

JAMES *JH* HAWKINS
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

9880 RESEARCH DRIVE, SUITE 200, IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92618
TELEPHONE (949) 387-7200; FACSIMILE (949) 387-6676

January 17, 2023

Via Online Filing (LWDA)

California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
Attn: PAGA Administrator
1515 Clay Street, Ste 801
Oakland, CA 94612
<http://www.dir.ca.gov/Private-Attorneys-General-Act>

Via Certified Mail (Employers)

AYA Healthcare Services, Inc.
5930 Cornerstone Court West, Suite 300,
San Diego, CA 92121
Receipt No. 7021 1970 0000 9061 2014

Agent for Service of Process for
AYA Healthcare Services, Inc.
CSC – Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Dr. Ste 150N
Sacramento, CA 95833
Receipt No.: 7021 1970 0000 9061 2038

Santa Clara Valley Medical Center
751 S. Bascom Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128
Receipt No. 7021 1970 0000 9061 2021

Agent for Service of Process for
Santa Clara Valley Medical Center
Adella Garland
751 S. Bascom Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128
Receipt No.: 7021 1970 0000 9061 2045

RE: NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

To Whom It May Concern:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff ROBIN LEIGH MCEL RATH, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, gives NOTICE of her intent to commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code Section 2698, *et seq.* against her former employers, Defendants AYA HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC., a Delaware Corporation; SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER, a California non-profit Corporation, and DOES 1-50 (collectively “Aya Healthcare” or “Defendants”). Plaintiff hereby gives written notice electronically to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and by certified mail to Defendants via their agent(s) for service of process.

January 17, 2023

Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as an hourly, non-exempt employee. Plaintiff continued such employment through January 2022. During the relevant time, she performed functions as a Travel Nurse.

The group of aggrieved employees that Plaintiff seeks to represent is a group of non-exempt employees working directly or indirectly for Defendants in the State of California during the relevant time period (“Aggrieved Employees”). This notice is timely as it is provided within one year of the violations. Each of the violations set forth below and in the attached complaint is asserted on behalf of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Plaintiff has attached her Complaint, and incorporates the allegations in the Complaint as though fully set forth herewith, setting out the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Plaintiff alleges have been violated, including the facts and relevant theories alleged against Defendant in the Complaint.

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Plaintiff has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees working for Defendant at their locations in the State regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

Plaintiff claims that Defendant implemented legally non-compliant policies and practices which led to Defendant’ 1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages; 2) Failure to Pay Overtime Owed; 3) Failure to Provide Lawful Meal Periods; 4) Failure To Authorize And Permit Rest Periods; 5) Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment; 6) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Owed Upon Separation From Employment; 7) Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenses; 8) Knowing and Intentional Failure to Comply with Itemized Wage Statement Provisions; 9) Violation of the Unfair Competition Law;.

Plaintiff also contends that Defendants failed to keep accurate records as required by Wage Order 5-2001, Labor Code 1174, and 1198. IWC Wage Order 4-2001 and 5-2001 requires in pertinent part: every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following: (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals, and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded...(5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay...” Labor Code section 1174 also requires Defendants to maintain and preserve, in a centralized location, among other items, records showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, its employees. On information and belief and based thereon, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code section 1174, including by implementing the policies and procedures and committing the violations alleged in the complaint, including without limitation failing to keep records of meal periods and all wages earned at the proper rates. Defendants’ failure to comply with Labor Code section 1174 is unlawful pursuant to Labor Code section 1175.

NOTICE PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE SECTIONS 2698 *et seq.*

January 17, 2023

All Labor Code provisions in the Complaint alleged to have been violated pertain to all entities and individuals named in the Complaint, even if not expressly specified.

Please advise by certified mail within sixty-five (65) days of the post mark on this letter if the LWDA intends to investigate these claims. Thank you, and please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Very Truly Yours,

/s/ James R. Hawkins

James R. Hawkins, Esq.

Enclosed: Complaint

James R. Hawkins (SBN 192925)
Christina M. Lucio (SBN 253677)
JAMES HAWKINS APLC
9880 Research Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 387-7200
Facsimile: (949) 387-6676
James@Jameshawkinsaplc.com
Christina@Jameshawkinsaplc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff ROBIN LEIGH MCELRATH,
on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

ROBIN LEIGH MCELRATH,
individually and on behalf of herself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AYA HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC.,
a Delaware Corporation; SANTA CLARA
VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER, a
California non-profit Corporation; and
DOES 1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

COMPLAINT

Assigned for All Purposes To:

Hon.

Dept.:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:

- 1) **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;**
- 2) **Failure to Pay Overtime Owed;**
- 3) **Failure to Provide Lawful Meal Periods;**
- 4) **Failure To Authorize And Permit Rest Periods;**
- 5) **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**
- 6) **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Owed Upon Separation From Employment;**
- 7) **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenses;**
- 8) **Knowing and Intentional Failure to Comply with Itemized Wage Statement Provisions;**
- 9) **Violation of the Unfair Competition Law;**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff ROBIN LEIGH MCELRATH (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, and asserts claims against defendants AYA HEALTHCARE, INC., a Delaware Corporation; SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER., a Delaware Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants” or “Aya Healthcare”) as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a Class Action, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, on behalf of Plaintiff and any and all persons who are or were employed by Defendants, either directly or indirectly, in the State of California at any time from four years prior to the filing of this Complaint through resolution or trial of the matter. (“Class Members” or “Non-Exempt Employees”).

