

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jorge Gonzalez

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
2/10/2025 12:23:15 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Y. Modica ,Deputy Clerk

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

JORGE GONZALEZ, on behalf of others
similarly situated and the State of California
under the Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE SERVICES,
LLC and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU027178C

CLASS ACTION

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT**

1. Meal Period Violations
2. Rest Period Violations
3. Untimely Payment of Wages
4. Wage Statement Violations
5. Waiting Time Penalties
6. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses
7. Unfair Competition
8. Civil Penalties under the Private Attorneys
General Act (Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)

1 Plaintiff JORGE GONZALEZ, on behalf of all others similarly situated and the State of
2 California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“Plaintiff”) brings this FIRST AMENDED
3 CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT against Defendants Z GOLF FOOD &
4 BEVERAGE SERVICES, LLC and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”),
5 alleging as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Plaintiff brings the instant class action on behalf of themselves and similarly situated
8 current and former employees of Defendants for a series of systemic violations of the California Labor
9 Code and IWC Wage Orders.

10 2. Defendants failed to provide, authorize, and/or permit the class members to take all
11 meal and rest periods to which they were entitled.

12 3. Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the class members for all costs incurred
13 for work-related purposes including cell phones.

14 4. Defendants’ employment policies, practices, and payroll administration systems
15 enabled and facilitated these violations on a company-wide basis with respect to the class members.

16 5. Plaintiff seeks to recover the damages, wages, interest, and penalties, in addition to
17 attorneys’ fees and costs, according to proof.

18 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

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

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

23 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
24 Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail
25 themselves to the California economy so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the
26 California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
27
28

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

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Jorge Gonzalez

10. Plaintiff Gonzalez is an individual over 18 years of age who worked for Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee from about April 2024 to Present. Plaintiff worked as a Event Server.

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

B. Defendants

12. Defendant Z Golf Food & Beverage Services, LLC is a California limited liability company that maintains operations and conducts business throughout the State of California, including in this county. Defendant does business as Wedgewood Weddings.

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

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

15. Upon information and belief, at least some of the Defendants have common ownership, common management, interrelationship of operations, and centralized control over labor relations and

are therefore part of an integrated enterprise and thus jointly and severally responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein, including pursuant to Labor Code sections 558, 558.1, and 1197.1.

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

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

17. This action is brought individually and on behalf of the following class pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382:

- a. All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California at any time from four years (plus the additional 178-day statutory tolling period under Emergency Rule 9) prior to the filing of this action through date of class certification.

18. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish various subclass definitions as appropriate at the class certification stage, according to proof.

19. The class is ascertainable and shares a well-defined community of interest in this litigation:

- a. Numerosity: The class is estimated to exceed 50 individuals, although the precise membership of the entire class is unknown at this time. The class is so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The identities of class members are ascertainable by inspection of Defendants' employment and payroll records.
- b. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other class members. They were subject to the same policies and practices of Defendants, which resulted in losses to the class. Proof of common unlawful business practices, which Plaintiff experienced, will establish the right of the class to recover on the causes of action alleged herein.

- 1 c. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate class representative; will take all necessary
2 steps to protect the class members' interests adequately and fairly; has no
3 interest antagonistic to other class members; and is represented by attorneys
4 who have substantial experience prosecuting, defending, resolving, and
5 litigating wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions in
6 California state and federal courts.
- 7 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other means for adjudicating this
8 dispute. Individual joinder is impractical. Class treatment will allow for
9 common issues to be resolved in a single forum, simultaneously, and without
10 duplication of effort and expense.
- 11 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class action
12 advances the State of California's strong public interest in ensuring its
13 approximately millions of employed residents are properly paid the wages they
14 earned for the hours they worked. Class actions provide a mechanism for
15 enforcement of labor laws and allow for vindication of employee rights by
16 unnamed class members.

17 20. Common questions of law and fact as to the class members predominate over questions
18 affecting only individual members. The common questions of law and fact exist as to whether the
19 employment policies and practices formulated by Defendants and applied to the class members
20 constitute violations of California law.

