pay at the correct rate, and pay for meal and rest period premium wages.

§226 (a) requires:

> An employer, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employee, either as a detachable

> part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, except as provided in subdivision (j), (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and, if the employer is a farm labor contractor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 1682, the name and address of the legal entity that secured the services of the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee…

Wage statements do not state the total hours worked. Additionally, due to rounding, employees are unable to determine the actual number of hours worked by reviewing wage statements.

Employer is liable for civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq*.

Finally, Employer has violated Labor Code §432.5 for forcing Claimant and aggrieved employees to sign employment-related contracts and documents that contained unlawful terms of employment, including invalid meal period waivers resulting from a noncompliant meal period policy and/or practice.

Conclusion

Employer has violated a number of California wage and hour laws. Claimant respectfully requests that the agency investigate the above allegations and hereby provides notice of the allegations pursuant to PAGA's provisions. Alternatively, Claimant requests that the agency inform Claimant if it does not intend to investigate these violations so that Claimant may pursue these claims as a representative action in civil court.

Sincerely,

Nazo Koulloukian, Esq.
Attorney for Claimant