2. Defendants implemented uniform policies and practices that deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of earned wages, including minimum wages; straight time wages; overtime wages; premium wages; lawful meal and/or rest breaks; and timely payment of wages.

3. Such actions and policies, as described above and further herein, were and continue to be in violation of the California Labor Code. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all Class Members, bring this action pursuant to the California Labor Code, including sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 218.6, 221-224, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 245-249, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1195, 1197, 1198, applicable IWC California Wage Orders (including IWC Wage Order 4-2001 and 5-2001) and California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et seq.*, seeking unpaid wages, unpaid meal and rest period compensation, penalties, liquidated damages, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

4. Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and others similarly situated, pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17200-17208, also seek restitution from Defendants for their failure to pay to Plaintiff and Class Members all of their wages, including overtime and premium wages.

1 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2 5. This action is brought as a Class Action on behalf of Plaintiff and similarly situated
3 employees of Defendants pursuant to California Code of Civ. Proc. Section 382. The monetary
4 damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimum jurisdiction limits of the
5 California Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

6 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution
7 Article VI §10, which grants the California Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes except
8 those given by statute to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not give
9 jurisdiction to any other court.

10 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this Action pursuant to California Code of Civil
11 Procedure, Section 410.10 and California Business & Professions Code, Section 17203.

12 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
13 each Defendant is either a resident of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or
14 otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of
15 jurisdiction over them by the California Courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and
16 substantial justice. Defendants have done and are doing business throughout California and Santa
17 Clara County.

18 9. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the other
19 similarly situated Non-Exempt Employees within Santa Clara County and it is believed that
20 Defendants have employed hundreds of Class Members as Non-Exempt Employees in Santa Clara
21 County.

22 10. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because the
23 individual claims of the Class Members described herein are presently believed to be under the
24 seventy-five thousand dollar (\$75,000.00) jurisdictional threshold for Federal Court and the
25 aggregate potential damages and recovery by all of the claims of the Plaintiff's Class, including
26 attorneys' fees, placed in controversy by Plaintiff's class-wide claims, is presently believed to be
27 under the five million dollar (\$5,000,000.00) threshold of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005.
28 Further, there is no federal question at issue, as the issues herein are based solely on California

1 statutes and law, including the Labor Code, IWC Wage Orders, the California Code of Civil
2 Procedure, the California Civil Code, and the California Business and Professions Code.

3 11. Venue is proper in this Court because one or more of the Defendants reside, transact
4 business, or have offices in this County, Plaintiff is a resident of this County, and the acts or
5 omissions alleged herein took place in this County.

6 **PARTIES**

7 12. Defendant AYA Healthcare Services, Inc. is a Delaware Corporation doing
8 business in the state of California. It is based at 5930 Cornerstone Court West, Suite 300, San
9 Diego, CA 92121.

10 13. Defendant Santa Clara Valley Medical Center. is a California non-profit corporation
11 doing business in the state of California. It is based 751 S. Bascom Avenue, San Jose, CA 95128.

12 14. Upon information and belief, Defendants employ Non-Exempt Employees, like
13 Plaintiff, throughout the State of California.

14 15. During the liability period, Plaintiff Robin Leigh McElrath worked in the State of
15 California for Defendants.

16 16. Plaintiff was employed in an hourly, non-exempt position by Defendants during the
17 relevant time period.

18 17. Plaintiff and the members of the putative class were employed as hourly paid
19 employees employed by Defendants, either directly or indirectly, in the State of California at any
20 time from four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

21 18. Whenever in this complaint reference is made to any act, deed, or conduct of
22 Defendants, the allegation means that Defendants engaged in the act, deed, or conduct by or through
23 one or more of Defendants' officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives, who was
24 actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of the ordinary business and
25 affairs of Defendants.

26 19. The true names and capacities of Defendants, whether individual, corporate,
27 associate, or otherwise, sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are currently unknown to
28 Plaintiff, who therefore sue Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure §

1 474. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and
2 capacities of the Defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

3 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon allege, that the Doe Defendants are
4 the partners, agents, or principals and co-conspirators of Defendants and of each other; that
5 Defendants and the Doe Defendants performed the acts and conduct herein alleged directly, aided
6 and abetted the performance thereof, or knowingly acquiesced in, ratified, and accepted the benefits
7 of such acts and conduct, and therefore each of the Doe Defendants is liable to the extent of the
8 liability of the Defendants as alleged herein.

9 21. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and thereon allege, that at all times
10 material herein, each Defendant was completely dominated and controlled by its co-Defendants
11 and each was the alter ego of the other. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this complaint
12 to any conduct by Defendant or Defendants, such allegations and references shall also be deemed
13 to mean the conduct of each of the Defendants, acting individually, jointly, and severally.
14 Whenever and wherever reference is made to individuals who are not named as Defendants in this
15 complaint, but were employees and/or agents of Defendants, such individuals, at all relevant times
16 acted on behalf of Defendants named in this complaint within the scope of their respective
17 employments.

18 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 22. During the relevant time frame, Defendants compensated Plaintiff and the Non-
20 Exempt Employees based upon an hourly wage.

21 23. Plaintiff and the Class Members were, and at all times pertinent hereto, have been
22 non-exempt employees within the meaning of the California Labor Code, and the implementing
23 rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders. They are subject to the protections of
24 the IWC Wage Orders and the Labor Code.

