



January 18, 2022

Submitted Via Online Filing to the LWDA

California LWDA
Attn: PAGA Administrator
455 Golden Gate Ave., 9th Fl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

Sent Via U.S. Mail and Certified Mail

Envision Foods, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

JIB Holdings I, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

Desert Jack, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

TNH Partners, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

Allied Restaurant Management, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

ENV Management, LLC
15401 Anacapa Road
Victorville, CA 92392

**Re: PAGA Civil Penalty Claim
*Anthony Baglietto v. Envision Foods, LLC, et al.***

To the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, Envision Foods, LLC, JIB Holdings I, LLC, Desert Jack, LLC, TNH Partners, LLC, Allied Restaurant Management, LLC, and ENV Management, LLC:

Pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*, this letter shall serve as notification of the PAGA civil penalty claim of aggrieved employee Anthony Baglietto (“Claimant”), on behalf of the State of California and all Aggrieved Employees, against his former employer(s), Envision Foods, LLC, JIB Holdings I, LLC, Desert Jack, LLC, TNH Partners, LLC, Allied Restaurant Management, LLC, and ENV Management, LLC, as well as its owners (the “Owners”) (collectively, the “Company”), for violations of Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199 among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted, and/or sections of the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order(s).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Claimant was employed by the Company from through July 2021. Claimant alleges that, at all relevant times, he and all other non-exempt employees employed by the Company in California (the “Aggrieved Employees”) were subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations that Claimant was subjected during his employment.

For instance, at all relevant times, Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and overtime wages due to the Company’s failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked. For example, the Company required Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees to undergo mandatory temperature checks and screenings prior to clocking in for payroll purposes. And the Company also were frequently required Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees to perform routine and recurring tasks at the beginning of the shift (before being allowed to clock in) and at the end of the shift (after being allowed to clock out) (e.g., duties connected to opening and closing the business). However, because the above-described time was spent under the Company’s control but not clocked in, it was uncompensated in violation of California law and led to minimum and overtime wage violations. See *Troester v. Starbucks Corporation* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 829 (California law “do[es] not allow employers to require employees to routinely work for minutes off the clock without compensation”); See also *Frlekin v. Apple Inc.* (2020) 8 Cal.5th 1038 (tasks are compensable when employee is under company’s control and where the tasks served the employer’s interests).

Also, at all relevant times, Claimant was compensated on an hourly basis plus additional compensation in the form of nondiscretionary bonuses. However, on the occasions when Claimant worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 hours per day and/or 40 hours per week and received additional earned compensation during the workweek, the Company failed to properly include these amounts in the calculations for Claimant’s regular rate of pay. Therefore, the Company failed to pay proper overtime wages for the hours worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week.

Claimant was also not provided 30-minute off-duty meal periods, as mandated by California law, during employment with the Company. As a result of the Company’s policies and practices, as well as the hectic and demanding workload, Claimant was subjected to meal period violations when he was: (1) unable to take a meal period due to workload, (2) forced to take an on-duty meal period while under the control of the Company, (3) forced to take a shortened meal period, (4) forced to take a meal period after the 5th hour of work, and (5) not provided a mandated second meal period for shifts in excess of 10 hours.

The Company also failed to provide Claimant with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. The Company did not schedule Claimant’s rest breaks, Claimant was unable to leave the premises for breaks, and Claimant was often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to the lack of adequate staffing and coverage and being overwhelmed by the hectic workload. Furthermore, on occasions when Claimant worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, the Company failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest break.

The Company also failed to comply with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 204 and 210 regarding the timing of the payment of wages to its employees each period, including minimum and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums. Also, the Company failed to comply with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 201–203 regarding timing of payment of final wages and failed to pay all wages due and owing upon separation of employment including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, and all required meal and



rest break premiums under Labor Code § 226.7. Finally, during his employment with the Company, Claimant received inaccurate and incomplete wage statements that failed to accurately state all necessary items required under Labor Code § 226(a).

