D.Law

1635 Pontius Ave, 2nd Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

(424) 320-6420
(424) 320-6454

November 18, 2024

<u>Submitted at https://www.dir.ca.gov with $75 filing fee</u>

PAGA Administrator
California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

Re: <u>Shasta Beverages, Inc. (the "Employer")</u>

NOTICE OF LABOR CODE VIOLATIONS UNDER LABOR CODE § 2699.3

To: PAGA Administrator, California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and the Employer

From: Jahangir W. Ahmad (the "Employee"), who was subjected to the wage and hour practices set forth below

The Employee, by way of the above-named counsel, submits this Notice, under and in compliance with the requirements of California Labor Code § 2699.3(a)/(c), and alleges the facts and theories to support the alleged violations as follows:

During the applicable time period the Employer employed the Employee and all other similarly situated aggrieved employees as non-exempt employees and utilized consistent policies and procedures regarding the Employee and all such other aggrieved employees, as follows:

<u>First</u>, the Employer failed to pay all straight time, minimum, and/or overtime wages due for the time the Employee and other aggrieved employees were subject to the Employer's control. For example, the Employer required the Employee and other aggrieved employees to wait in a long line before clocking in. Because the Employer failed to pay all straight time wages, minimum wages, and overtime wages due for the time the Employee and other aggrieved employees were subject to the Employer's control, the Employer violated Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197 and/or 1198 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order, and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f), 1197.1, and/or 558.

<u>Second</u>, the Employer paid the Employee and other aggrieved employees varying base rates and/or differentials but failed to properly incorporate such rates into the regular rate of pay for calculation of the overtime rate. rates. As such, the Employer violated Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, 1198 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f), 1197.1, and/or 558.

<u>Third</u>, the Employer failed to timely provide all legally compliant meal breaks (including second meal breaks) to the Employee and other aggrieved employees, because the Employer failed to relinquish all control and/or because meal breaks were missed, interrupted, short and/or late. The Employee and other aggrieved employees routinely worked over five hours but did not always get lawful full thirty-minute uninterrupted meal breaks within the first five hours of their shifts. Further, they sometimes worked over ten and/or twelve hours but were not timely provided a legally compliant second meal break. The Employer did not always pay a meal period penalty for these violations. As such, the Employer violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512 and 516 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order ¶ 11 and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f) and/or 558.

Fourth, the Employer failed to always authorize and permit paid rest breaks to the Employee and other aggrieved employees. The Employee and other aggrieved employees did not always get full ten-minute uninterrupted rest breaks within the first four hours of their shift or major fraction thereof and each subsequent four hours worked thereafter or major fraction thereof. As such, the Employee and other aggrieved employees were not always authorized and permitted legally compliant rest breaks. The Employer did not always pay a rest period penalty for these violations. As such, the Employer violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516, and the applicable Industrial Wage Order ¶ 12(A)/(B) and owes rest period wages and penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f) and/or 558.

Fifth, regarding wage statements, under Labor Code § 226 and the applicable Industrial Wage Order, the Employer is required to include certain information on a paystub. Here, because of the Employer failed to pay all wages as set forth above, Employer issued wage statements that inaccurately reflected hours worked and/or wages earned by the Employee and other aggrieved employees, and the Employer has derivatively violated Labor Code § 226 and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f) and/or 226.3

Sixth, regarding wage statements, also regarding wage statements, and in addition to the derivative violations of Labor Code § 226 above, under Labor Code § 226(a) and the applicable Industrial Wage Order, the Employer is required to include certain information on an employee's wage statement. Here, the Employer issued improper wage statements to the Employee and other aggrieved employees because the Employer's wage statements did not always contain all requisite information, including but not limited to all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the Employee. As such, the Employer independently violated Labor Code § 226 and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f) and/or 226.3.

Seventh, because the Employer failed to pay all wages as set forth above, formerly-employed aggrieved employees are entitled to thirty days of wages at their regular rate of pay for the Employer's failure to pay all wages due upon separation of employment. The Employer's failure to timely pay final wages to formerly-employed aggrieved employees was willful in that the Employer adopted policies and/or practices that were incompatible with the Labor Code. Because the Employer failed to pay all wages as set forth above, the Employer derivatively violated Labor Code §§ 201-202 and owes penalties under Labor Code §§ 2699(f) and/or 201-203.

Eighth, and finally, the Employee and other aggrieved employees were subjected by the Employer to excessive heat and/or excessive cold temperatures throughout the year. Under the applicable IWC Wage Order section 15, an employer must provide temperatures "in each work area" that "provide reasonable comfort consistent with industry-wide standards for nature of the process and the work performed." Here, the Employer failed to provide the Employee and other aggrieved employees with reasonable comfort by maintaining the indoor temperature within the range of industry standards by, inter alia, providing adequate air conditioning, heat, ventilation, etc. Therefore, the Employer violated Labor Code § 1198 and owes penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f).

Under Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), please advise within 65 calendar days of the postmark date of this notice whether the LWDA intends to investigate these alleged violations.

Further, under Labor Code § 2699.3(c)(2)(A), the Employer may cure the alleged violations within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of this notice and within that period, give notice by certified mail if the alleged violation is cured, including a description of actions taken.

In addition, this letter clearly sets forth the Employee's grievances and proposed remedies, under the Labor Code, PAGA, and otherwise, as set forth above. The Employee would like to engage in reasonable efforts to settle this dispute before filing a civil action against the Employer. The Employee gives the Employer the opportunity, prior to the expiration of the deadline for the LWDA to investigate, to meet the Employee's demands and settle this dispute.

We understand that if we do not receive a response within 65 calendar days of the postmark and filing date of this notice that the LWDA intends to investigate these allegations and/or a notice from the Employer that the alleged violations are cured, and/or if the alleged violations are not cured, then the Employee may immediately thereafter commence a civil action against the Employer under Labor Code § 2699.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Gregg Lander

Emil Davtyan
Gregg Lander
Vanessa M. Ruggles

cc: (via Certified Mail)
Shasta Beverages Inc.
8100 SW 10th Street, Suite 4000
Plantation, FL 33324

cc: (via Certified Mail)
Shasta Beverages Inc.
14405 E. Artesia Blvd.
La Mirada, CA 90638