25 24. During the relevant time, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in an hourly, non-
26 exempt position. She worked as a Travel Nurse approximately 4 days per week, 40+ hours per
27 week.

28 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants are and were

1 advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, and advisors with knowledge of the
2 requirements of California's wage and employment laws.

3 26. All Class Members are similarly situated in that they are all subject to Defendants'
4 uniform policies and systemic practices as specified herein.

5 27. Plaintiff and the Class Members were not paid for all hours worked because
6 employees were required to work off the clock including but not limited to pre-shift and post-shift
7 activities and to perform various job duties during purported meal and break periods. For instance,
8 Plaintiff was required company meetings and watch work-related webinars off the clock.

9 28. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all forms
10 of non-discretionary compensation into the regular rate, including differentials and incentives.

11 29. Plaintiff and the Class Members were regularly required to work shifts in excess of
12 five hours without being provided a lawful meal period as required by law.

13 30. Indeed, during the relevant time, as a consequence of Defendants' scheduling
14 practices, work demands, and Defendants' policies and practices, Defendants frequently failed to
15 provide Plaintiff and the Class Members timely, legally complaint uninterrupted 30-minute meal
16 periods as required by law.

17 31. Despite the above-mentioned meal period violations, Defendants failed to
18 compensate Plaintiff, and on information and belief, failed to compensate Class Members, one
19 additional hour of pay at their regular rate as required by California law when meal periods were
20 not timely or lawfully provided in a compliant manner.

21 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants know,
22 should know, knew, and/or should have known that Plaintiff and the other Class Members were
23 entitled to receive accurate premium wages under Labor Code §226.7 but were not receiving
24 accurately calculated compensation.

25 33. In addition, during the relevant time frame, Plaintiff and the Non-Exempt
26 Employees were systematically not authorized and permitted to take one net ten-minute paid, rest
27 period for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof, which is a violation of the Labor Code
28 and IWC Wage Order.

1 34. Defendants maintained and enforced scheduling practices, policies, and imposed
2 work demands that frequently required Plaintiff and Class Members to forego their lawful, paid
3 rest periods of a net ten minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Such
4 requisite rest periods were not timely authorized and permitted.

5 35. Despite the above-mentioned rest period violations, Defendants did not compensate
6 Plaintiff, and on information and belief, did not pay Class Members one additional hour of pay at
7 their regular rate as required by California law, including Labor Code section 226.7 and the
8 applicable IWC Wage Orders, for each day on which lawful rest periods were not authorized and
9 permitted.

10 36. Moreover, Plaintiff and the Class Members were required to incur necessary
11 expenses in the discharge of their duties, including without limitation cell phone, compute and
12 home internet expenses, as well as mileage and plane tickets. but were not reimbursed for such
13 necessary expenses.

14 37. In addition, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to maintain their uniforms
15 but were not reimbursed for related expense.

16 38. Defendants also failed to provide accurate, lawful itemized wage statements to
17 Plaintiff and the Class Members in part because of the above specified violations.

18 39. Defendants have also made it difficult to determine applicable rates of pay and
19 account with precision for the unlawfully withheld wages and deductions due to be paid to Non-
20 exempt Employees, including Plaintiff, during the liability period because they did not implement
21 and preserve a lawful record-keeping method to record all hours worked, and non-provided rest
22 and meal periods owed to employees as required for non-exempt employees by 29 U.S.C. section
23 211(c), California Labor Code section 226, and applicable California Wage Orders.

24 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
25 mentioned, Defendants knew that at the time of termination of employment (or within 72 hours
26 thereof for resignations without prior notice as the case may be) they had a duty to accurately
27 compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for all wages owed including straight time, overtime, meal
28 and rest period premiums, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation,

1 but willfully, knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so in part because of the
2 above-specified violations.

3 41. Plaintiff and the Class Members are covered by applicable California IWC Wage
4 Orders and corresponding applicable provisions of the California Code of Regulations, Title 8,
5 section 11000 *et seq.*

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

7 42. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf, as well as on behalf of each and every
8 other person similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil
9 Procedure §382.

10 43. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief
11 as authorized by California law.

12 44. The proposed class is comprised of and defined as: **all persons who are or were**
13 **employed by the Defendants as hourly paid, non-exempt employees in the State of California**
14 **at any time from four years prior to the filing of this action through resolution or trial of the**
15 **matter.** (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Class” or “Class Members”).

16 45. Plaintiff also seeks to represent Subclasses included in the Plaintiff’s Class, which
17 are composed of Class Members satisfying the following definitions:

18 a. All Class Members who were not paid at least minimum wage for all hours
19 worked (collectively “**Minimum Wage Subclass**”);

20 b. All Class Members who were not accurately paid overtime for hours worked
21 over eight in a day or over forty in a workweek (**collectively “Overtime Subclass”**);

22 c. All Class Members who worked more than five (5) hours in a workday and
23 were not provided with a timely, uninterrupted lawful meal period of net thirty (30) minutes, and
24 were not paid compensation of one hour premium wages at the employee’s regular rate in lieu
25 thereof (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**First Meal Period Subclass**”);

