

DAILY ALJIAN LLP

Justin E. D. Daily (State Bar No. 209772)

jd@dallp.com

Reed Aljian (State Bar No. 211010)

ra@dallp.com

Simon Kwak (State Bar No. 297362)

sk@dallp.com

Joshua D. Klein (State Bar No. 322099)

jklein@dallp.com

100 Bayview Circle, Suite 5500

Newport Beach, CA 92660

Telephone: 949.861.2524

Facsimile: 949.269.6364

(Additional Counsel Listed on Following Page)

Attorneys for Plaintiff Juan Siempre Javier,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA****COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**JUAN SIEMPRE JAVIER, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

WEBSTER BROS. CONCRETE
CONSTRUCTION, INC., a California
corporation; JASON WEBSTER, an
individual; JEFF WEBSTER, an
individual; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO.: 20STCV27129Assigned for All Purposes to:
Hon. Amy D. Hogue
Dept. 7**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

1. Failure to Pay All Wages;
2. Failure to Provide Meal Periods or Compensation in Lieu Thereof;
3. Failure to Permit Rest Periods or Provide Compensation in Lieu Thereof;
4. Knowing and Intentional Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
5. Waiting Time Penalties;
6. Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses;
7. Violations of the Unfair Competition Law; and
8. Enforcement of the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**11/22/2021**

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: M. Arellanes Deputy

LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL J. HYUN

Daniel J. Hyun (State Bar No. 309184)

dh@danielhyunlaw.com

Shelly D. Song (State Bar No. 312036)

ss@danielhyunlaw.com

1100 West Town and Country Road, Suite 1250

Orange, California 92868

Telephone: 949.596.4782

Facsimile: 949.528.2596

Attorneys for Plaintiff Juan Siempre Javier,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

1 Plaintiff JUAN SIEMPRE JAVIER (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and all others
2 similarly situated, hereby brings this First Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint
3 (“Complaint”) against Defendants WEBSTER BROS. CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION, INC., a
4 California corporation; JASON WEBSTER, an individual; JEFF WEBSTER, an individual; and
5 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”), and alleges as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. Plaintiff brings this proposed class action pursuant to California Code of Civil
8 Procedure section 382, on behalf of himself and all current and former non-exempt employees of
9 Defendants in California during the Class Period (collectively the “Class” or “Class Members”).
10 The term Class Period is defined as four years and 178 days prior to the filing of this action to the
11 date of class certification. The applicable statutes of limitation were tolled between April 6, 2020,
12 and October 1, 2020, pursuant to the California Rules of Court, Appendix I, Emergency Rule 9.

13 2. Plaintiff also brings this representative action pursuant to Labor Code sections 2698
14 *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against Defendants, on behalf of himself individually and other aggrieved
15 employees who are and were employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout
16 California during the PAGA Period. The term PAGA Period is defined as one year and 178 days
17 prior to Plaintiff’s notice of Labor Code violations to the Labor and Workforce Development
18 Agency (“LWDA”) and Defendants until judgment. The applicable statutes of limitation were
19 tolled between April 6, 2020, and October 1, 2020, pursuant to the California Rules of Court,
20 Appendix I, Emergency Rule 9.

21 3. This proposed class action seeks, *inter alia*, unpaid wages (including minimum,
22 regular, and overtime wages); compensation for non-compliant meal periods and rest breaks;
23 waiting time penalties; itemized wage statement penalties; business expense reimbursements;
24 interest; and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs. Plaintiff’s class action is brought under, *inter*
25 *alia*, the California Industrial Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders and applicable
26 provisions of the California Code of Regulations, California Business & Professions Code
27 sections 17200 *et seq.*, California Civil Code section 3289, California Code of Civil Procedure
28 section 1021.5, and California Labor Code sections 201-204, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510,

1 512, 558, 558.1, 1174, 1174.5, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698 *et seq.*, 2800 and
2 2802.

