



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 1 of 7

VIA ONLINE FILING

Labor and Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, CA 95814

PAGAFilings@dir.ca.gov

<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act/Private-Attorneys-General-Act.html>

RE: Christian Nunez v. Frito-Lay, Inc.

Dear Representative:

This office represents Christian Nunez (“**Mr. Nunez**”) with respect to his claims under the California Labor Code against Frito-Lay, Inc. (“**Employer**”). This letter is being sent simultaneously to Employer by certified mail.

Employer employed Mr. Nunez from approximately December 2024 to June 2025, as an hourly, non-exempt employee. During his employment with Employer, Mr. Nunez was employed as a Universal Packaging Technician at Employer’s location at 9535 Archibald Ave, Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730. His duties and responsibilities included but were not limited to Operating and loading heavy-duty machinery with boxes ranging in size, handling finished pallets, transporting heavy pallets using manual pallet jacks and conveyor systems—averaging 10–13 pallets per shift, Maintaining cleanliness and safety of the work area and supporting the main machine operator by assembling boxes, applying labels, and placing completed boxes onto the conveyor belt. Employer is an American food company that manufactures, markets, and sells snacks.

Mr. Nunez intends to seek penalties for violations of the California Labor Code which are recoverable under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“**PAGA**”). Mr. Nunez is seeking penalties solely in a representative capacity on behalf of the State of California and all current and former non-exempt employees of Employer (“**Aggrieved Employees**”). This letter is being sent in compliance with California Labor Code section 2699.3.

As detailed below, Employer violated several of California’s wage and hour laws during Mr. Nunez’s employment, including but not limited to violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800, 2802, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“**IWC Wage Order**”) including *inter alia*, IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7. These claims are based upon the following facts and theories:

1. FAILURE TO PAY FOR ALL TIME WORKED AT CORRECT RATES OF PAY, INCLUDING MINIMUM WAGES, STRAIGHT TIME WAGES, AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 2 of 7

Employer has engaged in numerous unlawful practices which resulted in the failure to pay Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for all time worked at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation.

First, Employer regularly required Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, but failed to pay them overtime compensation for such work. Employer also failed to provide Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees with adequate training as to the payment of overtime compensation, all in an effort to keep its workers uninformed as to their legal right to overtime compensation. In addition, Employer regularly required Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock in order to complete their duties and responsibilities. This off-the-clock work included, amongst other things, requiring Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to: (1) respond to Employer and work-related requests and perform work while clocked out for purported meal breaks; (2) perform work before clocking in for the start of their shift; and (3) perform work after clocking out for the end of their shift. Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not compensated for this off-the-clock work, resulting in a failure to pay minimum wages and straight time wages. Moreover, this off-the-clock work typically caused Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work more than eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in week, resulting in a failure to pay overtime compensation. Mr. Nunez was regularly required to wear safety equipment before the start of his shift, which typically consisted of ten (10) minutes, and at times more if there was a line. Additionally, Mr. Nunez was constantly interrupted during his meal breaks due to work demands and work-related requests and communications. Mr. Nunez was also required to take off the required safety equipment after clocking out of his shift.

In addition to requiring Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to perform work off-the-clock without compensation, Employer also failed to accurately record the actual time worked by Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees, which resulted in a failure to pay Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for all hours actually worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages. Finally, and as a matter of policy and/or practice, Employer failed to pay overtime to Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked based on regular rates of pay correctly calculated to include all applicable remuneration.

As a result of the foregoing practices, Employer has failed to pay Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned at the correct rates of pay, including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime compensation. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7 and California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1194, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek unpaid wages; PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558, 1197.1, and 1199; compensation pursuant to Labor Code Section 1194; and attorneys' fees and costs.

2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS AND PAY MEAL PERIOD PREMIUMS



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 3 of 7

Employer failed to provide Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees with legally-compliant 30-minute meal periods. Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were required by Employer to work more than five (5) hours per day, but were not provided with timely uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods. Further, Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted 30-minute meal period when they worked over ten (10) hours per day. Employer regularly required Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work through their first and second meal periods, to take their first meal period after their fifth (5th) hour of work, and/or to take their second meal period after their tenth (10th) hour of work. Mr. Nunez was constantly experiencing late meal breaks due to work demands. Mr. Nunez was taking his meal breaks after the fifth hour of work and his second meal breaks after the 10th hour of work. Additionally, Mr. Nunez was experiencing missed meal breaks due to overwhelming work demands. On the occasions that Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees did take a meal period, their meal periods were frequently interrupted or cut short. Mr. Nunez was constantly interrupted during his purported meal break periods and at times cutting his meal breaks short to attend to work-related tasks.