Claimant alleges that he worked under the joint direction and control of all entities listed herein and is informed and believes that each of them acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the others, carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of each are legally attributable to the others. On information and belief, a unity of interest and ownership between each exists such that all entities listed herein acted as a single employer of Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees. Furthermore, on information and belief, all entities listed herein are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single employer because all entities listed herein share an interrelation of operations, with common human resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Upon information and belief, all entities listed herein share common management, a centralized control of labor operations, and common ownership or financial control.

Furthermore, Claimant alleges that the Owners are now and at all relevant times were the owners of all entities listed herein and were Claimant's and the Aggrieved Employees' actual employer or, in the alternative, were individuals employed by the Company as managerial and/or supervisory employees and/or agents. In addition, Claimant alleges that at all relevant times the Owners had the authority, in the interest of all entities listed herein to exercise independent judgment to hire, transfer, promote, discharge, assign, discipline, or take other similar actions against Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees, and were in Claimant's chain of command at the time of and direct participants in the wrongful conduct which constitutes the basis of Claimant's complaint herein. Claimant also alleges that all entities listed herein and the Owners are the agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each other, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each other. Furthermore, in conducting themselves in the manner described herein, all entities listed herein and the Owners were acting in active concert with on another such that the acts of each were fully attributable to the other in all material respects.

Claimant also alleges all entities listed herein and the Owners were merely the alter-ego of the others in that there existed a unity of interest and ownership such that any separateness between them ceased to exist and each exercised undue dominance, control, influence, and management over the others. Claimant further alleges that, at all relevant times, all entities listed herein have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, has failed to follow appropriate corporate formalities, and has simply been a shell and instrumentality through which the Owners have conducted their personal affairs. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of all entities listed herein would permit abuse of the corporate privilege, thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice. Accordingly, the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to the entities listed herein should be imposed jointly and severally against the Owners.

Finally, in an additional separate, but not necessarily mutually exclusive, alternative theory of liability, the Owners are liable for PAGA civil penalties under Labor Code § 558 as "other person(s)" who caused the violations regarding minimum wage among other claims. *See Atempa v. Pedrazzani* (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 809, 820 ("if there is evidence and a finding that a party other than the employer 'violates, or causes to be violated' the overtime laws (§ 558(a)) or 'pays or causes to be paid to any employee' less than minimum wage (§ 1197.1(a)), then that party is liable for certain civil penalties regardless of the identity or business structure of the employer"); *Moua v. IBM* (N.D. Cal. 2019) 2019 U.S.Dist.LEXIS 40851 (same)

As a result of these violations, and others described below, Claimant alleges that he and other Aggrieved Employees were denied specific rights to which they are/were entitled under California law and the rules promulgated by the IWC Wage Orders, including the following:

**PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO
PAY ALL MINIMUM, REGULAR, AND OVERTIME WAGES**

(Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 221-223, 510, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198; IWC Wage Order §§ 3, 4(B))

As discussed above, the Company failed to pay all required minimum, regular, and overtime wages to Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees due to the Company's failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked, the failure to compensate for time spent in mandated temperature checks and pre/post shift duties, and the failure to pay overtime and/or properly calculate the regular rate of pay for Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees. This resulted in earned, but unpaid, wages due and owing to Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees. Therefore, Claimants and the Aggrieved Employees performed work for the Company without receiving proper payment of the requisite minimum, overtime, and/or doubletime wages.

Accordingly, Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1194.2, 1197.1, and 2699, among possibly others, impose various penalties upon the Company for each employee and each pay period in which it failed to pay all wages including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages in violation of the Labor Code and/or the IWC Wage Orders.

**PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR DENIAL OF MEAL PERIODS,
REST BREAKS, AND WAGE PREMIUMS**

(Labor Code §§ 226.7(b) & (c), 512, 558; Cal. Admin. Code, Title 8, § 11090)

Labor Code § 226.7(b) states that “[a]n employer shall not require an employee to work during a meal or rest or recovery period mandated pursuant to an applicable statute, or applicable regulation, standard, or order of the Industrial Welfare Commission ...” Labor Code § 512(a) states in pertinent part: “[A]n employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 5 hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes [...] [a]n employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.”

Section 12 of applicable IWC Wage Order states in pertinent part: “Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof.”