3 4. Under the California Unfair Competition Law, Business and Professions Code
4 sections 17200 *et seq.* (“UCL”), and pursuant to the class action procedures provided for in this
5 statute, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the proposed Class, seeks declaratory relief, injunctive
6 relief, and restitution of all benefits Defendants have received from their employees due to their
7 unlawful business practices, including but not limited to, its failure to timely provide minimum
8 wage, regular, and overtime compensation due for all hours worked, failure to reimburse business
9 expenses, failure to maintain proper records of hours worked, failure to provide compliant meal
10 periods and rest breaks to their employees or compensation in lieu thereof, and failure to provide
11 accurate itemized wage statements.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 5. This Court has jurisdiction over all causes of action asserted herein pursuant to the
14 California Constitution, Article VI, section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction
15 in all cases except those given to other trial courts. All claims alleged herein arise under California
16 law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law. Further, this is a class action
17 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and representative action under PAGA.
18 As such, the monetary damages, restitution, penalties, and other amounts sought by Plaintiff
19 exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to
20 proof at trial. The Court also has jurisdiction over certain causes of action pursuant to California
21 Business & Professions Code sections 17203 and 17204, which provide for exclusive jurisdiction
22 for enforcement of this statute in any court of competent jurisdiction.

23 6. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because each Defendant is a citizen
24 of California, a corporation or association organized under the laws of the State of California, an
25 association authorized to do business in California and registered with the California Secretary of
26 State, does sufficient business in California, has sufficient minimum contacts with California,
27 and/or intentionally avails itself of the laws and markets of California through the promotion, sale,
28 marketing and distribution of its products and/or services in California to render the exercise of

1 jurisdiction by the California courts permissible.

2 7. Venue in Los Angeles County is proper under California Business & Professions
3 Code section 17203 and California Code of Civil Procedure section 395.5 because a substantial
4 part of Defendants' unlawful conduct, acts, and omissions alleged herein occurred in this County,
5 Defendants had and have ongoing projects in this County, Defendants conduct substantial business
6 in this County, Defendants' liability arose in this County, and/or Defendants reside, transact
7 business, maintain offices, and/or have an agent or agents in this county. The relief requested is
8 within the jurisdiction of this Court.

9 **PARTIES**

10 8. Plaintiff is an individual who resides in Los Angeles County, California and was
11 formerly employed by Defendants in California as a non-exempt employee during the Class Period.
12 Plaintiff was assigned to work at Defendants' worksites in Los Angeles County during the Class
13 Period.

14 9. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times,
15 WEBSTER BROS. CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION, INC. ("WEBSTER") was and is a California
16 corporation with its principal executive office located in Ventura County. WEBSTER is in the
17 construction business and primarily builds homes and mansions in Los Angeles County, such as
18 Beverly Hills and Malibu. WEBSTER regularly conducts business within the State of California
19 and derives substantial revenues from services performed in California. WEBSTER is, and at all
20 relevant times was, an employer subject to California state wage and hour laws. Plaintiff is
21 informed, believes, and thereon alleges that the practices and policies of WEBSTER that are
22 complained of by way of this Complaint were implemented during the relevant time period.

23 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant JASON
24 WEBSTER ("Jason") is the Chief Executive Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and Secretary for
25 Defendant WEBSTER. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all relevant
26 times herein, Jason was involved in the day-to-day operations of WEBSTER's facilities and
27 worksites, including hiring, firing, and disciplining employees; making inadequate cash payments
28 to employees, enforcing company rules, policies, and practices; working directly at WEBSTER's

1 facilities; and meeting and communicating with current and former employees, among other things.
2 Consequently, Jason violated or caused to be violated the IWC Wage Order provisions regulating
3 minimum wages or hours and days of work, as well as Labor Code Sections 203, 204,
4 226, 226.7, 1194, 1197, and 2802 as explained below. Thus, Jason is personally liable for the Labor
5 Code and IWC Wage Order violations pursuant to Labor Code Section 558.1.

6 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant JEFF
7 WEBSTER (“Jeff”) serves as Director for Defendant WEBSTER. Plaintiff is informed and
8 believes, and thereon alleges, that at all relevant times herein, Jeff was involved in the day-to-day
9 operations of WEBSTER’s facilities and worksites, including hiring, firing, and disciplining
10 employees; making inadequate cash payments to employees, enforcing company rules, policies,
11 and practices; working directly at WEBSTER’s facilities; and meeting and communicating with
12 current and former employees, among other things. Consequently, Jeff violated or caused to be
13 violated the IWC Wage Order provisions regulating minimum wages or hours and days of work,
14 as well as Labor Code Sections 203, 204, 226, 226.7, 1194, 1197, and 2802 as explained below.
15 Thus, Jeff is personally liable for the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order violations pursuant to
16 Labor Code Section 558.1.

