

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104
KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672
JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626
SIMON KWAK, State Bar No. 297362
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 379-6250
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
Email: jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com
skwak@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Victor Flores,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

**Electronically Filed
by Superior Court of CA,
County of Santa Clara,
on 7/10/2020 10:38 AM
Reviewed By: R. Walker
Case #20CV365252
Envelope: 4580345**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

VICTOR FLORES, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

vs.

ACCO ENGINEERED SYSTEMS, INC.;
and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 20CV365252

**[Amended as a matter of right, pursuant to
Labor Code section 2699.3(a)(2)(C)]**

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

1. Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Breaks;
4. Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Failure to Pay All Wages Due Upon Separation of Employment;
6. Violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
7. Enforcement of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA")

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiff Victor Flores, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, alleges as
2 follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Victor Flores (“Plaintiff”) brings this putative class action, pursuant to
5 California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, and representative action pursuant to the Private
6 Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*, against defendants
7 ACCO Engineered Systems, Inc. and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive (collectively,
8 “Defendants”), on behalf of himself individually, other aggrieved employees, and a putative
9 class of non-exempt employees employed by Defendants throughout California.

10 2. Defendants are in the business of mechanical design and construction services.

11 3. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in a
12 systematic pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and Industrial
13 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders, all of which contribute to Defendants’ deliberate
14 unfair competition.

15 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
16 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 17 (a) Failing to pay overtime wages at the proper rates;
- 18 (b) Failing to provide meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- 19 (c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu
20 thereof;
- 21 (d) Failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
- 22 (e) Failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

23 5. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary relief against Defendants on
24 behalf of himself and all others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things,
25 unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses and penalties pursuant
26 to Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1174.5, 1194,
27 1198, and 2698, *et seq.*

28 ///

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This is a class action, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, they are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants reside, transact business or have offices in this county and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

THE PARTIES

10. Plaintiff is a citizen of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants during the Class Period in California.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants at all times hereinafter mentioned, were and are employers as defined in and subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of California.

12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 20, but will seek leave of this Court to amend this First Amended Complaint and serve such fictitiously named defendants once their names and capacities become known.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted

1 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint
2 scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant
3 are legally attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendants in all respects acted as
4 the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

5 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the
6 acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or
7 DOES 1 through 20, acting as the agent or alter ego for the other, with legal authority to act on
8 the other's behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent,
9 the official policy of Defendants.

10 15. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of
11 such agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein.
12 At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of
13 each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

14 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said
15 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently or otherwise responsible for the acts,
16 omissions, occurrences and transactions alleged herein.

17 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

18 17. Plaintiff brings this action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 on behalf of
19 himself and all others similarly situated who were affected by Defendants' Labor Code,
20 Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 and IWC Wage Order violations.

21 18. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks
22 relief authorized by California law.

23 19. Plaintiff's proposed Class consists of and is defined as follows:

24 Class

25 All California citizens currently or formerly employed as non-exempt employees
26 by Defendants in the State of California within four years prior to the filing of this
action to the date of class certification.

27 20. Plaintiff also seeks to certify the following Subclass of employees:

28 Waiting Time Subclass

All members of the Class who separated their employment from Defendants

1 within three years prior to the filing of this action to the date of class certification.

2 21. Members of the Class and Subclass described above will be collectively referred
3 to as “class members.” Plaintiff reserves the right to establish other or additional subclasses, or
4 modify any Class or Subclass definition, as appropriate based on investigation, discovery and
5 specific theories of liability.

6 22. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action
7 under the California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there are common questions of law
8 and fact as to the Class that predominate over questions affecting only individual members
9 including, but not limited to:

- 10 (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and class members overtime
11 compensation at the proper rates;
- 12 (b) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and class members of timely meal
13 periods;
- 14 (c) Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and class members of rest breaks;
- 15 (d) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and former class
16 members all wages due upon termination or within 72 hours of resignation;
- 17 (e) Whether Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and class members with
18 accurate, itemized wage statements; and
- 19 (f) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
20 Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 23. There is a well-defined community of interest in this litigation and the Class is
22 readily ascertainable:

- 23 (a) Numerosity: The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all
24 members is impractical. Although the members of the Class are unknown
25 to Plaintiff at this time, on information and belief, the Class is estimated to
26 be greater than 100 individuals. The identity of the class members are
27 readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants’ employment and payroll
28 records.

