

1 **To:** All Starbucks Corporation (“Starbucks”) employees, who worked, or will work as Baristas in
2 California at any time from October 8, 2000 through the date of trial in this action.

3 **This Notice May Affect Your Rights. Please Read It Carefully.**

4 This notice pertains to a class action lawsuit currently pending against Starbucks Corporation in
5 the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego, entitled *Chou v. Starbucks Corporation* (Case
6 No. GIC 836925). You may be a member of the Class for whom money and other relief is being
7 sought. You need not take any action if you wish to be included in this class action. **However, if you
do not wish to be included, you must take further action (as described below) or your rights will
be affected.**

8 **I. DESCRIPTION OF LAWSUIT**

9 On October 8, 2004, former Starbucks Barista, Jou Chou (“Plaintiff”) filed this case against
10 Starbucks Corporation (“Starbucks”), in the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego.
11 Plaintiff claims that Starbucks violated the California Labor Code § 351, and the California Unfair
12 Competition Law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*) by permitting **Shift Supervisors** to receive a
13 portion of the tips left by the customers in store tip receptacles. **If plaintiff wins this class action
lawsuit, Shift Supervisors may no longer receive a portion of the tips left in store tip pool
receptacles and Starbucks may be ordered to modify its tip policy to be in compliance with
California law.**

14 California Labor Code Section 351 states:

15 No employer or agent shall collect, take, or receive any gratuity or a part thereof that is
16 paid, given to, or left for an employee by a patron, or deduct any amount from wages
17 due an employee on account of a gratuity, or require an employee to credit the amount,
18 or any part thereof, of a gratuity against and as a part of the wages due the employee
from the employer. Every gratuity is hereby declared to be the sole property of the
employee or employees to whom it was paid, given, or left for.

19 Starbucks denies each of Plaintiff’s claims. Starbucks maintains that it does comply with
20 relevant California law. Starbucks further denies that Plaintiff and/or the Class are entitled to any relief
and will defend against any liability.

21 **II. CLASS CERTIFICATION**

22 On April 19, 2006, the Court granted Plaintiff’s Motion For Class Certification and appointed
23 Plaintiff as Class Representative for the certified Class. The certified Class includes all current and
24 former Starbucks Baristas employed by Starbucks in California, at any time from October 8, 2000
25 through the date of trial. If you fall within this definition, you are a member of the Class even though
26 you may also have worked as a **Shift Supervisor**. The decision to certify the Class should not be
27 viewed as a prediction of whether the Class will, or will not, ultimately prevail on the merits of the
28 action. Starbucks intends to bring a motion to decertify the Class.

1 **VI. VIEWING COURT FILE RECORDS**

2 You may view the Court files in this case by going to the San Diego Superior Court Hall of
3 Justice, Civil Business Office, Room 225, 2nd Floor, 330 W. Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101. **DO**
4 **NOT telephone, email, or contact in any manner the Court or any Court personnel with questions**
5 **concerning this case.**

6 Dated: February 13, 2007

HON. PATRICIA Y. COWETT
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28