26 d. All Class Members who worked more than ten hours in a workday and were
27 not provided with a timely, uninterrupted lawful second meal period of thirty (30) minutes, and
28 were not paid compensation of one hour premium wages at the employee’s regular rate in lieu

thereof (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Second Meal Period Subclass**”);

e. All Class Members who worked more than three and a half hours in a workday and were not authorized and permitted to take a net 10-minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked per day and were not paid compensation of one hour premium wages at the employee’s regular rate in lieu thereof (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Rest Period Subclass**”);

f. All Class Members who were not reimbursed for all necessary expenditures (collectively “**Indemnification Subclass**”);

g. All Class Members who did not receive all owed wages at time of separation or within 72 hours in the case of resignation (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Waiting Time Subclass**”);

h. All Class Members who were not provided with accurate and complete itemized wage statements (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Inaccurate Wage Statement Subclass**”);

i. All Class Members who were employed by Defendants and subject to Defendant’s Unfair Business Practices (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “**Unfair Business Practices Subclass**”).

46. Plaintiff reserves the right, under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to amend or modify the descriptions of the Class and Subclasses to provide greater specificity as appropriate, or if it should be deemed necessary by the Court or to further divide the Class Members into additional Subclasses or to limit the Subclasses to particular issues. Any reference herein to the Class Members or the Plaintiff’s Class includes the members of each of the Subclasses.

47. As set forth in further detail below, this action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under the provisions of section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation, and the proposed Class and Subclasses are easily ascertainable through Defendants’ records.

a. Numerosity: The members of the Class and Subclasses are so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class and Subclasses would be unfeasible and impractical. The

1 membership of the entire Class and Subclasses is unknown to Plaintiff at this time, however, the
2 Class is estimated to be hundreds of individuals. Accounting for employee turnover during the
3 relevant periods necessarily increases this number substantially. Plaintiff alleges Defendants'
4 employment records would provide information as to the number and location of all Class
5 Members. Joinder of all members of the proposed Class is not practicable.

6 b. The proposed class is easily ascertainable. The number and identity of the
7 class members are determinable from Defendants' payroll records and time records for each class
8 member.

9 c. Commonality: There are common questions of law and fact as to the Class
10 and Subclasses that predominate over questions affecting only individual Class Members. These
11 common questions of law and fact include, without limitation:

- 12 1. Whether Defendants accurately paid Class Members for all hours worked;
- 13 2. Whether Defendants knew or should have known that Class Members were
14 required to perform work off the clock;
- 15 3. Whether Defendants required Class Members to work off the clock;
- 16 4. Whether Defendants accurately calculated and paid all Class Members
17 overtime premiums for the hours which Plaintiff and Class Members worked
18 in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week;
- 19 5. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of providing lawful, timely
20 meal periods in accordance with Labor Code § 512, as well as the applicable
21 Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") wage order;
- 22 6. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of complying with Labor
23 Code section 226.7 and IWC Wage Order on each instance that a lawful,
24 timely 30-minute uninterrupted meal period was not provided;
- 25 7. Whether Defendants failed to authorize and permit a lawful, net 10-minute
26 rest period to the Class Members for every four (4) hours or major fraction
27 thereof worked;

- 1 8. Whether Defendants had a policy and practice of complying with Labor
2 Code section 226.7 and the IWC Wage Order on each instance that a lawful
3 rest period was not provided;
- 4 9. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages upon separation in
5 accordance with Labor Code sections 201-202;
- 6 10. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse employees for necessary expenses
7 in accordance with Labor Code section 2802
- 8 11. Whether Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of Class Members'
9 earned wages, work periods, meal periods and deductions;
- 10 12. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair competition in violation of section
11 17200 et seq. of the Business and Professions Code;
- 12 13. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful and/or reckless;
- 13 14. Whether Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements in
14 violation of Labor Code § 226; and
- 15 15. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties
16 resulting from Defendants' violations of California law.
- 17 a. Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will fairly and adequately protect
18 the interests of each member of the Class and Subclasses with whom she has a well-defined
19 community of interest. Plaintiff's claims herein alleged are typical of those claims which could be
20 alleged by any member of the Class and/or Subclasses, and the relief sought is typical of the relief
21 which would be sought by each member of the Class and/or Subclasses in separate actions. All
22 members of the Class and/or Subclasses have been similarly harmed by Defendants' failure to
23 provide lawful meal and rest periods, failure to reimburse expenses, failure to provide accurate
24 wage statements, failure to timely pay wages at termination, failure to pay minimum wages,
25 rounding practices, and failure to accurately pay all wages earned including all owed premium and
26 overtime wages, all due to Defendants' policies and practices that affected each member of the
27 Class and/or Subclasses similarly. Further, Defendants benefited from the same type of unfair
28 and/or wrongful acts as to each member of the Class and/or Subclasses.

1 b. Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will fairly and adequately protect the
2 interests of each member of the Class and/or Subclasses with whom she has a well-defined
3 community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff acknowledges that
4 he has an obligation to make known to the Court any relationships, conflicts, or differences with
5 any member of the Class and/or Subclasses, and no such relationships or conflicts are currently
6 known to exist. Plaintiff's attorneys and the proposed counsel for the Class and Subclasses are
7 versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, litigation, and settlement and
8 experienced in handling such matters. Other former and current employees of Defendants may also
9 serve as representatives of the Class and Subclasses if needed.

