

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Francisco Martinez v. The Toro Company

Martinez · No. 25-cv-08212-VC · Decided December 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California granted The Toro Company’s motion to dismiss Francisco Martinez’s employment-related wage and labor claims, with leave to amend. The court found that the complaint inadequately pleaded overtime, meal and rest period, derivative wage, expense reimbursement, and employment-records claims, and set deadlines for an amended complaint and the defendant’s response.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Vince Chhabria
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 22, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-08212-VC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state adequately pleaded claims. The motion was granted, and the plaintiff was granted leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The opinion applies the federal pleading standard governing a motion to dismiss, requiring factual allegations sufficient to connect the alleged employer policy to the plaintiff's work schedule and claimed violations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Francisco Martinez v. The Toro Company

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- wage and hour
- civil procedure
- affirmative defenses

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint adequately pleaded overtime and meal-and-rest-period claims by connecting the alleged employer policy to Martinez's work schedule.
2. Whether derivative claims for waiting-time penalties, wage-statement violations, and violations of the Unfair Competition Law were adequately pleaded when the underlying wage claims were deficient.
3. Whether the reimbursement claim adequately identified employment-related expenses that The Toro Company allegedly failed to reimburse.
4. Whether the records-request claim adequately alleged how The Toro Company failed to comply with Martinez's request.
5. Whether the records-request claim should be dismissed on statute-of-limitations grounds at the pleading stage.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint need not allege specific dates or identify a precise occasion on which the plaintiff worked overtime, but it must at least connect the employer's alleged policy to the employee's schedule and explain how the policy resulted in the alleged violations. Martinez's complaint did not meet that threshold.
2. Claims for waiting-time penalties, wage-statement violations, and the Unfair Competition Law failed because the underlying wage claims were inadequately pleaded.
3. A reimbursement claim is inadequately pleaded when the complaint does not identify the employment-related expenses incurred or explain how the employer failed to reimburse them. Martinez's reimbursement claim was inadequately pleaded.
4. A records-request claim must allege how the employer failed to comply with the request, including whether the employer ignored or formally denied it. Martinez's allegations did not satisfy that requirement.
5. The records-request claim should not be dismissed on statute-of-limitations grounds because the statute of limitations is an affirmative defense that a plaintiff need not plead around in the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Although Martinez does not have to allege specific dates or identify a precise occasion on which he worked overtime, at a minimum, his complaint must “connect the dots between the employer’s alleged policy and the employee’s schedule.””

“Although it would not be appropriate to dismiss this claim on statute of limitations grounds as the company urges (because the statute of limitations provides an affirmative defense that a plaintiff need not plead around in the complaint)”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides few underlying facts and assumes familiarity with the parties' allegations. Martinez alleged that The Toro Company maintained policies that resulted in uncompensated overtime and missed meal and rest periods, failed to pay derivative wage-related penalties, failed to reimburse employment-related expenses, and failed to comply with a records request. The court found that the complaint did not adequately identify Martinez's role, work schedule, the connection between company policies and the alleged wage violations, the expenses incurred, or the handling of the records request.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Francisco Martinez filed claims against The Toro Company concerning allegedly unpaid overtime, missed meal and rest periods, derivative wage penalties and wage-statement violations, reimbursement, and employment-records requests. The Toro Company moved to dismiss. The district court granted the motion with leave to amend and ordered an amended complaint within 21 days, followed by a response within 14 days.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Martinez may file an amended complaint within 21 days of the order; The Toro Company's response is due 14 days thereafter.

CASES CITED

- Stewart-Alexander v. Saks & Company, 2021 WL 3201380, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2021)
- Landers v. Quality Communications Inc., 771 F.3d 638, 646 (9th Cir. 2014), as amended (Jan. 26, 2015)
- Lopez v. Wendy's International, Inc., 2011 WL 6967932, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2011)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
FRANCISCO MARTINEZ, Case No. 25-cv-08212-VC Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO v. DISMISS THE TORO COMPANY, Re: Dkt. No. 10 Defendant. The motion to dismiss is granted with leave to amend. This ruling assumes that the reader is familiar with the facts, the applicable legal standards, and the arguments made by the parties.

Although Martinez does not have to allege specific dates or identify a precise occasion on which he worked overtime, at a minimum, his complaint must “connect the dots between the employer’s alleged policy and the employee’s schedule.” See Stewart-Alexander v. Saks & Company, 2021 WL 3201380, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2021); see also Landers v. Quality Communications Inc., 771 F.3d 638, 646 (9th Cir.

2014), as amended (Jan. 26, 2015). From Martinez’s complaint, it is difficult to make out what Martinez’s role at the Toro Company was, let alone what his schedule was or how the company’s

policies resulted in him working overtime without compensation and missing meal and rest periods. Martinez's derivative claims for waiting time penalties, wage statement violations, and the UCL claim similarly fail because the underlying wage claims are deficient.

Martinez's claim for reimbursement is also not adequately pled because he does not state what employment-related expenses he incurred that The Toro Company allegedly failed to reimburse. Finally, Martinez's records request claim is not adequately pled.

Although it would not be appropriate to dismiss this claim on statute of limitations grounds as the company urges (because the statute of limitations provides an affirmative defense that a plaintiff need not plead around in the complaint), the claim does not describe how The Toro Company failed to comply with Martinez's request and whether it ignored or formally denied that request.

See *Lopez v. Wendy's International, Inc.*, 2011 WL 6967932, at *11 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2011) (dismissing records request claim because allegations "merely mirror[ed] the language of the statute" and was not "supported by factual allegations"). Dismissal is with leave to amend. Any amended complaint is due within 21 days of this order, and a response from The Toro Company is due 14 days thereafter.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 22, 2025 = VINCE CHHABRIA. United States District Judge