17 12. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

18 13. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of those Defendants identified
19 as DOES 1 through 50. Therefore, Plaintiff identifies those Defendants fictitiously. Plaintiff is
20 informed, believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each DOE Defendant was a parent,
21 sister, or related corporate entity of Defendants, or an owner, employee or agent of Defendants, and
22 each related entity, and was acting with the knowledge and authorization of each of the other
23 Defendants. Plaintiff will seek to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of
24 each DOE Defendant when their names have been ascertained and identified. Plaintiff is informed,
25 believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants sued as DOES 1 through 50 participated
26 in, received the benefit of, or was in some way responsible for one or more of the wrongful acts
27 and omissions and some portion of the damages alleged herein.

28 ///

1 14. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that at all times material hereto,
2 each Defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendant,
3 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of
4 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendant. Furthermore, Defendants in all
5 respects acted as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

6 15. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, each and all of
7 them, at all times material hereto, were the joint employers, parent companies, successor
8 companies, predecessors in interest, affiliates, agents, employees, servants, joint venturers,
9 directors, fiduciaries, representatives, and/or co-conspirators of each of the remaining Defendants.
10 Defendants, unless otherwise alleged, at all times material hereto, performed all acts and omissions
11 alleged herein within the course and scope of said relationship(s), and are a proximate cause of
12 Plaintiff's damages as herein alleged.

13 16. Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges, that there exists a unity of interest
14 in ownership between Defendants and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, such that any individuality
15 and separateness between the individual and the corporation does not exist, as Defendants, and
16 DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are alter egos, in that: (1) Defendants are and at all times mentioned
17 herein were mere shells, instrumentalities and conduits through which DOES 1 through 50,
18 inclusive, carried out their business in the business name, exercising complete control and
19 dominance over such business; (2) that Defendants were conceived, intended and used by DOES 1
20 through 50, inclusive, as devices to avoid individual liability and in place of Defendants, and DOES
21 1 through 50, inclusive, and were without the financial solvency and responsibility required by law;
22 and (3) that all of the assets of the Defendants have been transferred to DOES 1 through 50,
23 inclusive, or some other individual or entity which he or she owns or controls, with the intent to
24 hinder, delay or defraud creditors of Defendants, leaving Defendants with no assets. Further,
25 Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon alleges, that there exists a principal-agency relationship
26 between and among Defendants.

27 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendants were agents of each other and acting within
28 the course and scope of their agency.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

18. Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of a proposed Class defined as follows:

Class:

All current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendants in the State of California within four years and 178 days prior to the commencement of this action to the date of class certification.

19. The Class is also comprised of the following Subclass:

Waiting Time Sub-Class:

Those members of the Class who separated from their employment with Defendants within three years prior to the commencement of this action to the date of class certification.

20. Plaintiff reserves the right pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.764 and 3.765, to amend or modify the respective definitions of the Class and/or Subclasses to provide greater specificity and/or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues based on further investigation and discovery.

21. This action is brought, and may properly be maintained, as a class action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation, and the proposed class is easily ascertainable. This action presents questions of common interest and satisfies the numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy, predominance, and superiority requirements of this provision.

22. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges Defendants have consistently maintained and enforced against Plaintiff and Class Members unlawful employment practices and policies which violate the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

23. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all minimum, regular, and overtime wages for all hours worked in violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. Specifically, during the relevant time period, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class

1 Members for all hours worked by rounding their time worked to Defendants' advantage, and
2 requiring Plaintiff and Class Members to perform work off-the-clock, such as arriving to work
3 before their scheduled start time, and reviewing text messages, phone calls, directions, and
4 assignments from Defendants' supervisors and employees while clocked out for their shifts,
5 without compensation. Defendants also underpaid Plaintiff and Class Members by deducting their
6 time worked. Defendants further failed to pay all overtime wages for hours worked at the proper
7 rates to Plaintiff and Class Members by failing to compensate them at one-and-a-half times their
8 regular rate of pay for each overtime hour worked, and forcing them to take paid-time-off or paid
9 days off at their regular rate of pay in lieu of proper overtime compensation.

10 24. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
11 period, Defendants deprived Plaintiff and Class Members of the opportunity to take all of their
12 statutorily entitled meal periods within the appropriate time intervals or provide compensation in
13 lieu thereof in violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. Specifically, Plaintiff
14 and Class Members were not allowed to leave the job site in order to take meal periods, and/or
15 frequently missed their meal periods, had them shortened, or interrupted because Defendants
16 required them to continue working or return to work before 30 minutes had passed. For example,
17 Plaintiff and Class Members were required to bring their own lunches or purchase food from a
18 nearby food truck in order to eat their meals at the worksite and be available to work. In addition,
19 on days where Plaintiff and Class Members performed cement work, they were not allowed to leave
20 the worksite while the cement dried. In addition, Plaintiff's and Class Members' meal periods were
21 interrupted, shortened, or late since they were required to report back to work prematurely, such as
22 when cement work was unexpectedly required or when a delivery arrived. Further, Defendants
23 failed to adopt and implement a policy authorizing a full second 30-minute meal period when
24 Plaintiff and Class Members worked in excess of 10 hours per workday, and maintained a practice
25 of prioritizing work demands over allowing employees to take compliant meal periods, which only
26 allowed Plaintiff and Class Members to take second meal periods that lasted up to 20 minutes.
27 Accordingly, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with uninterrupted off-duty
28 meal periods for at least 30 minutes when they worked more than five hours, and failed to provide