10 c. Superiority: The nature of this action makes the use of class action
11 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve economies of time, effort,
12 judicial resources, and expense, which would not be achieved with separate lawsuits. The
13 prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class and/or Subclasses would create
14 a risk of inconsistent and/or varying adjudications with respect to the individual members of the
15 Class and/or Subclasses, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendants, and
16 resulting in the impairment of the rights of the members of the Class and/or Subclasses and the
17 disposition of their interests through actions to which they were not parties. Thus, a class action is
18 superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because
19 individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common
20 to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. Each
21 member of the Class has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants'
22 unlawful policies and practices that affected each member of the Class and/or Subclasses similarly.
23 Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the
24 manner that is most efficient and economical for both parties and the judicial system. Plaintiff is
25 unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this action that
26 would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

27 d. Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the state of California violate
28 employment and labor laws every day. However, current employees are often afraid to assert their

1 rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions
2 because they believe their former employers may damage their future endeavors through negative
3 references and/or other means. The nature of this action allows for the protection of current and
4 former employees' rights without fear of retaliation or damage. Additionally, the citizens of
5 California have a significant interest in ensuring employers comply with California's labor laws
6 and in ensuring those employers who do not are prevented from taking further advantage of their
7 employees.

8 **CLASS ACTION CLAIMS**

9 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

11 **(By Plaintiff and the Class Against Defendants)**

12 48. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing
13 paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

14 49. Labor Code section 204 establishes the fundamental right of all employees in the
15 State of California to be paid wages, including minimum wage, straight time and overtime, in a
16 timely fashion for their work.

17 50. Labor Code section 1194(a) provides that notwithstanding any agreement to work
18 for a lesser wage, any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime
19 compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance
20 of the full amount of this minimum wage or overtime compensation, including interest thereon,
21 reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

22 51. Labor Code section 1197 provides: The minimum wage for employees fixed by the
23 commission or by any applicable state or local law, is the minimum wage to be paid to employees,
24 and the payment of a lower wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

25 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1198, it is unlawful to employ persons for longer
26 than the hours set by the Industrial Welfare Commission or under conditions prohibited by the IWC
27 Wage Order(s).

28 53. The applicable Wage Orders and California Labor Code sections 1197 and 1182.12

1 establish the right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by
2 state law.

3 54. Labor Code sections 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not
4 been paid the legal minimum wage as required by Labor Code section 1197 may recover the unpaid
5 balance together with attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount
6 equal to the unpaid wages and interest accrued thereon.

7 55. During all relevant periods, the California Labor Code and Wage Orders required
8 that Defendants fully and timely pay its non-exempt, hourly employees all wages earned and due
9 for all hours worked.

10 56. The IWC Wage Orders define "hours worked" as "the time during which an
11 employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered
12 or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

13 57. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and Class Members consistently worked hours for
14 which they were not paid because Defendants frequently required Plaintiff and the Class Members
15 to work off the clock.

16 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants were aware that Plaintiff and the
17 Class Members were working off the clock and that they should have been paid for this time.

18 59. In addition, Defendants failed to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked
19 because, upon information and belief, Defendants rounded hours worked against Plaintiff and the
20 Class Members' interests.

21 60. Defendant's policy and practice of not paying all minimum wages violates
22 California Labor Code sections 204, 210, 216, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and the
23 applicable Wage Orders 4-2001 and 5-2001.

24 61. Due to Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Orders,
25 Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Subclass members are entitled to recover from Defendant their
26 unpaid wages, statutory penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in this action, and pre-
27 judgment and post-judgment interest, as well as liquidated damages.

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME OWED

(By Plaintiff and the Overtime Subclass Against All Defendants)

1. Plaintiff incorporates each and every allegation set forth in all of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

2. During all relevant periods, Defendant required Plaintiff the Class Members to work shifts in excess of eight (8) hours per workday and/or to work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

3. During all relevant periods, both the California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, 510, 1198, and the pertinent Wage Orders 4-2001 and 5-2001 required that all work performed by an employee in excess of eight (8) hours in any workday, on the seventh day of work in any workweek, or in excess of forty (40) hours in any workweek be compensated at one and one-half (1.5) times the employee's regular rate of pay. Any work in excess of twelve (12) hours in one (1) day is required to be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee. In addition, any work in excess of eight (8) hours on any seventh (7th) day of a workweek is required to be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay of an employee.

4. During all relevant periods, Defendants had a uniform policy of requiring Plaintiff and the Class members to work in excess of eight (8) hours in a workday and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek without compensating them at a rate of one and one-half (1.5) times their regular rate of pay. Upon information and belief, Defendants also failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and the Class Members for hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in one (1) day, or eight (8) hours on the seventh (7th) day of a workweek.

5. The IWC Wage Orders define "hours worked" as "the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so."

6. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and Class Members consistently worked hours for which they were not paid because Plaintiff and the Class Members were required to work off the

1 clock—some of these hours were over eight (8) hours in one (1) workday or in excess of forty (40)
2 hours in a workweek and should have been paid at the overtime rate.

3 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants were aware that Plaintiff and the
4 Class Members were working off the clock and that they should have been paid for this time.

5 8. By way of example, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to go through
6 COVID-19 screenings prior to starting their shifts. This time was not compensated by Defendants
7 in violation of California Labor Code.