1 (b) Typicality: The claims (or defenses, if any) of Plaintiff are typical of the
2 claims (or defenses, if any) of the Class because Defendants' failure to
3 comply with the provisions of California wage and hour laws entitled each
4 class member to similar pay, benefits and other relief. The injuries
5 sustained by Plaintiff are also typical of the injuries sustained by the Class
6 because they arise out of and are caused by Defendants' common course of
7 conduct as alleged herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will fairly and adequately represent
9 and protect the interests of all members of the Class because it is in his best
10 interest to prosecute the claims alleged herein to obtain full compensation
11 and penalties due to him and the Class. Plaintiff's attorneys, as proposed
12 class counsel, are competent and experienced in litigating large
13 employment class actions and are versed in the rules governing class action
14 discovery, certification and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred and,
15 throughout the duration of this action, will continue to incur attorneys' fees
16 and costs that have been and will be necessarily expended for the
17 prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

18 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes the use of class action
19 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve
20 economies of time, effort and expense as compared with separate lawsuits,
21 and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be
22 adjudicated in the same manner and at the same time for each Class. If
23 appropriate this Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to
24 efficiently manage this case as a class action.

25 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California and
26 other states violate employment and labor laws every day. Current
27 employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or
28 indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing actions

1 because they believe their former employers might damage their future
2 endeavors through negative references and/or other means. Class actions
3 provide the class members who are not named in the complaint with a
4 type of anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights at the
5 same time as affording them privacy protections.

6 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

7 24. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
8 persons as non-exempt employees.

9 25. Plaintiff was employed in a non-exempt position at Defendants' California
10 business location(s).

11 26. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

12 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
13 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees and other professionals
14 who were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel
15 practices and the requirements of California law.

16 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 improperly calculated the overtime rate of pay for Plaintiff and Class Members because the
18 rates did not include non-discretionary wages, including, but not limited to, bonuses, shift
19 premiums, and/or other incentive pay into the computation of their regular rate of pay for
20 purposes of calculating the overtime rate of pay.

21 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
22 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive all required meal
23 periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular
24 rate of pay when they did not receive a timely meal period. In violation of the Labor Code and
25 IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and class members did not receive all timely meal periods or
26 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay
27 when they did not receive a timely meal period.

28 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or

1 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive all rest breaks or
2 payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay
3 when a rest break was missed. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff
4 and class members did not receive all rest breaks or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay
5 at Plaintiff and class members' regular rate of pay when a rest break was missed.

6 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and class members were entitled to receive itemized wage
8 statements that accurately showed their gross and net wages earned, inclusive dates of pay
9 periods, total hours worked and all applicable hourly rates in effect and the number of hours
10 worked at each hourly rate in accordance with California law. In violation of the Labor Code,
11 Plaintiff and class members were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

12 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
13 should have known that Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members were entitled to timely
14 payment of wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code,
15 Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members did not receive payment of all wages within
16 permissible time periods.

17 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
18 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and class members, and Defendants
19 had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly and intentionally
20 failed to do so all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

23 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 3)**

24 34. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
25 though fully set forth herein.

26 35. Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable IWC Wage Order provide that it is
27 unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at a rate of pay either one and one-half
28 or two times the person's regular rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the

1 person on a daily or weekly basis.

2 36. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194, during the relevant time
3 period, Defendants were required to compensate Plaintiff and class members for all overtime
4 hours worked, calculated at one and one-half (1½) times the regular rate of pay for hours
5 worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week and for the first
6 eight (8) hours of the seventh consecutive work day, with double time after eight (8) hours on
7 the seventh day of any work week, or after twelve (12) hours in any work day.

8 37. Plaintiff and class members were non-exempt employees entitled to the
9 protections of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194.

10 38. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class
11 members overtime wages at the correct rate because they failed to include non-discretionary
12 wages, including, but not limited to, bonuses, shift premiums, and/or other incentive pay in the
13 computation of their overtime rate of pay, which caused Plaintiff and Class Members to not be
14 paid all overtime wages owed.

15 39. In violation of state law, Defendants have knowingly and willfully refused to
16 perform their obligations and compensate Plaintiff and class members for all wages earned as
17 alleged above.

18 40. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class members the unpaid balance of
19 overtime compensation, as required by California law, violates the provisions of Labor Code
20 §§ 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

21 41. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled to
22 recover their unpaid overtime compensation as well as interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

23 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

25 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 11)**

26 42. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
27 though fully set forth herein.

28 43. Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work

1 during any meal period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

2 44. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states, “no employer shall employ
3 any person for a work period of more than five (5) hours without a meal period of not less than
4 30 minutes, except that when a work period of not more than six (6) hours will complete the
5 day’s work the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the
6 employee.”

7 45. Labor Code § 512(a) provides that an employer may not require, cause or permit
8 an employee to work for a period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the
9 employee with an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if
10 the total work period per day of the employee is not more than six (6) hours, the meal period
11 may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee.

12 46. Labor Code § 512(a) also provides that an employer may not employ an
13 employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day without providing the employee
14 with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours
15 worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual
16 consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

17 47. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members did not receive
18 compliant meal periods for each five hours worked per day.