1 uninterrupted off-duty meal periods for at least 30 minutes when they worked more than 10 hours
2 in a workday. Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members with an additional
3 hour of pay at their regular rate for each day in which they were denied a compliant meal period.

4 25. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
5 period, Defendants failed to permit Plaintiff and Class Members to take all of their statutorily
6 entitled 10-minute rest periods for every four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof or provide
7 compensation in lieu thereof in violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.
8 Specifically, Defendants failed to adopt and implement a rest period policy, maintained a practice
9 of prioritizing work demands over allowing employees to take compliant rest breaks, did not permit
10 Plaintiff and Class Members to take rest breaks, and required them to remain on premises during
11 their entire shift. Defendants also failed to provide one additional hour of pay at the regular rate of
12 pay for each day that Plaintiff and Class Members missed a rest period, had them shortened,
13 interrupted, or had them restricted to the worksite.

14 26. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
15 period, Defendants willfully failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time
16 Subclass upon separation of employment in violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage
17 Orders. Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members were not paid all meal period premiums,
18 rest period premiums, reimbursements, and/or wages (including minimum, regular, and overtime
19 wages) within the required time period.

20 27. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
21 period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate and complete wage
22 statements in violation of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders. Plaintiff and Class
23 Members received wage statements which did not accurately reflect the gross and net wages earned,
24 total hours worked, and all applicable rates of pay and the corresponding number of hours worked
25 at each pay rate.

26 28. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
27 period, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for necessary business
28 expenses incurred in the performance of their duties in violation of the California Labor Code and

1 IWC Wage Orders. Specifically, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to drive their
2 personal vehicles to and from worksites and to load and unload dirt, tools, and other work-related
3 materials without reimbursing them for maintenance, insurance, excessive mileage, and wear and
4 tear on their vehicles. In addition, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to use their
5 personal cellular phones to communicate with supervisors and coworkers, receive job site and
6 assignment information, and navigate to worksites using their phone's GPS and/or internet
7 application without reimbursing them for a reasonable portion of their cellular phone bills. Further,
8 Plaintiff and Class Members were required to purchase, maintain, and use their own tools such as
9 hammers, drills, chisels, and toolbelts in order to perform their job duties without reimbursement.

10 29. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants' actions as
11 described throughout this Complaint were willful.

12 **NUMEROSITY**

13 30. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all of its members is impracticable. While
14 the exact number and identities of Class Members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can
15 only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed, believes and thereon
16 alleges that the Class consists of more than 200 persons.

17 31. A class action is the only available method for the fair and efficient adjudication of
18 this controversy. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is
19 impractical, if not impossible. The identity of Class Members can be ascertained by analysis of
20 Defendants' employee and payroll records.

21 **COMMONALITY**

22 32. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class that
23 predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common legal
24 and factual questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

25 (a) Whether Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all minimum,
26 regular, and overtime wages for all hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members;

27 (b) Whether Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to perform work
28 off-the-clock without compensation;

1 (c) Whether Defendants rounded Plaintiff and Class Members' time worked to
2 Defendants' advantage;

3 (d) Whether Defendants failed to provide timely, uninterrupted, off-duty 30-
4 minute meal periods to Plaintiff and Class Members without compensation in lieu thereof;

5 (e) Whether Defendants failed to permit timely, uninterrupted, off-duty 10-
6 minute rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked by Plaintiff and Class
7 Members without compensation in lieu thereof;

8 (f) Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and Waiting Time
9 Subclass Members all wages due either immediately upon termination or within 72 hours after
10 resignation;

11 (g) Whether Defendants' conduct was willful;

12 (h) Whether Defendants failed to issue accurate itemized wage statements to
13 Plaintiff and Class Members;

14 (i) Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for
15 necessary business expenditures;

16 (j) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
17 California Business & Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq.*; and

18 (k) Additional common questions of law and fact that may develop as the
19 litigation progresses.

