



SHIRIAN LAW

Joshua Shirian, Esq.
Managing Partner
10850 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1260
Los Angeles, California 90024
Main: (310) 907-5000
Email: josh@shirianlaw.com
Website: www.shirianlaw.com

August 27, 2026

PAGA NOTICE FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Re: Notice Letter of Eduardo Amezcua on Behalf of Himself and
Aggrieved Employees Under California Labor section 2699.3

Employer: Hola Comida Hospitality LLC
1712 North Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90027

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 Eduardo Amezcua’s (“Employee”) employment with Employee’s former employers: Hola Comida Hospitality LLC. Employee was employed as a non-exempt employee of Hola Comida Hospitality LLC at, without limitation, 1712 North Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90027, with duties that included, but were not limited to, leading recipe preparation, cooking accompaniments, coordinating with kitchen staff, training employees, and cleaning the kitchen from approximately April of 2023 and through approximately February of 2025. In connection with the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*, Labor Code section 432, Labor Code section 1198.5, Labor Code section 2802, restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech, Employee seeks to represent all employees of Hola Comida Hospitality LLC, 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 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 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 complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries; and editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked. 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. Code Regs, title 8, section 110404(5)(A), 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; 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; 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.

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; 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; 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 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), 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 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 *et seq.* 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 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.

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.

Very truly yours,

SHIRIAN LAW, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leeor Vaknin", is written over the typed name below.

Leeor Vaknin

cc: Hola Comida Hospitality LLC (via U.S. Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested)