

1 Scott Edward Cole, Esq. (S.B. #160744)
2 Laura Grace Van Note, Esq. (S.B. #310160)
3 **SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC**
4 555 12th Street, Suite 1725
5 Oakland, California 94607
6 Telephone: (510) 891-9800
7 Facsimile: (510) 891-7030
8 Email: scole@scalaw.com
9 Email: lvannote@scalaw.com
10 Web: www.scalaw.com

11 Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff,
12 the Plaintiff Class and Aggrieved Employees

13 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MERCED**

15 SHANA WRIGHT individually, and on
16 behalf of all others similarly situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 WINGANOMICS, INC. d.b.a.
20 WINGSTOP, JASON KHAN, and DOES 1
21 through 100, inclusive,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 20CV-00657

CLASS ACTION

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND
RESTITUTION**

[JURY TRIAL DEMANDED]

23 Representative Plaintiff alleges as follows:

24 **INTRODUCTION**

25 1. This is a class action seeking unpaid compensation for wages, meal and/or rest
26 period violations, interest thereon, liquidated damages and other penalties, injunctive and other
27 equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under, *inter alia*, California Labor Code
28 §§ 200-204, 210, 218, *et seq.*, 226, *et seq.*, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, *et seq.*,
1197, 1197.1, 1198, California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* and California
Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 2. Plaintiff Shana Wright (“Representative Plaintiff” or “Plaintiff”) brings this action
2 individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated (“Class Members” and/or the
3 “Plaintiff Class”) who are or have been employed by defendant Winganomics, Inc. d.b.a.
4 Wingstop, Jason Khan, and/or Does 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) as non-
5 exempt restaurant workers within the State of California within the applicable class period.

6 3. The class period begins on February 7, 2016 and extends through trial, based upon
7 the allegation that the violations of California’s wage and hour laws, as described more fully
8 below, have been and are ongoing throughout that time.

9 4. During the class period, Defendants have had a consistent policy of (1) unlawfully
10 denying Class Members statutorily-mandated meal and rest periods, (2) willfully failing to provide
11 Class Members with accurate semimonthly itemized wage statements reflecting the total number
12 of hours each worked, the applicable deductions, and the applicable hourly rates in effect during
13 the pay period, and (3) willfully failing to pay compensation in a prompt and timely manner to
14 those Class Members whose employment with Defendants has terminated.

15 5. Defendants operate a chain of restaurants within California for which
16 Representative Plaintiff worked in various positions, including cashier and shift leader. The
17 Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, within the class
18 period, Defendants employed scores, if not hundreds, of individuals in California to perform these
19 services, employment positions which did not, and currently do not, meet any known test for
20 exemption from the payment of overtime wages and/or the entitlement to meal or rest periods.

21 6. Despite actual knowledge of these facts and legal mandates, Defendants have and
22 continue to enjoy an advantage over their competition and a resultant disadvantage to their workers
23 by electing not to pay all wages due (including missed meal and rest period compensation) and/or
24 all penalties due (including “waiting time” penalties) to Class Members.

25 7. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that
26 Defendants’ officers knew of these facts and legal mandates yet, nonetheless, repeatedly
27 authorized and/or ratified the violation of the laws cited herein.
28

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 8. Despite Defendants’ knowledge of Class Members’ entitlement to wages for all
2 hours worked and meal and/or rest periods for all applicable work periods, Defendants failed to
3 provide the same to Class Members, in violation of California state statutes, the applicable
4 California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, and Title 8 of the California Code of
5 Regulations. This action is brought to redress and end this prolonged pattern of unlawful conduct
6 once and for all.

7

8

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

 9. This Court has jurisdiction over the Class Members’ claims for unpaid wages
and/or penalties under, *inter alia*, the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order, Title
8 of the California Code of Regulations, Labor Code §§ 201-204, 226, 226.7, 512, 1174, and/or
the California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

 10. This Court also has jurisdiction over the claims herein for injunctive relief and
restitution of ill-gotten benefits arising from Defendants’ unfair and/or fraudulent business
practices under California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*

 11. Venue as to Defendants is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code
of Civil Procedure § 395(a). Defendants provided the aforementioned services within this County
where Plaintiff and numerous Class Members worked, transacts business, has agents, and is
otherwise within this Court’s jurisdiction for purposes of service of process. The unlawful acts
alleged herein have had a direct effect on Representative Plaintiff and those similarly situated
within the State of California and within this County.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PLAINTIFF

 12. Representative Plaintiff is a natural person who was employed by Defendants in
various capacities, including as a cashier and a shift supervisor during the class period.

