

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
ghan@justicelawcorp.com
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
statavos@justicelawcorp.com
JASON ROTHMAN (SBN 304961)
jrothman@justicelawcorp.com
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue Suite 101
Pasadena, CA 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Leroy Rost,
On behalf of himself and all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

LEROY ROST, individually, and on behalf
of other members of the general public
similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

v.

LEHIGH HANSON, INC., a Delaware
corporation; HANSON AGGREGATES
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive;

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY
FILED

11/10/2021 8:02 AM

SAN LUIS OBISPO SUPERIOR COURT
BY Carol L. McGulrk
Carol L. McGulrk, Deputy Clerk

Case No.: 20CV-0225

CLASS ACTION

Assigned for All Purposes To:
Hon. Tana L. Coates
Dept.: 9

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

- (1) Failure to Pay Wages and Overtime Under Labor Code § 510;
- (2) Meal Period Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
- (3) Rest-Break Liability Under Labor Code § 226.7;
- (4) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages Under Labor Codes §§ 1194 and 1197
- (5) Violation of Labor Code § 203;
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a);
- (7) Failure to Reimburse Expenses § 2802
- (8) Violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq*; and
- (9) Penalties Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, *et seq*

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Original Complaint: April 24, 2020
Trial Date: None Set

COMES NOW, Plaintiff LEROY ROST (“Plaintiff”), individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The “amount in controversy” for the named Plaintiff, including claims for compensatory damages, restitution, penalties, wages, premium pay, and pro rata share of attorneys’ fees, is less than seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000).

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

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, Defendants 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.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, and/or transact business in the State of California, including the County of San Luis Obispo. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took place in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff within the State of California, County of San Luis Obispo.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff LEROY ROST is an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Defendant LEHIGH HANSON, INC., at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California,

1 including the County of San Luis Obispo. Defendant HANSON AGGREGATES LLC, at all
2 times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware limited liability
3 company, and at all times herein mentioned, was and is, an employer whose employees are
4 engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Luis Obispo.

5 7. At all relevant times, Defendants LEHIGH HANSON, INC. and HANSON
6 AGGREGATES LLC were the “employer” of Plaintiff within the meaning of all applicable
7 California laws and statutes.

8 8. At all times herein relevant, Defendants LEHIGH HANSON, INC., HANSON
9 AGGREGATES LLC and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners,
10 joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest,
11 co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting
12 within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint
13 employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and
14 all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge,
15 permission, encouragement, authorization, and consent of each defendant designated herein.

16 9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or
17 otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff, who sues
18 said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on that
19 information and belief alleges, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is legally
20 responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused
21 the injuries and damages to Plaintiff and the other class members as alleged in this Complaint.
22 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and
23 capacities when the same have been ascertained.

24 10. Defendants LEHIGH HANSON, INC., HANSON AGGREGATES LLC and
25 DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

26 11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled or
27 affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
28 Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and

employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

13. The proposed class is defined as follows: All current and former California-based (*i.e.*, currently “residing” in California with the intent to remain in California indefinitely) hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through staffing agencies or labor contractors) of Defendants within the State of California at any time during the period from four years preceding the filing of this Complaint to final judgment.

14. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

15. The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation:

a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50) individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants’ employment records.

b. Typicality: Plaintiff’s claims are typical of all other class members’ claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-defined community of interest.

c. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each class member, with whom he has a well-defined community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff has no interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiff’s attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiff has incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur, costs and attorneys’ fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of each class member.

1 d. Superiority: A class action is superior to other available methods for the
2 fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation because individual joinder of all class members
3 is impractical.

4 e. Public Policy Considerations: Certification of this lawsuit as a class
5 action will advance public policy objectives. Employers of this great state violate employment
6 and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear
7 of direct or indirect retaliation. However, class actions provide the class members who are not
8 named in the complaint anonymity that allows for the vindication of their rights.

9 16. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class members that
10 predominate over questions affecting only individual members. The following common
11 questions of law or fact, among others, exist as to the members of the class:

- 12 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or
13 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- 14 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt
15 employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed
16 meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- 17 c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and the other class members to
18 work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week
19 and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiff
20 and the other class members;
- 21 d. Whether Defendants properly calculated the regular rate for Plaintiff and
22 the other class members to worked overtime and earned incentive pay;
- 23 e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and the other class members of
24 meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class
25 members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- 26 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
27 other class members for all hours worked;
- 28 g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the other

1 class members within the required time upon their discharge or
2 resignation;

3 h. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and
4 the other class members during their employment;

5 i. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the
6 California Labor Code, including, inter alia, section 226;

7 j. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class
8 members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;

9 k. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

10 l. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
11 California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

12 m. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary
13 penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

14 n. Whether Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to
15 compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

16 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

17 17. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff
18 and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

19 18. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff as an hourly-paid
20 employee from in or about November of 2017 to August of 2019 in the State of California,
21 County of San Luis Obispo.

22 19. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiff and other class
23 members; to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiff's and other class members'
24 employment; and to supervise their daily employment activities.

25 20. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
26 Plaintiff and other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiff and
27 the other class members.

28 ///

1 21. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and other
2 class members.

3 22. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
4 State of California.

5 23. Plaintiff and other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or
6 forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

7 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
9 employees within the State of California. This scheme involved, inter alia, failing to pay them
10 for all hours worked, missed meal periods, and missed rest breaks in violation of California
11 law.

12 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive
14 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiff and other class members were not
15 receiving wages for overtime compensation.

16 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
17 failed to provide Plaintiff and other class members the required rest and meal periods during
18 the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders
19 and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

20 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
21 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
22 timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and
23 the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
24 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and other class members did not receive all timely and proper
25 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
26 period was missed.

27 ///

28 ///

1 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
3 timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff
4 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, late or
5 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and other class members did not receive all rest periods or
6 payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a rest period was
7 missed.

8 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
9 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive at
10 least minimum wages for compensation and that Plaintiff and other class members were not
11 receiving at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

12 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive the
14 wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages
15 and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiff and other class members did not, in fact,
16 receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

17 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
18 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive
19 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, Plaintiff
20 and other class members did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from
21 Defendants. The deficiencies included, inter alia, the failure to include the total number of
22 hours worked by Plaintiff and other class members.

23 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
24 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to
25 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

26 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
27 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
28 for Plaintiff and other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did not

1 keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and other class members.

2 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
3 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and other class
4 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
5 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
6 represented to Plaintiff and other class members that they were properly denied wages, all in
7 order to increase Defendants' profits.

8 35. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
9 Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other class members for all hours
10 worked. Plaintiff and other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per
11 day and/or forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.

12 36. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
13 Defendants failed to provide the requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to
14 Plaintiff and other class members.

15 37. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
16 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members at least minimum wages for all
17 hours worked.

18 38. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
19 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members the wages owed to them upon
20 discharge or resignation.

21 39. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
22 Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and other class
23 members.

24 40. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
25 Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and other class
26 members.

27 41. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
28 Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and other class members pursuant to

1 California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

2 42. California Labor Code section 218 states that nothing in Article 1 of the Labor
3 Code shall limit the right of any wage claimant to "sue directly . . . for any wages or penalty
4 due to him [or her] under this article."

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198)**

7 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

8 43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1
9 through 42, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
10 forth herein.

11 44. California Labor Code section 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare
12 Commission ("IWC") Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without
13 compensating them at a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person's regular
14 rate of pay, depending on the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly
15 basis.

16 45. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
17 were required to pay Plaintiff and other class members employed by Defendants, who
18 work(ed) more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at
19 the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more
20 than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

21 46. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
22 required to pay Plaintiff and other class members overtime compensation at a rate of two times
23 their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of twelve (12) hours in a day.

24 47. California Labor Code section 510 codifies the right to overtime compensation
25 at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours
26 in a day or forty (40) hours in a week or for the first eight (8) hours worked on the seventh day
27 of work, and overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in
28 excess of twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day

1 of work.

2 48. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff and other class
3 members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a
4 week.

5 49. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
6 Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and other
7 class members (but not all).

8 50. Defendants' pattern and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other class
9 members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws,
10 violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore
11 unlawful.

12 51. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and other class
13 members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and
14 attorneys' fees.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a))**

17 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

18 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs
19 1 through 51, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
20 forth herein.

21 53. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the IWC Order and California
22 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and other class members'
23 employment by Defendants.

24 54. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
25 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest
26 period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

27 55. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage
28 Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require,

1 cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day
2 without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except
3 that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal
4 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

5 56. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage
6 Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not
7 require, cause, or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than ten (10) hours
8 per day without providing the employee with a second uninterrupted meal period of not less
9 than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12)
10 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the
11 employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

12 57. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
13 Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) who were scheduled to work for a period of time
14 no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by
15 mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an
16 uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

17 58. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
18 Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) who were scheduled to work for a period of time
19 no longer than twelve (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods
20 by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an
21 uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

22 59. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
23 Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) who were scheduled to work for a period of time
24 in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without
25 an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

26 60. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
27 Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) who were scheduled to work for a period of time
28 in excess of twelve (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours

1 without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest
2 period.

3 61. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
4 Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and other class members (but not all)
5 to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members
6 (but not all) the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

7 62. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
8 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) the full meal period
9 premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

10 63. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
11 Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

12 64. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
13 226.7(b), Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
14 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that
15 the meal or rest period is not provided.

16 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

18 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

19 65. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
20 through 64, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
21 forth herein.

22 66. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage
23 Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and other class
24 members' employment by Defendants.

25 67. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
26 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period
27 mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

28 ///

68. During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “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” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

69. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

70. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

71. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members (but not all) the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7

72. Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

73. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period was not provided.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197)

(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)

74. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 73 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set

1 forth herein.

2 75. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
3 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a
4 lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

5 76. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
6 Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) as
7 required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197.

8 77. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other class members the minimum wage
9 as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197. Pursuant to those sections,
10 Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum
11 wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an
12 amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

13 78. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and other class
14 members are entitled to recover liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages
15 unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202)**

18 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

19 79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
20 through 78, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
21 forth herein.

22 80. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections
23 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid
24 at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and if an employee quits his or her
25 employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than seventy-two (72)
26 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (72) hours notice of his or her
27 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of
28 quitting.

81. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

82. Defendants' pattern and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

83. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then 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 is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

84. Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to the thirty (30) day maximum as provided by Labor Code section 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a))

(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)

85. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 84, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

86. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the

1 employee and his or her social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity
2 that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
3 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions
4 made from payments of wages shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated,
5 showing the month, day, and year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions
6 shall be kept on file by the employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a
7 central location within the State of California.

8 87. As a pattern and practice, Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to
9 provide Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) with complete and accurate wage
10 statements. The deficiencies include but are not limited to: the failure to include the total
11 number of hours worked by Plaintiff and other class members.

12 88. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a),
13 Plaintiff and other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected
14 rights.

15 89. More specifically, Plaintiff and other class members have been injured by
16 Defendants' intentional and willful violation of California Labor Code section 226(a) because
17 they were denied both their legal right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving,
18 accurate and itemized wage statements pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(a).

19 90. Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the
20 greater of their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor
21 Code section 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars per
22 employee.

23 91. Plaintiff and other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure
24 compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

25 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802)**

27 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

28 92. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1

1 through 91, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
2 forth herein.

3 93. Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
4 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
5 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her
6 obedience to the directions of the employer.

7 94. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiff and other
8 class members (but not all) for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiff and
9 other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and
10 costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the
11 date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments in
12 civil actions in the State of California.

13 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **(Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*)**

15 **(Against all Named Defendants and DOES 1 through 100)**

16 95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
17 through 94, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
18 forth herein.

19 96. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair,
20 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants'
21 competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public
22 interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

23 97. Defendants' activities as alleged herein are violations of California law, and
24 constitute unlawful business acts and practices in violation of California Business &
25 Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*

26 98. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*
27 may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants'
28 pattern and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other class members work overtime hours

1 without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and
2 1198. Additionally, Defendants' pattern and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other class
3 members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper
4 compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants'
5 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiff and other class members violate
6 California Labor Code sections 201 and 202. Defendants also violated California Labor Code
7 sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800 and 2802.

8 99. As a result of the herein described violations of California law, Defendants
9 unlawfully gained an unfair advantage over other businesses.

10 100. Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) have been personally injured by
11 Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not
12 necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

13 101. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*,
14 Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained
15 by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this Complaint;
16 an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and
17 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

18 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Violation of Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*)**

20 **(Against JAFRA COSMETICS INTERNATIONAL, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

21 102. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
22 through 101, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
23 forth herein.

24 103. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code
25 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its
26 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
27 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
28 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees

1 104. On April 21, 2020, Plaintiff Leroy Rost provided written notice to the LWDA
2 and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code he contends were violated, and the
3 theories supporting his contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by
4 reference is a copy of the written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff Leroy Rost believes that on or
5 about June 25, 2020, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired as to all Defendants, and the
6 LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiff
7 Leroy Rost has exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action

8 105. Plaintiff Leroy Rost and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are
9 “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all
10 current or former employees of Defendants who worked for Defendants at any time during the
11 period from April 21, 2019, to the present, and one or more of the alleged violations was
12 committed against them.

13 **Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages**

14 106. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to compensate their non-
15 exempt employees minimum wages for all hours worked and overtime wages for all hours
16 worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a workweek, pursuant to the
17 mandate of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198.

18 107. As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff Brandi
19 Johnson and other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a
20 failure to pay all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

21 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks**

22 108. In accordance with the mandates of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, Defendants
23 were required to authorize and permit their non-exempt employees to take a 10-minute rest
24 break for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof, and were further required to
25 provide their non-exempt employees with a 30-minute meal period for every five (5) hours
26 worked.

27 109. As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Brandi Johnson
28 and other aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest

breaks and failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment

110. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees within a specified time period pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code § 204.

111. As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Brandi Johnson and other aggrieved current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time period.

Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination

112. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 201 to 204.

113. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Brandi Johnson and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements

114. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to keep *accurate* records regarding their California employees pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1174.

115. As a result of Defendants' various Labor Code violations, Defendants failed to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff Brandi Johnson and other aggrieved current and former employees. For example, Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff Brandi Johnson and other aggrieved current and former employees' gross wages earned, total hours worked, all deductions, net wages earned, and all applicable hourly rates and the number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses

116. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§

1 2800 and 2802.

2 117. As a pattern and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Brandi Johnson and
3 other aggrieved current and former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them
4 within the required time period.

5 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

6 Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly
7 situated, requests a trial by jury.

8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other members of the general
10 public similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and
11 severally, as follows:

12 **Class Certification**

- 13 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
14 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as representative of the Class;
15 3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as Class Counsel; and
16 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
17 current contact information (address, e-mail and telephone numbers) of all class members.

18 **As to the First Cause of Action**

- 19 5. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
20 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay
21 all overtime wages due to Plaintiff and other class members (but not all);

- 22 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special
23 damages as may be appropriate;

- 24 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
25 from the date such amounts were due;

- 26 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
27 California Labor Code section 1194; and

- 28 9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Second Cause of Action

10. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiff and the other class members (but not all);

11. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal period was not provided;

12. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

13. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

14. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due;

15. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Third Cause of Action

17. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members (but not all);

18. That the Court make an award to Plaintiff and the other class members of one (1) hour of pay at each employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

19. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

20. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);

21. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were due; and

22. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and the other class members (but not all);

24. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

25. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due;

26. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194(a);

27. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

28. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

29. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the time of termination of the employment of Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) no longer employed by Defendants;

30. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

31. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

32. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such amounts were due; and

33. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

34. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and other class members (but not all), and willfully failed to provide accurate

1 itemized wage statements thereto;

2 35. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

3 36. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(e);

4 37. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to
5 California Labor Code section 226(g); and

6 38. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

7 **As to the Seventh Cause of Action**

8 39. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
9 Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other class
10 members (but not all) for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California
11 Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

12 40. For actual, consequential and incidental losses and damages, according to proof;

13 41. For the imposition of civil penalties and/or statutory penalties;

14 42. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

15 43. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein; and

16 44. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

17 **As to the Eighth Cause of Action**

18 45. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
19 Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiff and other
20 class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest
21 periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to
22 Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiff's and other class members' wages
23 timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, 202.

24 46. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and other class members and all pre-
25 judgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

26 47. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all
27 funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by
28 Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections

17200, *et seq.*;

48. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5;

49. For injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*; and

50. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

51. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiff Brandi Johnson, individually, and on behalf of other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant, as well as all statutory penalties against Defendants, and each of them, including but not limited to:

52. Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

53. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

54. Penalties under California Labor Code § 210 in addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;


55. Penalties under Labor Code § 1197.1 in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

1 56. Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other
2 statutes; and

3 57. Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 1194, and 2699, and
4 any other applicable statute

5
6 Dated: November 9, 2021

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

7
8
9 By:  _____

Douglas Han

Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh

Jason Rothman

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, Leroy Rost and all
similarly situated*

EXHIBIT 1

April 21, 2020

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov

State of California

Labor & Workforce Development Agency

800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55

Sacramento, California 95814

Re: LEHIGH HANSON, INC., HANSON AGGREGATES, LLC, LEHIGH CEMENT COMPANY, LLC, CALAVERAS MATERIALS, INC., AND SOUTH VALLEY MATERIALS, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent LeRoy Rost against Lehigh Hanson, Inc., Hanson Aggregates, LLC, Lehigh Cement Company, LLC, Calaveras Materials, Inc., South Valley Materials, Inc. (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "LEHIGH HANSON").

Mr. Rost is pursuing his California Labor Code sections 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Rost may seek penalties and wages for violations of the Labor Code on behalf of the State of California and aggrieved employees, which are recoverable under PAGA. This letter is sent in compliance with the reporting requirements of California Labor Code section 2699.3.

Lehigh Hanson, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 300 E. John Carpenter Freeway, Irving, Texas 75062. Hanson Aggregates, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company located at 300 E. John Carpenter Freeway, Irving, Texas 75062. Lehigh Cement Company, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company located at 300 E. John Carpenter Freeway, Irving, Texas 75062. Calaveras Materials, Inc. is a California corporation located at 3000 Executive Parkway, San Ramon, California 94583. South Valley Materials, Inc. is a California corporation located at 3000 Executive Parkway, San Ramon, California 94583.

¹ Mr. Rost does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner or corporate, of DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, and for that reason, said DOES are designated under such fictitious names. Mr. Rost will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Rost is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Rost and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

LEHIGH HANSON employed Mr. Rost as an hourly-paid non-exempt Equipment Operator and Groundsmen within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about August of 2019) in the State of California. LEHIGH HANSON directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Mr. Rost's employment.

The "aggrieved employees" that Mr. Rost may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through staffing agencies or labor contractors) of LEHIGH HANSON within the State of California.

LEHIGH HANSON failed to properly pay its hourly-paid or non-exempt employees for all hours worked, failed to properly provide or compensate minimum and overtime wages and for meal and rest breaks, failed to issue compliant wage statements and failed to reimburse for all necessary business-related costs and expenses, thus resulting in other Labor Code violations as stated below.

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, Mr. Rost has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at LEHIGH HANSON, regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

LEHIGH HANSON has violated and/or continues to violate, among other provisions of the California Labor Code and applicable wage law, California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code sections 510, 1194, and 1198 require employers to pay at least minimum wage for all hours worked, pay time-and-a-half, or double time overtime wages, and make it unlawful to work employees for hours longer than eight hours in one day and/or over forty hours in one week without paying the premium overtime rates. During the relevant time period, Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. LEHIGH HANSON failed to compensate Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift and during meal breaks. LEHIGH HANSON also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees were entitled to receive certain wages for overtime compensation, but they were not paid for all overtime hours worked.

California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 require employers to pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate for each workday that a meal or rest break is not provided. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON routinely required Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with LEHIGH HANSON policies and expectations, and meet production goals. Further, LEHIGH HANSON failed to authorize and permit Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees to take the requisite number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length. Despite these facts, LEHIGH HANSON failed to compensate Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees all the premium wages they were owed.

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 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. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON failed to pay Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees all wages, including for uncompensated off-the-clock work and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203 and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON failed to pay Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204.

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON did not provide Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from LEHIGH HANSON were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved 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 the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees.

California Labor Code section 558 allows recovery of penalties. (a) Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages. (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee. Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees have been denied their wages and premium wages and, therefore, are entitled to penalties.

California Labor Code sections 1174(d) requires an employer to keep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and any applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than two years. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees.

///

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, LEHIGH HANSON did not provide Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift and during meal breaks.

California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 require an employer to reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer. During their employment, Mr. Rost and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by LEHIGH HANSON, including for the use of their personal cellular phones and vehicle for work purposes, and purchasing personal protective equipment they were required to wear while working.

We believe that Mr. Rost and other current and former California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are entitled to penalties and wages as allowed under California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* for violations of Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802, and the IWC Wage Orders.

California Labor Code section 2699.3 requires that a claimant send a certified letter to the employer in questions and the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency setting forth the claims, and the basis for the claims, thereby giving the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency an opportunity to investigate the claims and/or take any action it deems appropriate.

The purpose of this letter is to satisfy the requirement created by California Labor code section 2699 prior to seeking penalties allowed by law for the aforementioned statutory violations. We look forward to determining whether California Labor & Workforce Development Agency intends to take any action in reference to these claims. We kindly request that you respond to this notice according to the time frame contemplated by the California Labor Code.

Mr. Rost will seek these penalties and wages on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of LEHIGH HANSON within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

LWDA
April 21, 2020
Page 6 of 6

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your attention to this matter and the noble cause you advance each and every day.

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas Han, Esq.

CC: (By Certified U.S. Mail Only)

Lehigh Hanson, Inc., Hanson Aggregates, LLC, Lehigh Cement Company, LLC,
Calaveras Materials, Inc., and South Valley Materials, Inc.

c/o - CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, California 95833.

Agent for Service of Process for Lehigh Hanson, Inc., Hanson Aggregates, LLC, Lehigh
Cement Company, LLC, Calaveras Materials, Inc., and South Valley Materials, Inc.

CC: (By Electronic Mail Only)

Michele Ballard Miller, Esq.
mbmiller@cozen.com

COZEN O'CONNOR

Counsel of Record for Lehigh Hanson, Inc. and Hanson Aggregates, LLC

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

PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Ste. 101 Pasadena, California 91103. My electronic service address is fgonzalez@justicelawcorp.com

On November 10, 21, I served the foregoing document described as

FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

for the following case: **Rost v. Lehigh Hanson, Inc., et al.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA-CM-783988-20**
20CV-0225
San Luis Obispo County Superior Court

on interested parties in this action by electronically submitting as follows:

State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

Pursuant to California Senate Bill No. 836, I caused the documents described above to be electronically submitted by and through the procedure stated on the website of the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency.

[X] STATE

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

Executed on November 10, 2021, at Pasadena, California.



Flor Gonzalez