Here, Claimant and other Aggrieved Employees were regularly not provided compliant mandatory meal periods and paid rest breaks due to the Company's policies described above. Although the Company was required to pay Claimant and all Aggrieved Employees premium wages equal to an additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each violation under Labor Code § 226.7(c), the Company did not pay the mandatory one-hour wage premiums and did not do so at the proper rate. Labor Code § 558 imposes a penalty for each violation, plus an amount sufficient to recover the underpaid wages. Additionally, the civil assessment set forth in Labor Code § 2699 applies to these violations.

///



**PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE AND OWING
EACH PAYROLL PERIOD WITHIN THE TIME REQUIRED BY LAW**

(Labor Code §§ 204, 204.1, 208, 210, 256 and 2699)

Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of the following month. Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

As a result of the Company’s failure to pay Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees all compensation to which they were entitled, the Company had a pattern and practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Claimant and the Aggrieved Employees within the time mandated by Labor Code § 204. As a result of these violations, penalties may be assessed pursuant to Labor Code §§ 203, 210, 256, and/or 2699.

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 256 and 2699)

Labor Code § 201(a) provides in pertinent part: “If an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.” Labor Code § 202(a) states in pertinent part “If an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours’ previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.” Labor Code § 203(a) states “If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days.”

The Company did not pay the Aggrieved Employees all wages that were due and owing within the required time following the end of their employment in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201-202. As a result, all such Aggrieved Employees are entitled to 30 days of wages as a “waiting time penalty.” (Labor Code § 203.) Labor Code § 2699 also imposes a penalty.

**PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE,
ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

(Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3, and 1174)

Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee’s name and the last four digits of his or her Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.



At all times pertinent hereto, the Company failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements to Claimants and all Aggrieved Employees due to violations including: failure to accurately state total hours worked (for example, the wage statements failed to accurately reflect the compensable hours spent in temperature checks, along with pre/post shift duties); failure to accurately state gross wages earned; failure to accurately state all deductions; failure to accurately state net wages earned; failure to state the applicable hourly rates (including the accurate overtime rate of pay); failure to state the inclusive dates of the pay period; and failure to accurately state the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. Accordingly, Labor Code §§ 226.3 and 2699 impose civil penalties for these violations.

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE § 1199

(Labor Code § 1199)

An employer violates Labor Code § 1199 if said employer: (a) requires or causes an employee to work for longer hours than those fixed, or under conditions of labor prohibited by an order of the commission; (b) pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of the commission; or, (c) violates or refuses or neglects to comply with any provision of this chapter or any order or ruling of the commission. Labor Code § 2699.5 specifically enumerates Labor Code § 1199 as a section to which the civil penalties under the PAGA apply. Therefore, the Company is subject to the civil penalties in accordance with Labor Code § 2699.

ATTORNEYS' FEES, INTEREST, AND PENALTIES

(Labor Code §§ 2699(f)(2), 2699(g)(1), 2699.5)

Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), give employees the right to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of wages, including interest thereon, penalties and other damages, as applicable, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit. Additionally, Claimants seek the assessment of penalties, including civil penalties, under Labor Code §§ 203, 210, 225.5, 226.3, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2699, and/or § 20 of the IWC Wage Orders, among possibly other provisions inadvertently omitted herein. Furthermore, Claimants is entitled to bring a wage/hour claim on behalf of all current and former similarly situated employees of the Company. Thus, the Company is exposed to these same penalties for violations involving all Aggrieved Employees. Additionally, Claimant seeks attorney's fees pursuant to C.C.P. § 1021.5. Please construe this correspondence as Claimants' notification of alleged wrongdoing and attempted resolution in accordance with C.C.P. § 1021.5 and *Graham v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 553.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Company may be liable for civil penalties related to the foregoing claims and remedies. If Claimant becomes aware of any additional claims for Labor Code violations related to his employment and/or other employees of the Company, he reserves the right to add new claims by supplementing this notice letter. Should you have any questions, please feel free to give me a call.

Very Truly Yours,



By: Peter J. Carlson, Esq.

E-mail: peter@lmlfirm.com
www.LMLfirm.com

IMI

4590 Allstate Drive, Riverside, CA 92501
Toll Free 888.959.8508