 13. In these capacities, Representative Plaintiff is and was entitled to full, uninterrupted
and statutorily-mandated meal and rest periods, as well as other benefits of employment as set
forth herein.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DEFENDANTS

14. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that, at all times herein relevant, Defendants (including the Doe defendants) did business within the State of California providing restaurant services.

15. Those defendants identified as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, are and were, at all relevant times herein-mentioned, officers, directors, partners, and/or managing agents of some or each of the remaining defendants. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, employed and/or exercised control over the wages, hours, and/or working conditions of the Representative Plaintiff and Class Members within the State of California.

16. The Representative Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of those defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 100, inclusive and, therefore, sues these defendants by such fictitious names. The Representative Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint when such names are ascertained. The Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that each of the fictitiously-named defendants were responsible in some manner for, gave consent to, ratified, and/or authorized the conduct herein alleged and that the damages, as herein alleged, were proximately caused thereby.

17. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent and/or employee of each of the remaining defendants and, in doing the acts herein alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and/or employment.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18. The Representative Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all persons similarly situated and proximately damaged by Defendants’ conduct including, but not necessarily limited to, the following Plaintiff Class:

“All persons employed by Defendants as non-exempt restaurant workers in California on or after February 7, 2016.”

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

- 1 19. Defendants’ officers and directors are excluded from the Plaintiff Class.
- 2 20. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
- 3 under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of
- 4 interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable.
- 5 a. Numerosity: A class action is the only available method for the fair and
- 6 efficient adjudication of this controversy. The members of the Plaintiff
- 7 Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impractical, if not
- 8 impossible, insofar as Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and,
- 9 on that basis, alleges that there are sufficient Class Members to meet the
- 10 numerosity requirement. Membership in the Class will be determined upon
- 11 analysis of employee and payroll, among other, records maintained by
- 12 Defendants.
- 13 b. Commonality: The Representative Plaintiff(s) and the Class Members share
- 14 a community of interests in that there are numerous common questions and
- 15 issues of fact and law which predominate over any questions and issues
- 16 solely affecting individual members, including, but not necessarily limited
- 17 to:
- 18 1) Whether Defendants violated California Business and
- 19 Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide meal
- 20 and/or rest breaks to Class Members working eligible shifts;
- 21 2) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code § 1174 by
- 22 failing to keep accurate records of employees’ hours of work;
- 23 3) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201-
- 24 204 by failing to pay wages due and owing at the time that
- 25 certain Class Members’ employment with Defendants
- 26 terminated;
- 27 4) Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code § 226 by
- 28 failing to provide semimonthly itemized statements to Class
- Members of total hours worked by each, all wages earned and
- all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period; and
- 5) Whether Class Members are entitled to “waiting time”
- penalties, pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.
- c. Typicality: The Representative Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the claims
- of Class Members. The Representative Plaintiff and Class Members
- sustained damages arising out of and caused by Defendants’ common
- course of conduct in violation of law, as alleged herein.
- d. Adequacy of Representation: The Representative Plaintiff in this class
- action is an adequate representative of the Plaintiff Class in that the
- Representative Plaintiff’s claims are typical of those of the Plaintiff Class
- and has the same interest in the litigation of this case as the Class Members.
- The Representative Plaintiff is committed to vigorous prosecution of this

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 case and retained competent counsel who are experienced in conducting
2 litigation of this nature. The Representative Plaintiff is not subject to any
3 individual defenses unique from those conceivably applicable to Class
Members as a whole and anticipates no management difficulties in this
litigation.

4 e. Superiority of Class Action: Since the damages suffered by individual Class
5 Members, while not inconsequential, may be relatively small, the expense
6 and burden of individual litigation by each member makes or may make it
7 impractical for Class Members to seek redress individually for the wrongful
conduct alleged herein. Should separate actions be brought, or be required
8 to be brought, by each individual Class Member, the resulting multiplicity
of lawsuits would cause undue hardship and expense for the Court and the
9 litigants. The prosecution of separate actions would also create a risk of
inconsistent rulings which might be dispositive of the interests of other
Class Members who are not parties to the adjudications and/or may
substantially impede their ability to adequately protect their interests.

10 **COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11 21. As described herein, for years, Defendants have knowingly failed to adequately
12 compensate those employees within the class definition identified above for all wages earned
13 (including premium wages such as compensation for missed meal and/or rest periods) under the
14 California Labor Code and the applicable IWC Wage Order, thereby enjoying a significant
15 competitive edge over similar companies.

16 22. Defendants have declined to pay these wages, even upon a Class Member's
17 termination or resignation from employment, in blatant violation of California Labor Code § 201
18 and/or § 202.

19 23. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 require Defendants to pay severed
20 employees all wages due and owed to the employee immediately upon discharge or within 72
21 hours of resignation of their positions, in most circumstances. California Labor Code § 203
22 provides that an employer who willfully fails to timely pay such wages must, as a penalty, continue
23 to pay the subject employees' wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is
24 commenced, and the payment of such penalty shall continue for a period of time up to 30 days.

25 24. Furthermore, despite knowledge of the Class Members' entitlement to
26 compensation for all hours worked, Defendants violated California Labor Code § 1174(d) by
27 failing to provide or require the use, maintenance, or submission of time records by members of
28 the Plaintiff Class. Defendants also failed to provide Class Members with accurate semimonthly

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 itemized statements of the total number of hours worked by each, and all applicable hourly rates
2 in effect, during the pay period, in violation of California Labor Code § 226. In failing to provide
3 the required documents, Defendants have not only failed to pay their workers the full amount of
4 compensation due, but have also, until now, effectively shielded themselves from employee
5 scrutiny by concealing the magnitude and financial impact of their wrongdoing that such
6 documents might otherwise have led workers to discover.

7 25. Representative Plaintiff and all persons similarly situated are entitled to unpaid
8 compensation, yet, to date, have not received such compensation despite many of the same having
9 been terminated by and/or resigned from Defendants’ employ. More than 30 days have passed
10 since certain Class Members have left Defendants’ employ.

11 26. As a consequence of Defendants’ willful conduct in not paying former employees’
12 compensation for all hours worked in a prompt and timely manner, certain Class Members are
13 entitled to up to 30 days wages as a penalty under California Labor Code § 203, together with
14 attorneys’ fees and costs.

15 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as set forth
16 herein, Class Members have sustained damages, as described above, including compensation for
17 loss of earnings for hours worked on behalf of Defendants, in an amount to be established at trial.
18 As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as set forth herein,
19 certain Class Members are entitled to recover “waiting time” penalties (pursuant to California
20 Labor Code § 203) and penalties for failure to provide semimonthly statements of hours worked
21 and all applicable hourly rates (pursuant to California Labor Code § 226) in an amount to be
22 established at trial. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as
23 set forth herein, Class Members are also entitled to recover costs and attorneys’ fees pursuant to
24 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, among other authorities.

25 28. Representative Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from
26 engaging in the complained-of illegal labor acts and practices in the future. Representative Plaintiff
27 also seeks restitution of costs incurred by Class Members under California’s Unfair Competition
28 Law. Unless enjoined, Defendants’ unlawful conduct will continue unchecked, while Class

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 Members bear the financial brunt of Defendants’ unlawful conduct. As a further direct and
2 proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Class Members are also
3 entitled to recover costs and attorneys’ fees, pursuant to statute.

4 29. Representative Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit (as
5 specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3) necessary to maintain a civil action against
6 Defendants for violation of (and/or recovery under) California’s Private Attorneys General Act.
7 On February 6, 2020, Representative Plaintiff served and filed a notice upon the Labor and
8 Workforce Development Agency in compliance with Labor Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*

9
10 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **UNLAWFUL FAILURE TO PAY WAGES**
12 **(California Labor Code §§ 200-204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198; IWC Wage Order)**

13 30. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause
14 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

15 31. During the limitations period, Class Members performed work for Defendants,
16 oftentimes in excess of eight hours in a workday and/or forty hours in a workweek. The number
17 of hours will be proven at trial.