21 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 21. Defendants failed to provide all meal period to which Plaintiff and the class members
23 were entitled and further failed to pay meal period premiums for these violations.

24 22. Plaintiff and class members routinely experienced missed, late, short, and interrupted
25 first and second meal periods to keep up with the high demands of the job.

26 23. Plaintiff's time records show he experienced missed or otherwise non-compliant meal
27 periods. Plaintiff's wage statement further show Defendant failed to pay meal period premiums for
28 each noncompliant meal period.

1 24. For example. Plaintiff time records for May 31, 2024 show Plaintiff worked over 6
2 hours without a compliant meal period. Plaintiff's wage statement for the corresponding pay period
3 shows Defendant failed to provide a meal period premium, despite experiencing at least one non-
4 compliant meal period.

5 25. Each time Plaintiff and the class members experienced a noncompliant meal period,
6 they were owed a meal period premium. However, as a matter of policy and practice, Defendant failed
7 to pay Plaintiff and other class members a meal period premium in violation of Labor Code section
8 226.7.

9 26. Similarly, Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which employees were
10 entitled and failed to pay rest period premiums to Plaintiff and other class members.

11 27. As stated in the above sections, due to Defendants' policy of requiring Plaintiff and
12 class members to work through their shifts at times, Plaintiff and other class members were not always
13 permitted to take rest periods.

14 28. Each time Plaintiff and the class members experienced a noncompliant rest period, they
15 were owed a rest period premium at the lawful rate. However, as a matter of policy and practice,
16 Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members a rest period premium at the lawful rate of
17 pay.

18 29. Defendants required Plaintiff and the class members, both exempt and non-exempt, to
19 incur costs for work-related purposes without full reimbursement.

20 30. Specifically, Plaintiff and the class members were required to use their cell phones to
21 maintain contact with Defendant. Defendant often sent Plaintiff and the class members text messages
22 and emails about work-related issues including staffing and schedule changes

23 31. Thus, in direct consequence of their job duties, Plaintiff and the class members
24 unavoidably and necessarily incurred these losses, expenditures, costs, and as a matter of policy and
25 practice. To the extent Defendants reimbursed class members, those amounts were underpaid.

26 32. Defendants failed to accurately state the "gross wages earned" and "net wages earned"
27 in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1) and (5), as Plaintiff and class members were underpaid
28

1 premiums resulting in an inaccurate and depreciated itemization of gross and net wages earned on
2 those wage statements.

3 33. In violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9), the hourly rates and corresponding hours
4 worked at those rates are incorrectly listed on Plaintiff's and class members' wage statements.
5 Defendants failed to state on employee wage statements each pay period the applicable hourly rates in
6 effect and the number of hours worked at that rate, as Defendants failed to pay all wages owed to
7 employees. The amounts stated are instead depreciated and underpaid, resulting in an inaccurate
8 reflection on the pay stub.

9 34. These violations create derivative liability for failure to pay all wages owed each
10 payday or upon separation of employment.

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

13 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512**

14 35. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

15 36. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
16 §§ 226.7, 558 and 512, which require non-exempt employees be provided complaint meal periods (or
17 meal period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an
18 employer's failure to lawfully provide all meal periods and/or pay meal period premiums at the lawful
19 regular rate of compensation.

20 37. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently provide
21 Plaintiff and class members compliant, duty-free meal periods of not less than 30 minutes beginning
22 before the fifth hour of hour for each work period of more than five hours per day and a second duty-
23 free meal period of not less than 30 minutes beginning before the tenth hour of hour of work in
24 violation of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512, 558, 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the "Meal Periods"
25 sections of the applicable orders).

26 38. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay
27 Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation
28 for each workday that a fully compliant meal period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code

1 sections 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Meal Periods” sections of the
2 applicable orders).

3 39. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the meal period
4 premiums owed, in addition to interest, statutory and civil penalties, and attorneys’ fees, and costs to
5 the extent permitted by law.