19 48. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Order require
20 an employer to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular rate of
21 compensation for each work day that a meal period is not provided.

22 49. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members meal
23 period premiums for meal period violations pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 11
24 of the applicable IWC Wage Order.

25 50. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and class members an
26 additional hour of pay for each day a meal period was not provided, Plaintiff and class members
27 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

28 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

1 **FAILURE TO PERMIT REST BREAKS**

2 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7; Violation of IWC Wage Order § 12)**

3 51. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
4 though fully set forth herein.

5 52. Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to
6 work during any rest period mandated by the IWC Wage Orders.

7 53. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order states “every employer shall
8 authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in
9 the middle of each work period” and the “authorized rest period time shall be based on the total
10 hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major
11 fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½) hours.

12 54. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members did not receive a ten
13 (10) minute rest period for every four (4) hours or major fraction thereof worked.

14 55. Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order
15 requires an employer to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee’s regular
16 rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.

17 56. At all relevant times, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members rest
18 period premiums for rest period violations pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and section 12 of
19 the applicable IWC Wage Order.

20 57. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Plaintiff and class members an
21 additional hour of pay for each day a rest period was not provided, Plaintiff and class members
22 suffered and continue to suffer a loss of wages and compensation.

23 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

25 **(Violation of Labor Code § 226)**

26 58. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
27 though fully set forth herein.

28 59. Labor Code § 226(a) requires Defendants to provide each employee with an

1 accurate wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (1) gross
2 wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units
3 earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all
4 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
5 aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period
6 for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and the last four digits of his or
7 her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security
8 number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable
9 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at
10 each hourly rate by the employee.

11 60. During the relevant time period, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally
12 failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a) on wage statements that were provided to Plaintiff
13 and class members. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly state
14 accurate inclusive dates of the pay period for Plaintiff and class members.

15 61. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
16 and class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.
17 Specifically, Plaintiff and class members have been injured by Defendants' intentional
18 violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal right to
19 receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate itemized wage statements under
20 California Labor Code § 226(a). Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in order to determine the
21 extent of the underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur expenses and lost time.
22 Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs had Defendants
23 provided the accurate wages earned. This has also delayed Plaintiff's ability to demand and
24 recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants.

25 62. California Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to pay the greater of all
26 actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50.00) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred,
27 and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods,
28 plus attorney's fees and costs, to each employee who was injured by the employer's failure to

1 comply with California Labor Code § 226(a).

2 63. Defendants' violations of California Labor Code § 226(a) prevented Plaintiff
3 and class members from knowing, understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and
4 resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a result of Defendants'
5 knowing and intentional failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and
6 class members have suffered an injury, and the exact amount of damages and/or penalties is all
7 in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

8 64. Plaintiff and class members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California
9 Labor Code § 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code § 226, and
10 seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

11 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES DUE UPON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT AND**
13 **WITHIN THE REQUIRED TIME**

14 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203)**

15 65. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
16 though fully set forth herein.

17 66. California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an
18 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
19 immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his employment, his wages shall
20 become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee
21 has given seventy-two (72) hours previous notice of his intention to quit, in which case the
22 employee is entitled to his wages at the time of quitting.

23 67. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and
24 Waiting Time Subclass members all their earned wages upon termination including, but not
25 limited to, proper minimum wages and overtime compensation, either at the time of discharge
26 or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

27 68. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members all
28 their earned wages at the time of discharge or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving

1 Defendants' employ is in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

2 69. California Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay
3 wages owed immediately upon discharge or resignation in accordance with Labor Code §§ 201
4 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date at the
5 same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more
6 than thirty (30) days.

7 70. Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members are entitled to recover from
8 Defendants the statutory penalty which is defined as Plaintiff's and Waiting Time Subclass
9 members' regular daily wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of
10 pay, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §§ 17200, *ET SEQ.***

13 71. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as
14 though fully set forth herein.

15 72. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair,
16 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff and class members. Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights
17 affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

18 73. Defendants' activities, as alleged herein, violate California law and constitute
19 unlawful business acts or practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code
20 §§ 17200, *et seq.*

21 74. A violation of Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
22 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

23 75. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the
24 following respects:

25 (a) Failing to pay all overtime wages at the proper rate to Plaintiff and class
26 members in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198;

27 (b) Failing to provide timely meal periods without paying Plaintiff and class
28 members premium wages for every day said meal periods were not

provided in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;

(c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks without paying Plaintiff and class members premium wages for every day said rest breaks were not authorized or permitted in violation of Labor Code § 226.7;

(d) Failing to provide Plaintiff and class members with accurate itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226; and

(e) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass members upon separation of employment in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203.