20 **TYPICALITY**

21 33. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Plaintiff's claims are typical
22 of the claims of the Class because: Plaintiff and the Class sustained injuries and damages arising
23 out of and caused by Defendants' unlawful policies and practices; the claims arise out of the same
24 course of conduct by Defendants; Plaintiff's claims are based upon the same legal theories as the
25 claims of the Class; and the legal issues raised under California state law as a result of Defendants'
26 conduct apply equally to Plaintiff and the Class Members.

27 ///

28 ///

ADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION

34. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class, in that his claims (and defenses, if any) are typical of those of the Class. Plaintiff has no conflicts of interest with his fellow Class Members and will be able to fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff has the same interests in the litigation of this case as the Class Members; and is committed to vigorous prosecution of this case and has retained competent counsel experienced in class action and wage and hour litigation of this nature.

PREDOMINANCE

35. Defendants have engaged in a common course of wage and hour abuse toward Plaintiff and Class Members. The common issues arising from this conduct that affect Plaintiff and Class Members predominate over any individual issues. Adjudication of these common issues in a single action has important and desirable advantages of judicial economy.

SUPERIORITY OF CLASS ACTION

36. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy because individual litigation of the claims of all Class Members is impracticable. Even if every Class Member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous cases would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. Moreover, individual actions by Class Members may establish inconsistent standards of conduct for Defendants. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein, presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and the court system, and protects the rights of each Class Member.

37. Defendants have acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole, as requested herein.

///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES)
(Against All Defendants)

38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

39. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations.

40. California Labor Code section 204 and the IWC Wage Orders require timely payment of all wages owed on regularly scheduled paydays at least twice during each calendar month, on days designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays. All wages in earned in excess of the normal work period must be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period.

41. At all times relevant, California Labor Code section 510, and applicable sections of the California Code of Regulations and the IWC Wage Orders applied to Plaintiff's work with Defendants and continue to apply to Class Members' employment with Defendants. California Labor Code section 510 and applicable provisions of the California Code of Regulations and IWC Wage Orders state that any work performed in excess of eight hours in a workday and/or 40 hours in a workweek must be paid at one and one-half times the employee's regular rate of pay. Any work performed in excess of 12 hours in a workday must be compensated at the rate of no less than twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

42. California Labor Code section 1182.12 sets forth the minimum hourly wage that must be paid to all employees in California for all hours worked. Local minimum wage ordinances may provide for higher minimum wage rates that must be paid to employees for all hours worked in those locales where each local ordinance is in effect.

43. California Labor Code section 1194 provides that any employee receiving less than the legal minimum wage or the legal overtime compensation applicable to the employee is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of the full amount of the minimum wage or overtime

1 compensation, including interest thereon, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

2 44. California Labor Code section 1194.2 authorizes the recovery of liquidated damages
3 in an amount equal to the minimum wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

4 45. California Labor Code section 1197 provides that the payment of a lower wage than
5 the minimum wage fixed by the commission or by any applicable state or local law is unlawful.

6 46. California Labor Code section 1198 prohibits employers from employing for longer
7 hours or less favorable conditions than those set forth in the California Labor Code, IWC Wage
8 Orders, or as otherwise set by the Labor Commissioner.

9 47. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
10 period, Plaintiff and Class Members regularly worked over eight hours per workday and/or 40 hours
11 in a workweek.

12 48. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time
13 period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members all wages for hours worked (including
14 minimum, regular, and overtime wages), due to Defendants' practices of requiring Plaintiff and
15 Class Members to work-off-the-clock, deducting time worked, providing inadequate cash
16 payments, failing to pay overtime at the proper rate by forcing them to take paid-time-off or paid
17 days off at their regular rate of pay in lieu of proper overtime compensation, and rounding time
18 worked to Defendants' advantage.

19 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth
20 herein, Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained and continue to sustain damages, including loss
21 of earnings from minimum, regular, and overtime compensation due, in an amount to be established
22 at trial, plus prejudgment interest, attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to statute.

23 50. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
24 as described herein and below.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF)

(Against All Defendants)

51. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

52. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations.

53. California Labor Code section 512 and Section 11 of the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from employing any person for a work period of more than 5 hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than 30 minutes (commencing before the employee's fifth hour of work), except that if the total work period per day is no more than 6 hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee. A second meal period of not less than 30 minutes is required if an employee works more than 10 hours per day and must begin before the employee's tenth hour of work, except if the total hours worked is no more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and employee, but only if the first meal period was not waived.

54. Section 11 of the applicable IWC Wage Orders state that "[u]nless the employee is relieved of all duty during a 30-minute meal period, the meal period shall be considered an 'on duty' meal period and counted as time worked."

55. California Labor Code section 226.7(b) and the IWC Wage Orders prohibit an employer from requiring any employee to work during a meal period mandated by any California statute, regulation, standard or order. If an employer fails to provide an employee with a meal period in accordance with state law, California Labor Code section 226.7(c) and the IWC Wage Orders require that the employer pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the meal period is noncompliant.

56. Throughout the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive compliant meal periods when they worked more than five and/or 10 hours per day because their first and/or second meal periods were short, late, missed, interrupted, not free of all duties, and/or

1 restricted to the worksite.

2 57. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class
3 Members meal period premiums for noncompliant meal periods pursuant to California Labor Code
4 section 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Code of Regulations.

5 58. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Class Members did not
6 voluntarily waive their meal periods.

7 59. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth
8 herein, Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained and continue to sustain damages, including loss
9 of premium pay for meal period violations and earnings, in an amount to be established at trial, plus
10 prejudgment interest pursuant to statute. To the extent such unpaid premiums or meal period
11 violations are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to
12 statute.

13 60. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
14 as described herein and below.

15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(FAILURE TO PERMIT REST PERIODS OR**
17 **PROVIDE COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF)**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

19 61. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as
20 though fully set forth herein.

21 62. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code
22 section 226.7 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations.

23 63. California Labor Code section 226.7(a) states "No employer shall require any
24 employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the Industrial
25 Welfare Commission."

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

64. Section 12 of the applicable IWC Wage Order provides in relevant part that:

(A) Every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period. The authorized rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. However, a rest period need not be authorized for employees whose total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 1/2) hours. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

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

65. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that during the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members worked in excess of 3.5 hours, six (6) hours, and/or 10 hours.

66. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and Class Members did not receive compliant 10 minute rest periods for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof because they were required to work through their daily rest periods, were not authorized to take their rest periods, and/or were restricted to the worksite during their entire shift.

67. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members rest period premiums for noncompliant rest periods pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

68. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, as set forth herein, Plaintiff and Class Members have sustained and continue to sustain damages, including loss of earnings, in an amount to be established at trial plus prejudgment interest pursuant to statute. To the extent such unpaid premiums or rest period violations are deemed unpaid wages, Plaintiff will also seek attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute.

69. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief as described herein and below.

///

///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS)

(Against All Defendants)

70. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

71. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code section 226 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations.

72. California Labor Code section 226(a) requires that, semimonthly or at the time of each payment of wages, employers must furnish each employee with an accurate itemized wage statement in writing that accurately shows (1) gross wages earned, (2) total number of hours worked, (3) the number of any piece-rate units earned and all applicable piece rates, (4) all deductions made from wages, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the pay period, (7) the name and last four digits or employment identification number of the employee, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

73. California Labor Code section 226(e)(1) authorizes an employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to provide an accurate itemized wage statement to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay violation and \$100 for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, in addition to an award of costs and attorneys' fees.

74. Section 7 of the IWC Wage Orders requires Defendants to maintain time records showing, among other things, when the employee begins and ends each work period, meal periods taken, and total daily hours worked in an itemized wage statement, and must show all deductions and reimbursements from payment of wages, and accurately report total hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members. Plaintiff is informed, believes, and thereon alleges that Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with the IWC Wage Orders.

75. Throughout the relevant time period, Defendants provided wage statements that did not accurately reflect the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and Class Members at each

1 corresponding pay rate, and the gross and net wages earned, making it difficult for Plaintiff and
2 Class Members to determine whether they were paid correctly for all hours worked, which
3 deductions were made, and the extent of any underpayment. Plaintiff has had to file this lawsuit in
4 order to determine the extent of the underpayment of wages, thereby causing Plaintiff to incur
5 expenses and lost time. Plaintiff would not have had to engage in these efforts and incur these costs
6 had Defendants provided the accurate wages earned. This has also delayed Plaintiff's ability to
7 demand and recover the underpayment of wages from Defendants. Defendants' violations of
8 California Labor Code section 226(a) prevented Plaintiff and Class Members from knowing,
9 understanding and disputing the wages paid to them, and resulted in an unjustified economic
10 enrichment to Defendants.