6 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

8 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516**

9 40. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

10 41. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
11 §§ 226.7 and 516, which require non-exempt employees be authorized to take complaint rest periods
12 (or rest period premiums in lieu thereof), and which further provide a private right of action for an
13 employer’s failure to lawfully provide all rest periods and/or pay rest period premiums at the lawful
14 regular rate of compensation.

15 42. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently authorize and
16 permit Plaintiff and class members to receive compliant, duty-free rest periods of not less than ten
17 (10) minutes for every four hours worked (or major fraction thereof) in violation of Labor Code
18 sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders (the “Rest Periods” sections of the
19 applicable orders).

20 43. Further, Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to consistently pay
21 Plaintiff and class members one additional hour of pay at the respective regular rate of compensation
22 for each workday that a fully compliant rest period was not provided, in violation of Labor Code
23 sections 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198 and the IWC Wage Orders.

24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **UNTIMELY PAYMENT OF WAGES**

26 **Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 218**

27 44. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.
28

1 45. This cause of action is brought pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders and Labor Code
2 §§ 204, 204b, and 210 which require non-exempt employees be timely paid all wages owed each pay
3 period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to comply with
4 this obligation. Labor Code § 218 authorizes individuals to sue directly for wages and penalties due
5 under these sections, including Labor Code § 210(c)'s statutory late payment penalties.

6 46. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to timely pay all wages,
7 including paid sick leave and meal and rest premiums, earned by Plaintiff and class members twice
8 during each calendar month on days designated in advance by the employer as regular paydays (for
9 employees paid on a non-weekly basis) and on the regularly-scheduled weekly payday for weekly
10 employees, if any, in violation of Labor Code sections 204 and 204b and the IWC Wage Orders (the
11 "Minimum Wages" sections of the applicable orders).

12 47. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the full amount of the unpaid wages,
13 in addition to a statutory penalty in the amount of \$100 for the initial violation for each failure to pay
14 each employee and \$200 for all subsequent violations and for all willful or intentional violations for
15 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld under provided
16 in Labor Code § 210, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

17 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**

19 **Violation of Labor Code § 226**

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

21 49. This cause of action is brought by a wage statement subclass pursuant to Labor Code
22 § 226(a) which requires non-exempt employees be provided accurate itemized wage statements each
23 pay period, and which further provide a private right of action for an employer's failure to comply
24 with this obligation.

25 50. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed in their affirmative obligation to provide
26 accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and class members resulting in injury to Plaintiff and
27 class members. Specifically, the wage statements issued to Plaintiff and class members did not
28 accurately state each pay period all of the information required by Labor Code § 226(a)(1)-(9).

51. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of accurate itemized wage statements, causing confusion and concealing wage and premium underpayments.

52. As a result, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the statutory penalty of \$50 per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, up to an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 226(e).

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAITING TIME PENALTIES

Violation of Labor Code §§ 201 *et seq.*

53. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

54. This cause of action is brought by a waiting time subclass pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 through 203, which require an employer to timely pay all wages earned upon termination of employment, and which further provide a private right of action to recover statutory waiting time penalties each day an employer fails to comply with this obligation, up to a maximum of 30 days wages.

55. Defendants willfully failed and continue to fail in their affirmative obligation to pay all wages earned and unpaid to Plaintiff and class members immediately upon termination of employment or within 72 hours thereafter for employees who did not provide at least 72 hours prior notice of his or her intention to quit, and further failed to pay those sums for 30 days thereafter in violation of Labor Code sections 201 through 203 and the IWC Wage Orders.

56. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover a waiting time penalty for a period of up to 30 days, in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES

Violation of Labor Code § 2802

57. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

58. Defendants willfully failed in their affirmative obligation to reimburse Plaintiff and a reimbursement subclass for all necessary expenditures, losses, expenses, and costs incurred by them in direct discharge of the duties of their employment, in violation of Labor Code section 2802.

59. Defendants' unlawful acts and omissions deprived Plaintiff and class members of lawful reimbursements for business expenses in amounts to be determined at trial. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover the amount unreimbursed expenses of Plaintiff and class members in addition to interest, attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Labor Code section 2802.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR COMPETITION

Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

60. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

61. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful business practices in the State of California in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 by committing the foregoing wage and hour violations alleged throughout this Complaint.

