

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Aylin Rodriguez v. Tyson Foods, Inc.

Rodriguez · No. 4:25-CV-5156-TOR · Decided March 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington considers Tyson Foods, Inc.’s motions for judgment on the pleadings and to dismiss claims arising from alleged Washington wage-and-hour violations. The court denies the motion for judgment on the pleadings as moot, grants in part and denies in part the motion to dismiss, dismissing the rest-break claim with leave to amend and the unlawful-deductions claim with prejudice while allowing several other claims to proceed. Plaintiff is granted twenty days to file a second amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	March 17, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-CV-5156-TOR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought Washington wage-and-hour claims in state court. Defendant removed the action to federal court and moved for judgment on the pleadings and dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). After Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint, the court denied the judgment-on-the-pleadings motion as moot and partially granted and partially denied the motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court tests the legal sufficiency of the complaint and accepts material factual allegations as true, construing them in the plaintiff’s favor. The complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a facially plausible claim for relief; conclusory allegations and unwarranted inferences are insufficient.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Aylin Rodriguez

TOPICS

wage and hour

motions to dismiss

motion for judgment on the pleadings

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

wage and hour

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the first amended complaint adequately pleaded a Washington rest-break claim.
2. Whether the first amended complaint adequately pleaded a Washington meal-break claim.
3. Whether the alleged interrupted and automatically deducted meal breaks plausibly supported a claim for wages less than those required under Washington law.
4. Whether the first amended complaint adequately pleaded an overtime-wage claim without identifying a particular workweek in which unpaid time caused the plaintiff to exceed forty hours.
5. Whether requiring employees to purchase work-related gloves and boots stated a claim for unlawful deductions or rebates under Washington law.
6. Whether the claims for failure to pay all wages due at termination and willful refusal to pay wages were subject to dismissal as derivative claims.
7. Whether Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings became moot after Plaintiff filed the first amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for judgment on the pleadings was moot because the first amended complaint superseded the original complaint.
2. The rest-break claim was insufficiently pleaded and was dismissed with leave to amend.
3. The meal-break claim was sufficiently pleaded and survived the motion to dismiss.
4. The claim for payment of wages less than entitled was sufficiently pleaded and survived dismissal.
5. The overtime-wage claim was sufficiently pleaded and survived the motion to dismiss even though Plaintiff did not identify a particular calendar week.
6. The alleged requirement that employees purchase work-related gloves and boots did not state a cognizable claim for unlawful withholding or diversion of wages under Washington law, and the claim was dismissed with prejudice.
7. The challenge to the claims for failure to pay all wages due at termination and willful refusal to pay wages failed because those claims were adequately supported by the surviving overtime, minimum-wage, and meal-break allegations.
8. Plaintiff was granted leave to amend the rest-break claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As the FAC supersedes the original complaint, Defendant’s pending Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is now moot and is denied as such.” (at 1)

“Plaintiff has failed to sufficiently plead a rest break claim.” (at 7)

“The Court disagrees and concludes Plaintiff has sufficiently pled her meal break violation claim.” (at 10)

“Plaintiff has sufficiently pled her overtime wages claim.” (at 15)

“Plaintiff does not demonstrate that Defendant “withheld or diverted” wages within the meaning of RCW 49.48.010(3)” (at 19)

“As Plaintiff has adequately pled her overtime, minimum wage, and meal break claims, Defendant’s challenge to the claims as derivative thereof fails.” (at 21)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rodriguez worked for Tyson Foods at its meat-processing and packing plant in Wallula, Washington, from February 2016 through January 2023 as a packer, meat handler, and machine operator. She alleged that Tyson denied or interrupted meal and rest breaks, required off-the-clock work, failed to pay minimum and overtime wages, made automatic meal-break deductions, required employees to incur certain work-related expenses, mishandled paid sick leave, failed to pay all wages due at termination, and failed to maintain accurate payroll and personnel records. The court relied on allegations that work-related interruptions occurred during meal breaks approximately three times per month and that Tyson automatically deducted meal periods regardless of interruptions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rodriguez filed the original complaint in Spokane County Superior Court on July 28, 2025. Tyson Foods removed the action on November 14, 2025, and filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Rodriguez then filed a first amended complaint, which superseded the original complaint and rendered the pending judgment-on-the-pleadings motion moot. The district court dismissed the rest-break claim with leave to amend and the unlawful-deductions claim with prejudice, while allowing the meal-break, minimum-wage, overtime, termination-wage, and willful-refusal claims to proceed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schwarz v. United States, 234 F.3d 428, 436 (9th Cir.)
- Navarro v. Block, 250 F.3d 729, 732 (9th Cir.)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc., 540 F.3d 1049, 1061 (9th Cir. 2008)

- Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd., 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007)
- In re Stac Elecs. Sec. Litig., 89 F.3d 1399, 1403 (9th Cir.)
- Landers v. Quality Commc'ns, Inc., 771 F.3d 638, 644-46 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Haralson v. United Airlines, Inc., 224 F. Supp. 3d 928, 942 (N.D. Cal. 2016)
- Tan v. GrubHub, Inc., 171 F. Supp. 3d 998, 1008 (N.D. Cal. 2016)
- Boon v. Canon Bus. Solutions, Inc., 592 F. App'x 631, 632 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Rittman v. Amazon.com, Inc., No. C16-01554-JCC, 2017 WL 881384, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 6, 2017)
- Valdovinos v. Delta Air Lines Inc., No. C25-2026-SKV, 2025 WL 3623739, at *4 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 15, 2025)
- Sanders v. Western Express, Inc., No. 1:20-CV-03137-SAB, 2021 WL 2772801, at *6 (E.D. Wash. Feb. 11, 2021)
- Flores v. United Parcel Serv., Inc., No. 8:25-CV-01534-FWS-ADS, 2026 WL 41359, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2026)
- Johnson v. Q.E.D. Env't Sys. Inc., No. 16-CV-01454-WHO, 2016 WL 4658963, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2016)
- Alvarez v. IBP, Inc., 339 F.3d 894, 913-14 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Arnold v. Marriott Int'l, No. 3:24-CV-00221-RAJ, 2025 WL 1919260, at *6 (W.D. Wash. July 11, 2025)
- Parker v. Walgreen Pharmacy Servs. Midwest, LLC, No. 3:25-CV-05624-BHS, 2025 WL 3214395, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 18, 2025)
- LaCoursiere v. Camwest Dev., Inc., 181 Wash. 2d 734, 741 (2014)
- Schilling v. Radio Holdings, Inc., 136 Wash. 2d 152, 159 (1998)
- State v. Carter, 18 Wash. 2d 590, 621 (1943)
- Eminence Capital, L.L.C. v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003)