18 32. During the limitations period, Defendants refused to compensate Class Members
19 for all of the wages they earned, in violation of the applicable IWC Wage Order and provisions of
20 the California Labor Code.

21 33. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of, and were under a duty to comply
22 with, the overtime provisions of the California Labor Code including, but not limited to, California
23 Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198.

24 34. California Labor Code § 510(a) provides, in pertinent part:
25 Any work in excess of eight hours in one workday and any work in excess
26 of 40 hours in any one workweek and the first eight hours worked on the
27 seventh day of work in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate
28 of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an
employee.

35. California Labor Code § 1194(a) provides, in pertinent part:

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

- 1 42. California Labor Code § 226.7 provides, in pertinent part:
- 2 (a) No employer shall require any employee to work during any meal
- 3 or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
- 4 Commission.
- 5 (b) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period or rest
- 6 period in accordance with an applicable order of the Industrial Welfare
- 7 Commission, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of
- 8 pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that
- 9 the meal or rest period is not provided.
- 10 43. Moreover, California Labor Code § 512(a) provides, in pertinent part:
- 11 An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than
- 12 five hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of
- 13 not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the
- 14 employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by
- 15 mutual consent of both the employer and employee. An employer may not
- 16 employ an employee for a work period of more than 10 hours per day
- 17 without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than
- 18 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours,
- 19 the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer
- 20 and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.
- 21 44. Sections 11 and 12, respectively, of the applicable IWC Wage Order mandate that employers
- 22 provide all applicable meal and/or rest periods to non-exempt (including exempt-misclassified)
- 23 employees.
- 24 45. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:
- 25 (A) No employer shall employ any person for a work period of more than
- 26 five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than 30 minutes...
- 27 (B) An employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more
- 28 than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee with a
- second meal period of not less than 30 minutes...
- (C) If an employer fails to provide an employee a meal period in accordance
- with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the
- employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
- compensation for each workday that the meal period is not provided.
46. Moreover, Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides:
- (A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest
- periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work
- period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours
- worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4)
- hours or major fraction thereof

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 (B) If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance
2 with the applicable provisions of this order, the employer shall pay the
3 employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
4 compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

4 47. By failing to consistently provide uninterrupted thirty-minute meal periods within
5 the first five hours of work each day, a second uninterrupted thirty-minute meal period within the
6 first ten hours of work each day and/or uninterrupted net ten-minute rest periods to Class Members,
7 Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

8 48. Representative Plaintiff is informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that
9 Defendants have never paid the one hour of compensation to any Class Member due to their
10 violations of the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order provisions.

11 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth
12 herein, Class Members have sustained damages, including lost compensation resulting from
13 missed meal and/or rest periods, in an amount to be established at trial.

14 50. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set
15 forth herein, certain Class Members are entitled to recover "waiting time" penalties in amounts to
16 be established at trial, as well as recovery of attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

17
18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**
19 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**
20 **(California Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174)**

20 51. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause
21 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

22 52. California Labor Code § 226(a) provides:

23 Each employer shall semimonthly, or at the time of each payment of wages,
24 furnish each of his or her employees either as a detachable part of the check,
25 draft or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately when wages
26 are paid by personal check or cash, an itemized wage statement in writing
27 showing: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total number of hours worked by each
28 employee whose compensation is based on an hourly wage; (3) all
deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the
employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (4) net wages earned;
(5) the inclusive date of the period for which the employee is paid; (6) the
name of the employee and his or her social security number; and (7) the
name and address of the legal entity which is the employer.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1 53. Moreover, California Labor Code § 226(e) provides:

2 An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure

3 by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the

4 greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period

5 in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee

6 for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate

7 penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of

8 costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.