62. Defendants' dependence on these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived Plaintiff and continue to deprive other class members of compensation to which they are legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage to Defendants over competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers in compliance with California's wage and hour laws. These failures constitute unlawful, deceptive, and unfair business acts and practices in violation of Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq.*

63. Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged in this Complaint, and Plaintiff, as an individual and on behalf of others similarly situated, seeks full restitution of the moneys as necessary and according to proof to restore all monies withheld, acquired, and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

64. Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law for past or future violations, to the extent the statute of limitations on each of the alleged causes of action do not extend to the four year

1 limitation provided under the UCL or to the extent the underlying Labor Code and IWC Wage Order
2 violations do not provide a private right of action.

3 65. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to injunctive relief against Defendants,
4 restitution, and other equitable relief to return all funds over which Plaintiff and class members have
5 an ownership interest and to prevent future damage and the public interest under Business and
6 Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Plaintiff and class members are further entitled to recover interest,
7 attorneys' fees, and costs to the extent permitted by law, including under Code of Civil Procedure
8 § 1021.5.

9 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

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

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

13 66. All outside paragraphs of this Complaint are incorporated into this section.

14 67. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California on behalf of
15 the following “aggrieved employees” pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”),
16 codified as Labor Code section 2698 *et seq.*:

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

20 68. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, supplement, or add to this description of the
21 aggrieved employees, according to proof.

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

26 70. Labor Code section 2699(a) provides: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law,,
27 any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
28 and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards,

1 agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
2 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of the employee and other current or former
3 employees against whom a violation of the same provision was committed pursuant to the procedures
4 specified in Section 2699.3. “

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

8 72. Labor Code section 2699.3 sets forth the procedure for commencing an action for civil
9 penalties under the PAGA.

10 73. On or about **December 4, 2024**, Plaintiff paid the requisite PAGA filing fee and
11 provided written notice (by online electronic filing with the LWDA and by certified mail to
12 Defendants) of Defendants’ alleged Labor Code violations, including the facts and theories to support
13 the alleged violations.

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

17 75. To date, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received a response to Plaintiff’s
18 written PAGA notice from the LWDA.

19 76. Within 33 calendar days of the postmark date of the notice sent by Plaintiff, neither
20 Plaintiff nor Plaintiff’s counsel has received written notice by certified mail from any defendant
21 providing a description of any actions taken to cure the alleged violations.

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

26 78. As set forth in the PAGA notice attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated into this
27 Complaint, Defendants committed the following violations and are liable for all corresponding civil
28 penalties:

- a. ***Unpaid Meal Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- b. ***Unpaid Rest Period Premium Wages.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 1198; IWC Wage Orders.
- c. ***Untimely Payment of Wages During Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 204b, 210.
- d. ***Untimely Payment of Wages Upon Separation of Employment.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256.
- e. ***Non-Compliant Wage Statements.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3.
- f. ***Unreimbursed Employee Expenses.*** Violation of Labor Code §§ 2802, 2804.
- g. ***Failure to Maintain Accurate Records.*** Violation of Labor Code § 1174; IWC Wage Orders.

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

PRAYER


Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

- a. For certification of this action as a class action;
- b. For appointment of Plaintiff as the class representative;
- c. For appointment of above-captioned counsel for Plaintiff as Class Counsel;
- d. For division of class members into appropriate classes and/or subclasses according to proof;
- e. For recovery of all statutory penalties and liquidated damages;
- f. For disgorgement of all amounts wrongfully obtained to the extent permitted by law;
- g. For restitution and injunctive relief;

- 1 h. For attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent permitted by
2 law, including (without limitation) under Labor Code §§ 218.5, 226, 2802 and Code of
3 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.
- 4 i. For recovery of damages in amount according to proof;
- 5 j. For all recoverable pre- and post-judgment interest;
- 6 k. For this action to be maintained as a representative action under the PAGA;
- 7 l. For Plaintiff and counsel of record to be provided with all enforcement capability as if
8 the action were brought by the State of California or the California Division of Labor
9 Enforcement;
- 10 m. For recovery of all civil penalties and other recoverable amounts under the PAGA;
- 11 n. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit, including expert fees, to the extent
12 permitted by law, associated with the PAGA claims pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
13 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and any other applicable sections; and
- 14 o. For such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