11 76. Defendants knowingly and intentionally failed to provide accurate, itemized wage
12 statements to Plaintiff and Class Members, and as such Plaintiff and Class Members are deemed to
13 have suffered injury in accordance with California Labor Code section 226. Plaintiff and the Class
14 are therefore entitled to the damages and penalties provided for under California Labor Code
15 section 226(e).

16 77. Plaintiff and Class Members are also entitled to injunctive relief under California
17 Labor Code section 226(h), compelling Defendants to comply with California Labor Code section
18 226, and seek the recovery of attorneys' fees and costs incurred in obtaining this injunctive relief.

19 78. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
20 as described herein and below.

21 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
22 **(WAITING TIME PENALTIES)**
23 **(Against All Defendants)**

24 79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as
25 though fully set forth herein.

26 80. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code
27 sections 201, 202, and 203, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of
28 Regulations. Defendants failed to comply with these final paycheck requirements with respect to

1 Plaintiff and Waiting Time Subclass Members.

2 81. California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an
3 employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately.

4 82. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if “an employee not having a written
5 contract for a definite period” quits, the employee’s wages shall become due and payable no later
6 than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her
7 intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

8 83. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to
9 pay, without abatement or reduction, any wages of an employee who is discharged or quits, the
10 wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until
11 paid or until an action therefor is commenced, but that the wages shall not continue for more than
12 30 days per employee.

13 84. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Subclass are entitled to compensation for unpaid
14 wages earned, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, compensation
15 for non-compliant meal periods and rest periods, and unpaid reimbursements but to date have not
16 received such compensation, therefore entitling them to penalties pursuant to California Labor
17 Code section 203.

18 85. As a consequence of Defendants’ willful conduct in failing to pay all earned wages,
19 Waiting Time Subclass Members are entitled to up to 30 days’ wages as a penalty for Defendants’
20 failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, in addition to prejudgment interest,
21 attorneys’ fees, and costs in amounts that will be established at trial.

22 86. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
23 as described herein and below.

24 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES)**

26 **(Against All Defendants)**

27 87. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as
28 though fully set forth herein.

1 88. At all relevant times, Defendants had a duty to comply with California Labor Code
2 sections 2800 and 2802 and the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Code of Regulations.

3 89. California Labor Code section 2800 requires employers to indemnify employees for
4 losses caused by the employer's want of ordinary care. To the extent Defendants claim that Plaintiff
5 and Class Members failed to request, demand, notify or otherwise seek reimbursement for their
6 expenses and losses, Defendants were obligated to nevertheless indemnify Plaintiff and Class
7 Members due to their own negligence.

8 90. California Labor Code section 2802(a) requires that employers indemnify and
9 reimburse employees for all business expenses, which are defined as all necessary expenditures or
10 losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge of the employee's duties or
11 otherwise incurred based on the employee's obedience to the employer's directions. California
12 Labor Code section 2802(b) authorizes employees to recover in a court action interest which shall
13 accrue from the date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditure or loss. California
14 Labor Code section 2802(c) authorizes employees, who to enforce their right to reimbursements
15 under California Labor Code section 2802, to also recover attorneys' fees and costs.

16 91. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members
17 to drive their personal vehicles without being reimbursed for mileage, insurance, wear and tear on
18 their vehicles, use their personal cellular phones without reimbursing them for a reasonable portion
19 of their cellular phone bills, and purchase tools without reimbursing them for the costs.

20 92. Defendants have unfairly and unlawfully violated California Labor Code sections
21 2800 and 2802, and the applicable IWC Wage Orders by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class
22 Members for all of their out-of-pocket business expenses incurred in the discharge of their job
23 duties.

24 93. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct, Plaintiff and Class Members have
25 sustained damages for unreimbursed out-of-pocket business expenses, due in an amount to be
26 established at trial, plus prejudgment interest, attorney's fees, and costs pursuant to statute.

27 94. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
28 as described herein and below.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES)
(Against All Defendants)

95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

96. California Business & Professions Code Section 17200, *et seq.* prohibits unfair competition by prohibiting unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practices or acts.

97. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, Class Members, and Defendants' competitors. Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

99. A violation of Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law.

100. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all members of the general public, including the Class Members, pursuant to the UCL. Defendants' conduct alleged below constitutes false, fraudulent, unlawful, unfair, and/or deceptive business practices, in violation of the UCL. Defendants' policies and practices have violated state law in at least the following respects:

(a) Failing to pay all minimum, regular, and overtime wages due to Plaintiff and Class Members in violation of California Labor Code sections 204, 510, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197 and 1198;

(b) Failing to provide compliant meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof in violation of California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512;

(c) Failing to authorize or permit rest breaks or provide compensation in lieu thereof in violation of California Labor Code section 226.7;

1 (d) Intentionally failing to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with accurate
2 itemized wage statements in violation of California Labor Code section 226;

3 (e) Failing to timely pay all earned wages to Plaintiff and Waiting Time
4 Subclass Members upon separation of employment in violation of California Labor Code sections
5 201, 202 and 203;

6 (f) Failing to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members all necessary business
7 expenses in violation of California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802; and

8 (g) Violations of the IWC Wage Orders for the same conduct above.