8 9. By way of further example, Plaintiff and Class Members were required to do pre-
9 and/or post-shift activities while off the clock. These activities included but were not limited to
10 donning and doffing of required safety equipment. Defendants did not compensate Plaintiff and
11 Class Members for this time spent off the clock.

12 10. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants failed to incorporate all forms
13 of compensation, including without limitation differentials and incentives, into the regular rate for
14 overtime purposes.

15 11. As a result, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Class members earned
16 overtime wages and such employees suffered damages as a result.

17 12. Defendants knew or should have known Plaintiff and the Class Members were
18 undercompensated as a result of these practices.

19 13. Due to Defendant's violations of the California Labor Code, Plaintiff and the Class
20 members are entitled to recover from Defendants their unpaid overtime wages, reasonable
21 attorneys' fees and costs in this action, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, statutory
22 penalties, and liquidated damages.

23
24 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE LAWFUL MEAL PERIODS**

26 **(By Plaintiff and the Meal Period Subclasses Against All Defendants)**

27 14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained
28 above, as though fully set forth herein.

1 15. Pursuant to Labor Code § 512, no employer shall employ an employee for a work
2 period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal break of not less than thirty (30)
3 minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties, except that when a work period
4 of not more than six (6) hours will complete the day's work the meal period may be waived by
5 mutual consent of the employer and employee.

6 16. For the four (4) years preceding the filing of this lawsuit as properly tolled by
7 Emergency Rule 9, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members timely and
8 uninterrupted first meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes within the first five hours of a
9 shift.

10 17. As a consequence of Defendants' policies and practices, requirements, demands,
11 coverage and staffing, Plaintiff and the Class Members were often required to forego such meal
12 periods, take shortened meal periods, and/or commence their meal periods into and beyond the
13 sixth hour of their shifts.

14 18. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff and the Class Members were not paid one
15 hour of pay at their regular rate for each day that a meal period was not lawfully provided.

16 19. Moreover, as a matter of policy and practice, upon information and belief, the Class
17 members were also not provided second meal periods on days when shifts exceeded ten hours (and
18 twelve hours), nor were they provided premium wages in lieu of a second meal period. On
19 information and belief, Plaintiff and the Class Members did not waive their rights to a second meal
20 period on shifts in excess of ten hours.

21 20. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff and the Class
22 Members have been damaged in an amount according to proof at time of trial.

23 21. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover
24 one (1) hour of premium pay for each day in which a meal period violation occurred. They are also
25 entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees, cost, interest, and penalties as applicable.

26 22. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and the Class she seeks to
27 represent have been deprived of premium wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are
28 entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs,

1 under Labor Code sections 218.6, 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Civil Code
2 section 3287.

3 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **FAILURE TO AUTHORIZE AND PERMIT LAWFUL REST PERIODS**

5 **(By Plaintiff and the Rest Period Subclasses Against All Defendants)**

6 23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained
7 above, as though fully set forth herein.

8 24. Pursuant to the IWC Wage Orders applicable to Plaintiff's and Class Members'
9 employment by Defendants, "Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest
10 periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period.... [The] authorized
11 rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net
12 rest time per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof.... Authorized rest period time shall
13 be counted as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages."

14 25. Labor Code §226.7(a) prohibits an employer from requiring any employee to work
15 during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the IWC.

16 26. Defendants were required to authorize and permit employees such as Plaintiff and
17 Class Members to take rest periods during shifts in excess of 3.5 hours, based upon the total hours
18 worked at a rate of ten (10) minutes net rest per four (4) hours worked, or major fraction thereof,
19 with no deduction from wages.

20 27. Despite said requirements of the IWC wage orders applicable to Plaintiff's and Class
21 Member's employment with Defendants, Defendants failed and refused to authorize and permit
22 Plaintiff and Class Members to take lawful, net ten (10) minute rest periods for every four (4) hours
23 worked, or major fraction thereof. Such rest breaks, when provided, were frequently untimely or
24 less than net ten minutes because of the work requirements imposed by Defendants, and frequent
25 calls during rest periods.

26 28. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff one additional hour of pay at her regular rate of pay
27 for each day that a rest period violation occurred. On information and belief, the other members of
28

1 the Class endured similar violations as a result of Defendants' rest period policies and practices and
2 Defendant did not pay said Class Members premium pay as required by law.

3 29. By their failure to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Class Members to take a
4 lawful, net ten (10) minute rest period free from work duties every four (4) hours or major fraction
5 thereof worked, including failure to provide two (2) total rest periods on six to ten hour shifts and
6 three (3) total ten (10) minute rest periods on days on which Plaintiff and the other Class Members
7 work(ed) work a third rest period for shifts in excess of ten (10) hours, and by their failure to provide
8 compensation for such unprovided rest periods as alleged herein, Defendants willfully violated the
9 provisions of Labor Code sections 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Order(s).

10 30. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and the Class she seeks to
11 represent have been deprived of premium wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are
12 entitled to recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and costs,
13 under Labor Code sections 218.6, 226.7, the applicable IWC Wage Orders, and Civil Code 3287.

14
15 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE AND PAYABLE DURING**
17 **EMPLOYMENT**

18 **(By Plaintiff and the Class Against All Defendants)**

19 31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained
20 above, as though fully set forth herein.

21 32. Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages are due and payable twice in each
22 calendar month.

23 33. The wages required by Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 1194 and other sections became
24 due and payable to each employee in each month that he or she was not provided with a meal period
25 or rest period or paid minimum wage, straight or overtime wages to which he or she was entitled.