15 Dated: February 10, 2025

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

17 

18 Nicholas J. Ferraro

19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Jorge Gonzalez*

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Labor Code Violations

FERRARO VEGA

SAN DIEGO EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

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

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

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

December 4, 2024

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

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

Z Golf Food & Beverage Services, LLC
43385 Business Park Dr, Suite 220
Temecula, CA 92590

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

Dear LWDA Officer and Company Representatives:

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

Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE SERVICES, LLC
dba Wedgewood Weddings

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

This office serves as legal counsel for Plaintiff. If the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) does not investigate the facts, allegations, and violations set forth in this notice within the statutorily prescribed 65-day period under Labor Code section 2699.3, Plaintiff intends to commence a civil action against Defendants as a proxy and agent of the State of California under the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”). “PAGA allows an ‘aggrieved employee’—a person affected by at least one Labor Code violation committed by an employer—to pursue penalties for all the Labor Code violations committed by that employer.” *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751; *Kim v. Reins International California, Inc.* (2020) 9 Cal. 73, 79. Plaintiff maintains standing to pursue these claims against Defendants as an aggrieved employee.

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

- BACKGROUND -

Defendants employed Plaintiff during the PAGA Period in the position of Event Server from about April 22024 to Present. During their employment Plaintiff and the other aggrieved employees were subject to the wage and hour and employment protections set forth in the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

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

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

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

- PAGA CLAIMS -

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

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

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

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

Defendant failed to provide all meal periods to which employees were entitled and failed to pay meal period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees often experienced missed, short, and late meal periods to keep up with high demands of the job.

Plaintiff's time records show he missed meals or otherwise experienced non-compliant meal periods. Plaintiff's wage statements further show Defendant failed to pay meal period premiums for each noncompliant meal period.

For example, Plaintiff's time records below show he worked over 6 hours on May 31, 2024 without a compliant meal period:

Apply Date	Pay Code	In	In Excep.	Out	Out Excep.	Hours	Wages	Days
		Job(Labor) Transfer						
		Comments			Work Rule			
2024-05-30		1:52 PM		5:59 PM				
2024-05-30		6:38 PM		12:03 AM		9.53		0.00
2024-05-31		4:04 PM		10:12 PM	Short Total Break, Bonus Applied	6.13		0.00

Extract from Plaintiff's Time Records on May 31, 2024

CO.	FILE	DEPT.	CLOCK	VOHR. NO.	070
38W	559427	226ESS		0000240769	1

Z GOLF FOOD & BEVERAGE SERVICES, LLC
28765 SINGLE OAK DR
#210
TEMECULA, CA 92590

Filing Status: Single/Married filing separately
Exemptions/Allowances:
Federal: Tax blocked

Social Security Number: XXX-XX-7079

Earnings Statement 

Period Beginning: 05/27/2024
Period Ending: 06/09/2024
Pay Date: 06/14/2024

JORGE GONZALEZ


Earnings	rate	hours	this period	year to date	Other Benefits and Information	this period	total to date
Regular	19.0000	34.66	658.54	2,221.29	Totl Hrs Worked	37.23	
Overtime	28.5000	2.57	73.25	121.71			
Gross Pay			\$731.79	2,343.00			

Important Notes
COMPANY PH#+1 951 491 8110 305

Extract from Plaintiff's Wage Statement for the Pay Period 5/27/2024 to 6/9/2024

Plaintiff's wage statement for the corresponding pay period shows Defendant failed to provide a meal period premium, despite experiencing at least one non-compliant meal period.