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, complete and duty-free meal periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of meal periods or systematically disregarded its own purported meal period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant meal period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant meal periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during meal periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees right to receive timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free meal periods.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the meal periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7 and California Labor Code sections 226.7, 512(a) and 1198.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 4 of 7

3. FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT REST PERIODS AND PAY REST PERIOD PREMIUMS

Employer failed to authorize and permit Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees take legally-compliant 10-minute rest periods. Employer required Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods. Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with uninterrupted, duty-free rest periods when they worked more than four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof. Further, Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not provided with a second uninterrupted, duty-free rest period when they worked more than six (6) hours in a day, or a third uninterrupted, duty-free rest period after working more than ten (10) hours in day. In the rare event that a rest period was taken, it was frequently interrupted or cut short. Mr. Nunez was consistently experiencing interrupted rest breaks due to work demands. Additionally, Mr. Nunez experienced missed and cut short rest breaks to perform and respond to work-related tasks and communications. Moreover, Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not completely relieved of duty as required by *Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.*, 2 Cal.5th 257 (2016).

Employer's policies, practices, and procedures were responsible for the violations alleged above and prevented Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely and complete rest periods because, amongst other reasons: (1) Employer did not have legally-compliant policies regarding the provision and timing of rest periods or systematically disregarded its own purported rest period policies; (2) Employer's management at various levels, affecting all hourly-non-exempt employees, failed and refused to implement and enforce legally compliant rest period policies and practices; (3) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees regarding their right to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (4) Employer failed to adequately inform and train Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees about their right to premium wages for non-compliant rest periods; (5) Employer failed to ensure that there was adequate staffing to allow Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees to take timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods; (6) Employer required Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees to remain on-call and respond to work-related requests at all times, including during rest periods, which included responding to in-person verbal interruptions; and (7) Employer's policy and culture prevented Mr. Nunez and other Aggrieved Employees from taking timely, uninterrupted, and duty-free rest periods because of the priority placed on completing job requirements over employees right to receive rest periods.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees did not receive an extra hour of wages at their regular rate of pay for the rest periods which were not provided to them in compliance with California law.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7 and California Labor Code sections 226.7, and 1198.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7; California Labor Code sections 558 and 1199 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

4. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DURING EMPLOYMENT



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 5 of 7

As to each pay period, Employer has failed to timely pay all wages earned because Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all the wages they were owed including, *inter alia*, overtime compensation, straight time wages, minimum wages, and meal and rest period premiums. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 204(a).

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210 and 1199; and attorneys' fees and costs.

5. FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS

As a result of the practices described above, the wage statements provided to Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees failed to include the actual hours worked, the actual gross wages earned, and the correct rates of pay. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code section 226(a).

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.3; and attorneys' fees and costs.

6. FAILURE TO MAINTAIN ACCURATE RECORDS

Employer has failed to maintain accurate records relating to Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, and total hours worked per payroll period. Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7 and California Labor Code sections 1198.5 and 1174(d).

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7; California Labor Code section 1174.5 penalties; and attorneys' fees and costs.

7. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENDITURES

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employees for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7 requires employers to provide employees with the tools or equipment necessary for the performance of their job. During the relevant time period, Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Employer. These costs include, but are not limited to, required work boots compliant to safety regulations and personal cell phone expenses. Mr. Nunez was required to monitor his personal cell phone for work-related communications.

Accordingly, Employer violated IWC Order No. 1 and 7 and California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802.



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 6 of 7

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to paragraph (20)(A) of IWC Wage Order No. 1 and 7; and attorneys' fees and costs.

8. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY ALL WAGES UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Upon the termination of employment, Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees were not paid all wages due to them within twenty-four (24) hours or even within seventy-two (72) hours for those who resigned. Specifically, as a result of Employer's practices of requiring Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees to work off-the-clock without compensation, failing to pay proper overtime compensation, failure to properly calculate regular rates, and failure to accurately record all hours actually worked, Employer failed to pay Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for all straight time wage, minimum wages and overtime compensation owed to them upon termination of their employment. Employer also failed to pay Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees for meal period premiums, and rest period premiums they were owed, amongst other wages. Accordingly, Employer violated California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

Mr. Nunez and Aggrieved Employees will therefore seek PAGA default penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2699; penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 203, 1199, and 2699(f)(2); and attorneys' fees and costs.

Therefore, on behalf of the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, Mr. Nunez may seek all applicable penalties related to these violations of the California Labor Code pursuant to PAGA. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

Jeffrey Jimenez

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (9414 7111 0549 5896 9490 06)

Frito-Lay, Inc.
Attn.: Agent for Service of Process, C T Corporation System
330 N Brand Blvd, Suite 700
Glendale, CA 91203



149 Sheldon Street
El Segundo, CA 90245
Fax. 866.264.7880

www.protectionlawgroup.com

Jeffrey Jimenez, Esq.
jeffrey@protectionlawgroup.com
424.290.3095

July 23, 2025
Page 7 of 7

Notice provided to Employer via Certified Mail (9414 7111 0549 5896 9434 55)

Frito-Lay, Inc.
7701 Legacy Drive
Plano, TX 75024-4099