26 34. Defendants violated Labor Code § 204 by systematically refusing to pay wages due
27 under the Labor Code.

35. Labor Code section 210 (a) provides that “In addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 204.2, 204.11, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a penalty as follow:

(1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee.

(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

103. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and the Class she seeks to represent have been deprived of wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, penalties, plus interest thereon, attorneys fees, and costs, pursuant to Labor Code § 210, 218.5, 218.6, 510, 1194.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES OWED AT SEPARATION

(By Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass Against All Defendants)

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

37. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendants to pay their employees all wages due within seventy-two (72) hours of separation of employment.

38. Section 203 of the Labor Code provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages the employer must, as a penalty, continue to pay the subject employee's wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

39. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to compensation for all forms of wages earned, including but not limited to minimum wages, overtime, and premium meal and rest period compensation, but to date have not received such compensation, therefore entitling them to Labor Code § 203 penalties.

1 40. In addition, irrespective of any derivative violation, Defendants failed to timely pay
2 Plaintiff and, upon information and belief, other Class Members earned compensation at the time
3 of termination despite their obligations under Labor Code 201 and 202.

4 41. More than thirty (30) days have passed since affected Waiting Time Subclass
5 Members have left Defendants' employ, and on information and belief, they have not received
6 payment pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

7 42. Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members are thus entitled to 30 days' wages
8 as a penalty under Labor Code § 203, together with interest thereon and attorneys' fees and costs.

9 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY EXPENSES**

11 **(By Plaintiff and the Indemnification Subclass Against All Defendants)**

12 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained
13 above, as though fully set forth herein.

14 63. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation set
15 forth above, as though fully set forth herein.

16 64. Labor Code § 2802 requires Defendants to indemnify Plaintiff and Class Members
17 for necessary expenditures incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her duties.

18 65. Plaintiff and the members of the Indemnification Class were required to incur
19 expenses in the performance of their assigned job duties, including but not limited to personal cell
20 phone expenses, milage costs, plane tickets, uniform maintenance and use of personal computer
21 and home internet.

22 66. Upon information and belief, the Defendants did not reimburse Plaintiff or the
23 Plaintiff's subclass for such expenses.

24 67. As a result of the unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and the Plaintiff's Subclass
25 Members have been deprived of un-reimbursed sums in amounts to be determined at trial, and are
26 entitled to the recovery of such amounts, plus interest and penalties thereon, attorneys' fees, and
27 costs, pursuant to Labor Code §2802.

28 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**

(By Plaintiff and Wage Statement Subclass Against Defendants)

43. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation set forth above, as though fully set forth herein.

44. Labor Code section 226(a) reads in pertinent part: “Every employer shall, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, furnish each of his or her employees, either as a detachable part of the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee’s wages, or separately when wages are paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee... (4) all deductions... (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during each the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee....”.

45. Further, the IWC Wage Orders require in pertinent part: Every employer shall keep accurate information with respect to each employee including the following: (3) Time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, split shift intervals, and total daily hours worked shall also be recorded...(5) Total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay....”

46. Labor Code section 1174 of the California also requires Defendants to maintain and preserve, in a centralized location, among other items, records showing the names and addresses of all employees employed and payroll records showing the hours worked daily by, and the wages paid to, its employees. On information and belief and based thereon, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code section 1174, including by implementing the policies and procedures and committing the violations alleged in the preceding causes of action and herein. Defendants’ failure to comply with Labor Code section 1174 is unlawful pursuant to Labor Code section 1175.

1 47. Defendants have failed to record many of the items delineated in applicable
2 Industrial Wage Orders and Labor Code section 226, and required under Labor Code section 1174,
3 including by virtue of the fact that each wage statement which failed to accurately compensate
4 Plaintiff and Class Members for all hours worked and for missed and non-provided meal and rest
5 periods, or which failed to include compensation for all minimum wages earned or overtime hours
6 worked, was an inaccurate wage statement. In addition, the wage statements inaccurately stated
7 total hours worked and hours worked at each hourly wage rate.

8 48. On information and belief, Defendants failed to implement and preserve a lawful
9 record-keeping method to record all non-provided meal and rest periods owed to employees or all
10 hours worked, as required for Non-Exempt Employees under California Labor Code section 226
11 and applicable California Wage Orders. In order to determine if they had been paid the correct
12 amount and rate for all hours worked, Plaintiff and Class Members have been, would have been,
13 and are compelled to try to discover the required information missing from their wage statements
14 and to perform complex calculations in light of the inaccuracies and incompleteness of the wage
15 statements Defendants provided to them.

16 49. As a pattern and practice, in violation of Labor Code section 226(a) and the IWC
17 Wage Orders, Defendants did not and still do not furnish each of the members of the Wage
18 Statement Class with an accurate itemized statement in writing accurately reflecting all of the
19 required information. Here, Plaintiff asserts the Defendant omitted required information, failed to
20 accurately include total hours, all applicable hourly rates on the wage statements and the
21 corresponding number of hours worked at such rates or hours paid at such rates. By way of example
22 only, certain hours were also double counted. In addition, Defendants have failed to provide
23 accurate itemized wage statements as a consequence of the above-specified violations for failure to
24 accurately pay all wages owed, accurately record all hours worked, and failure to pay meal and rest
25 period premiums as required by law.