On information and belief this was common to all aggrieved employees. Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced a noncompliant meal period, they were owed a meal period premium. However, as a matter of policy and practice, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees a meal period premium in violation of Labor Code section 226.7.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

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

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

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

conditions of labor prohibited by the [IWC Wage Orders]” unlawful. The IWC Wage Orders, including Section 12 (Rest Periods), further require one uninterrupted 10-minute rest period for each four-hour period (or major fraction thereof) worked and an additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of compensation for each workday that a compliant rest period is not authorized or permitted.

Similarly, Defendants failed to provide all rest periods to which employees were entitled and failed to pay rest period premiums to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees. As stated in the above sections, due to Defendants’ policy of requiring Plaintiff and aggrieved employees to work through their shifts at times, Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees were not always permitted to take rest periods.

Each time Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees experienced a noncompliant rest period, they were owed a rest period premium at the lawful rate. However, as a matter of policy and practice, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees a rest period premium at the lawful rate of pay.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

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

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

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

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

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

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

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

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

Defendants failed to pay all wages and premiums owed to aggrieved employees during their employment as set forth in this notice, and also failed to timely pay those amounts to departing employees upon separation of employment. Defendants did not pay waiting time penalties for the late payments. As a result, Defendants violated Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

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

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

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

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

Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees cannot promptly and easily determine from the wage statement alone the wages paid or earned without reference to other documents or information. Indeed, these wage statement violations are significant because they sow confusion among Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees with respect to what amounts were owed and paid, at what rates, the number of hours worked, and how those amounts were or should be calculated. The wage statements reflect a false statement of earnings and concealed the underlying problems and underpayments of employee wages.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Unreimbursed Employee Expenses **Violation of Labor Code §§ 2802, 2804**

Defendants violated Labor Code section 2802 with respect to the aggrieved employees by failing to reimburse the aggrieved employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred as part of their job duties.

Labor Code section 2802 requires an employer to “indemnify his or her employee for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer, even though unlawful, unless the employee, at the time of obeying the directions, believed them to be unlawful.” *See, e.g., Espinoza v. West Coast Tomato Growers, LLC*, 2016 WL 4468175 at *4, n.2 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2016, No. 14-CV-2984 W (KSC)).

Labor Code section 2804 affirms that “[a]ny contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of this article or any part thereof, is null and void, and this article shall not deprive any employee or his personal representative of any right or remedy to which he is entitled under the laws of this State.”

Defendants required Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees to incur costs for work-related purposes without full reimbursement. In direct consequence of their job duties, Plaintiff and

the aggrieved employees unavoidably and necessarily incurred these losses, expenditures, costs, and as a matter of policy and practice.

Specifically, Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees were required to use their cell phones to maintain contact with Defendant. Defendant often sent Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees text messages and emails about work-related issues including staffing and schedule changes.

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

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

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

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

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

As a result, Plaintiff may recover civil penalties as an individual and on behalf of the State of California and the aggrieved employees, up to the maximum amount allowed as set forth under the Labor Code.

Attorneys’ Fees and Costs
Labor Code § 2699(k)(1)

Plaintiff has been compelled to retain the services of counsel to protect the interests of other aggrieved employees and the State of California. Plaintiff continues to incur attorneys’ fees and costs, which are recoverable under California law, including Labor Code section 2699(k)(1).

- LITIGATION HOLD NOTICE -

This letter imposes a duty upon all defendants and their respective employees, officers, directors, executives, attorneys, human resource and payroll personnel, accountants, and other

agents to preserve all physical and electronic evidence, including electronically stored information and emails, which relate to the employment of Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees specified in this notice. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, Defendants' written employment and payroll policies and handbooks; the aggrieved employees' personnel files and payroll records, such as paystubs, time records, wage statements, compensation reports, as well as the underlying electronically data in Excel or similar format. Memoranda and internal and external correspondence relating to the subject matter of this notice shall also be maintained. Failure to preserve and retain relevant evidence may constitute spoliation of evidence and result in an adverse inference or sanctions.

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

- CONCLUSION -

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

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Elyssa Martinez". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first name "Elyssa" being more prominent than the last name "Martinez".

Elyssa Martinez

Cc Plaintiff Jorge Gonzalez
Defendant's HR Representative - angelas@wedgewoodweddings.com