76. Defendants intentionally avoided paying Plaintiff and class members' wages and monies, thereby creating for Defendants an artificially lower cost of doing business in order to undercut their competitors and establish and gain a greater foothold in the marketplace.

77. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* Plaintiff and class members are entitled to restitution of the wages unlawfully withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of the Complaint; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

ENFORCEMENT OF LABOR CODE §§ 2698, *ET SEQ.* ("PAGA")

78. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

79. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for violation of the Labor 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 pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

1 80. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
2 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one hundred
3 dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
4 hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay
5 period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

6 81. The following sections of the Labor Code include those violated by Defendants
7 and those upon which Plaintiff seeks the recovery of civil penalties:

- 8 (a) Labor Code §§ 201-203, 204, 210, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198 for failure to
9 timely pay all earned wages (including overtime wages) owed to Plaintiff
10 and other aggrieved employees during employment and upon separation of
11 employment as herein alleged;
- 12 (b) Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
13 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages
14 for missed meal periods as herein alleged;
- 15 (c) Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to Plaintiff and other
16 aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest
17 periods as herein alleged;
- 18 (d) Labor Code § 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate itemized wage
19 statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;
20 and
- 21 (e) Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate and
22 complete records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily by
23 and the wages paid to aggrieved employees.

24 82. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged
25 violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is properly
26 suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

27 ///

28 ///

1 83. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3 as
2 to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and all
3 other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

4 84. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3, and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
5 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections
6 cited above.

7 85. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs incurred
8 herein.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 Plaintiff, on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief
11 and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

12 1. For certification of this action as a class action, including certifying the Class
13 and Subclass(es) alleged by Plaintiff;

14 2. For appointment of Victor Flores as the class representative;

15 3. For appointment of Aegis Law Firm, PC, as class counsel for all purposes;

16 4. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof with interest
17 thereon;

18 5. For economic and/or special damages in an amount according to proof with
19 interest thereon;

20 6. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit and interest to the extent permitted
21 by law, including pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, Labor Code §§ 226(e), 1194,
22 and 2698, *et seq.*;

23 7. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant
24 to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

25 8. For restitution as provided by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

26 9. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each
27 employee acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair
28 or fraudulent and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions

1 Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*;

2 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
3 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits and penalties, including interest thereon;


4 11. For pre-judgment interest;

5 12. For civil penalties; and

6 13. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

7
8 Dated: July 10, 2020

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

9
10 By:  _____

Jessica L. Campbell

11 Simon Kwak


Attorneys for Plaintiff

12
13 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

14 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

15
16 Dated: July 10, 2020

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

17
18 By:  _____

Jessica L. Campbell

19 Simon Kwak

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I, the undersigned, am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over
3 the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; am employed with Aegis Law Firm PC and
4 my business address is 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100, Irvine, California 92618.

5 On July 10, 2020, I served the foregoing document entitled:

6 • **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

7 on all the appearing and/or interested parties in this action by delivering ☐ *the original*
8 ☒ *a true copy* thereof on the party(ies) addressed below as follows:

9 Registered Agent Solutions, Inc. (C2392069)
10 1220 S. Street, Ste 150N
11 Sacramento, CA 95811

12 *Agent for Service of Process for:*
13 ACCO ENGINEERED SYSTEMS, INC.

14 ☒ **(BY MAIL)** I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing
15 correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S.
16 Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Irvine, California
17 in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service
18 is presumed invalid if postage cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one
19 day after date of deposit for mailing this affidavit. (*Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a); Fed.*
20 *R. Civ. Proc. 5(a); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(c).*)


21 ☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT MAIL)** I am personally and readily familiar with the business
22 practice of Aegis Law Firm PC for collection and processing correspondence for
23 overnight delivery, and I caused such document(s) described herein to be deposited for
24 delivery to a facility regularly maintained Federal Express for overnight delivery. (*Cal*
25 *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(c).*)

26 ☐ **(BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION)** I caused said document(s) to be served via
27 electronic transmission via the above listed email addresses on the date below. (*Cal.*
28 *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(6); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(b)(2)(E); Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5(b)(3).*)

☐ **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE)** I delivered the foregoing document by hand delivery to
the addressed named above. (*Cal Code Civ. Proc. § 1011; Fed. R. Civ. Proc.*
5(b)(2)(A).)

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 10, 2020, at Irvine, California.


Delaney Graves

RIVE, SUITE 100

\$1.400
US POSTAGE
FIRST-CLASS
FROM 92618
JUL 10 2020
stamps



endicia *****



Agent for ACCO Engineered Systems, Inc.
Registered Agent Solutions, Inc.
1220 S. Street, Ste 150N
Sacramento CA 95811-7138