26 50. Moreover, upon information and belief, as a pattern and practice, in violation of
27 Labor Code section 226(a) and the IWC Wage Orders, Defendants did not and do not maintain
28 accurate records pertaining to the total hours worked for Defendants by the members of the Wage

1 Statement Class, including but not limited to, beginning and ending of each work period, meal
2 period and split shift interval, the total daily hours worked, and the total hours worked per pay
3 period and applicable rates of pay.

4 51. Plaintiff and the members of the Wage Statement Class have suffered injury as a
5 result of Defendants' failure to maintain accurate records for the members of the Wage Statement
6 Class in that the members of the Wage Statement Class were not timely provided written accurate
7 itemized statements showing all requisite information, such that the members of the Wage
8 Statement Class were misled by Defendants as to the correct information regarding various items,
9 including but not limited to total hours worked by the employee, net wages earned and all applicable
10 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
11 hourly rate.

12 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226, and in light of Defendants' violations addressed
13 above, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Class Members are each entitled to recover up to a
14 maximum of \$4,000.00, along with an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees.

15 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW**

17 **(By Plaintiff and Class Against All Defendants)**

18 53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and realleges each and every allegation contained
19 above, as though fully set forth herein.

20 54. Defendants' conduct, as alleged in this complaint, has been, and continues to be,
21 unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff and Class Members, Defendants' competitors, and the
22 general public. Plaintiff also seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within
23 the meaning of the California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

24 55. Defendants' policies, activities, and actions as alleged herein are violations of
25 California law and constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California
26 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

27 56. A violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, may be
28 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

57. The state law violations, including violations of the relevant IWC Wage Orders, detailed herein above are the predicate violations for this cause of action. By way of example only, in the instant case Defendants' policy of failing to lawfully provide Plaintiff and the Class with timely meal and rest periods or pay one (1) hour of premium pay when a meal or rest period was not lawfully provided violates Labor Code § 512, and § 226.7, and the IWC Wage Orders. Defendants further violated the law through their policies of failing to fully and accurately compensate Plaintiff and the Class Members for all hours worked, including minimum wages and overtime, and failing to reimburse for necessary expenses, as well as failing to provide accurate itemized wage statement as specified above.

58. Plaintiff and the Class Members have been personally aggrieved by Defendants' unlawful and unfair business acts and practices alleged herein by the loss of money and/or property.

59. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four (4) years prior to the filing of this complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5; interest; and an award of costs.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representative of the Class;
3. That Plaintiff be appointed as the representatives of the Subclasses; and
4. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as counsel for the Class and Subclasses.

On the First Cause of Action

(Failure to pay minimum wages)

1. For the unpaid balance of the full amount of any minimum wages, and regular wages owed, as well as interest thereon.

2. Penalties according to statute,
3. Liquidated damages,
4. Reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit;
5. For interest and
6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Second Cause of Action

(Failure to pay overtime)

1. For the unpaid balance of the full amount of any overtime wages owed, as well as interest thereon,

2. Penalties according to statute,
3. Liquidated damages,
4. Reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit;
5. For interest and
6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Third Cause of Action

(Failure to Provide Lawful Meal Periods)

1. For one (1) hour of premium pay for each day in which a required meal period was not lawfully provided;

2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute; and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Fourth Cause of Action

(Failure to Authorize and Permit Lawful Rest Periods)

1. For one (1) hour of premium pay for each day in which a required rest period was not lawfully authorized and permitted; and

2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute; and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Fifth Cause of Action

(Failure to Timely Pay Wages Due and Payable During Employment)

1. For unpaid wages;
2. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 210 and 25% of the amount of wages unlawfully withheld;
3. For interest;
4. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute; and
5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Sixth Cause of Action

(Failure to Timely Pay Wages At Separation)

6. For unpaid wages;
7. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203;
8. For interest;
9. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute; and
10. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Seventh Cause of Action

(Failure to Reimburse Necessary Expenses)

1. For unreimbursed sums;
2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute;
3. For interest; and
4. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

On the Eight Cause of Action

(Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements)

1. For statutory penalties, including penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226;
2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper;

On the Ninth Cause of Action

(Violation of the Unfair Competition Law)

1. That Defendants, jointly and/or severally, pay restitution and/or disgorgement of sums to Plaintiff and Class Members for the Defendants' past failure to pay minimum, overtime

1 and regular wages, for Defendants' past failure to reimburse necessary expenses, and for premium
2 wages for meal and rest periods that were not provided to Plaintiff and Class Members over the last
3 four (4) years in an amount according to proof;

4 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees that Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
5 recover under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code section 1194, 1197,
6 1198 ;

7 3. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid minimum, regular and overtime wages due
8 from the day that such amounts were due;

9 4. For costs of suit incurred herein that Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to
10 recover under the Labor Code; and

11 5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

12
13 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

14 Plaintiff, on behalf of the Class and Subclasses, respectfully demands a jury trial in this
15 matter to the fullest extent available under the law.

16
17 Respectfully submitted,

18
19 Dated: January 17, 2022

20 
21 JAMES HAWKINS, APLC
James R. Hawkins, Esq.
Christina M. Lucio, Esq.

22 Attorneys for ROBIN LEIGH MCEL RATH, on behalf of
23 herself and all others similarly situated
24
25
26
27
28