



September 16, 2025

The Honorable Governor Gavin Newsom
Governor, State of California
1021 O Street, Suite 9000
Sacramento, CA 95814

**SUBJECT: SB 642 (LIMÓN) EMPLOYMENT: PAYMENT OF WAGES
REQUEST FOR VETO**

The California Chamber of Commerce and organizations listed below are respectfully **REQUEST your VETO of SB 642 (Limón)**. Our outstanding concern with **SB 642** is proposed subdivision (i)(2) in Section 1197.5. That language allows recovery under the Equal Pay Act to reach back as far as six years, which is *double* the present statute of limitations. One of the reasons statute of limitations exist is to ensure memories and evidence are fresh.¹ For example, last year your administration vetoed a bill that would have created a seven-year statute of limitations period for certain claims under the Fair Employment and Housing Act.² While **SB 642** is only concerned with the look-back period of recovery (as opposed for the amount of time a plaintiff has to file a case once a cause of action occurs), the rationale is the same here as SB 1022. A six-year look back period means the parties must litigate the events of the last six years, including the nature of the plaintiff's job duties and performance as compared to work of every single one of their colleagues. The risk for the fading of memories or lack of evidence here is very high. Enacting a six-year period here sets a troubling precedent for purposes of statutes of limitations and remedies issues.

For these reasons, we respectfully **REQUEST your VETO of SB 642 (Limón)**.

Sincerely,

Ashley Hoffman
Senior Policy Advocate
California Chamber of Commerce

California Association of Winegrape Growers, Michael Müller
California Farm Bureau, Bryan Little
California Retailers Association, Sarah Pollo
Civil Justice Association of California, Kyla Christoffersen Powell
Housing Contractors of California, Bruce Wick
National Federation of Independent Business, Tim Taylor
Public Risk Innovation Solutions and Management (PRISM), Michael Pott

AH/ ks

¹ See *Duty v. Abex Corp.*, 214 Cal. App. 3d 742, 748–49 (Ct. App. 1989), *reh'g denied and opinion modified* (Nov. 1, 1989).

² SB 1022 (Skinner) (2024)