9 54. Finally, California Labor Code § 1174(d) provides:

10 Every person employing labor in this state shall. . . (d) [k]eep, at a central

11 location in the state...payroll records showing the hours worked daily by

12 and the wages paid to...employees.... These records shall be kept in

13 accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but

14 in any case shall be kept on file for not less than three years.

15 55. Defendants have failed to provide timely, accurate itemized wage statements to the

16 Class Members in accordance with California Labor Code § 226. Representative Plaintiff is

17 informed and believes and, on that basis, alleges that none of the statements provided by

18 Defendants accurately reflected actual gross wages earned, net wages earned, or the appropriate

19 deductions for Class Members.

20 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as set forth

21 herein, the Class Members are entitled to penalties in an amount to be established at trial and are

22 entitled to recover attorneys’ fees and costs of suit.

23

24

25

26

27

28

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
FAILURE TO PAY WAGES ON TERMINATION
(California Labor Code § 203)

1 57. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause

2 of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

3 58. California Labor Code § 203 provides that:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

 If an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in

 accordance with Sections 201, 201.5, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an

 employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall

 continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid

 or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue

 for more than 30 days.

61. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' willful conduct in failing to pay said Class Members for all hours worked, affected Class Members are entitled to recover "waiting time" penalties of up to thirty days' wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 203 in an amount to be established at trial, and attorneys' fees and costs.

65. Defendants have clearly established a policy of accepting a certain amount of collateral damage, as represented by the damages and penalties to Class Members herein alleged, as incidental to their business operations, rather than accept the alternative costs of full compliance with fair, lawful, and honest business practices, ordinarily borne by its responsible competitors and as set forth in legislation and the judicial record.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CLAIM
(California Labor Code §§ 2699)

66. Each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs is incorporated in this cause of action with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

67. California Labor Code § 2699(a) provides, in pertinent part:

Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees. . .

68. Representative Plaintiff and each and every other Class Member working for Defendants within one year of Representative Plaintiff’s exhaustion of administrative prerequisites under the California Private Attorneys General Act are “aggrieved employees,” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c), because they were employed by Defendants and were among the employees against whom violations of law were committed.

69. Representative Plaintiff has met all of the requirements set forth in California Labor Code § 2699.3 necessary to maintain a civil action against Defendants for violations of (and/or recovery under) California’s Private Attorneys General Act.

70. Representative Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees alleging violations of the California Labor Code provisions cited in the preceding paragraphs.

71. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Representative Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover penalties as provided by California Labor Code § 2699, in an amount to be established at trial, as well as costs and attorneys’ fees, pursuant to statute.

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, the Representative Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the proposed Plaintiff Class, prays for judgment and the following specific relief against Defendants, and each of them, jointly and separately, as follows:

1. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that this action is a proper class action and certify the proposed class and/or any other appropriate subclasses under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382;

2. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants willfully violated their legal duties to pay all wages due under the California Labor Code and the applicable California Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order;

3. That the Court make an award to Class Members of one hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

4. That the Court make an award to Class Members of one hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

5. That the Court order Defendants to pay restitution to Class Members due to Defendants' unlawful activities, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-17208;

6. That the Court further enjoin Defendants, ordering them to cease and desist from unlawful activities in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

7. For interest on the amount of any and all economic losses, at the prevailing legal rate;

8. That the Court make an award to Class Members of penalties, pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 203, 226, 558, 1174.5 and/or liquidated damages pursuant to § 1194.2, in an amount to be proven at trial;

9. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that this action is a proper representative action pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699;

10. That the Court make an award of civil penalties for violations of the California Labor Code, pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699;

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
555 12TH STREET, SUITE 1725
OAKLAND, CA 94607
TEL: (510) 891-9800

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

11. For reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code § 218.5;
12. For costs of suit and any and all such other relief as the Court deems just and proper;
13. For all other Orders, findings and determinations identified and sought in this Complaint.

JURY DEMAND

Representative Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Plaintiff Class and Aggrieved Employees, hereby demands a trial by Jury.

Dated: May 5, 2020

SCOTT COLE & ASSOCIATES, APC

By:



Laura Van Note, Esq.
Attorneys for Representative Plaintiff,
the Plaintiff Class and Aggrieved Employees