9 101. Defendants' course of conduct, acts, and practices in violation of California law
10 mentioned above each constitute a separate and independent violation of the UCL. Defendants'
11 conduct described herein violates the policy or spirit of such laws or otherwise significantly
12 threatens or harms competition. The substantial harm to Plaintiff and Class Members in being
13 wrongfully denied earned wages, meal and rest periods, premium pay, and reimbursements
14 outweighs the utility, if any, of Defendants' policies or practices and, therefore, Defendants' actions
15 described herein constitute an unfair business practices or acts within the meaning of the UCL.

16 102. Plaintiff further brings this cause of action on behalf of the proposed Class, seeking
17 statutory and injunctive relief to stop the misconduct of Defendants, as complained herein, and to
18 compel restitution and disgorgement of all profits (i.e., unpaid wages, reimbursements, and
19 premiums, etc.) obtained by Defendants through the unfair and unlawful business practices
20 described herein pursuant to, *inter alia*, Business and Professions Code sections 17202, 17203, and
21 17208. Under the circumstances alleged, it would be inequitable and result in a miscarriage of
22 justice for Defendants to continue to retain the property of Plaintiff and Class Members.

23 103. Defendants' failure to adopt and implement policies in accordance with and/or
24 adhere to these laws, all of which are binding upon and burdensome to Defendants' competitors,
25 engenders an unfair competitive advantage for Defendants against its competitors, thereby
26 constituting an unfair business practice, as set forth in the UCL.

27 104. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code section 17203, as a direct and
28 proximate result of the unfair business practices of Defendants, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf

1 of all employees similarly situated, is entitled to equitable and injunctive relief, against such
2 unlawful practices in order to prevent future damage, for which there is no adequate remedy at law,
3 and to avoid a multiplicity of lawsuits. Plaintiff also seeks an order enjoining Defendants to cease
4 and desist from engaging in the practices described herein.

5 105. Plaintiff and the Class Members also request any other such legal and equitable
6 relief from Defendants' unlawful and willful conduct as the Court deems just and proper, including
7 an injunction prohibiting Defendants from engaging in the unfair, unlawful, and/or fraudulent
8 practices alleged in this Complaint.

9 106. As a result of Defendants' unlawful and unfair business practices, Plaintiff and Class
10 Members are entitled to and seek other appropriate relief available under California Business &
11 Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq.* Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class, also seeks
12 recovery of attorneys' fees and costs of this action to be paid by Defendants as provided by
13 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

14 107. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the Class Members he seeks to represent request relief
15 as described herein and below.

16 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(ENFORCEMENT OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

18 **(Against All Defendants)**

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

21 109. Under Labor Code section 2699.3(a), a plaintiff may bring a cause of action under
22 PAGA only after giving the LWDA and the employer notice of the Labor Code sections alleged
23 to have been violated, and after receiving notice from the LWDA of its intention not to investigate
24 or after 65 days have passed without notice from the LWDA.

25 110. On June 29, 2020, Claimant Ronald Green gave written notice of the specified
26 provisions alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
27 violations, as required by Labor Code section 2699.3 ("PAGA Notice"). This written notice was
28 provided via certified mail to Defendant WEBSTER and to the LWDA by electronically filing the

1 notice via the Department of Industrial Relations' website. On September 15, 2021, Plaintiff
2 submitted an Amended PAGA Notice which gave written notice of the specified provisions alleged
3 to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations, as required
4 by Labor Code section 2699.3, and added Jason Webster and Jeff Webster as employers pursuant
5 to Labor Code section 558.1. More than 65 days have passed since Plaintiff submitted his Amended
6 PAGA notice to the LWDA without notice from the LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff has exhausted
7 his administrative remedies and may amend the original complaint in this action to add a PAGA
8 cause of action.

9 111. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that
10 provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments,
11 divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for violation of the code may, as an
12 alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of
13 himself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code
14 section 2699.3.

15 112. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
16 specifically provided, Labor Code section 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a penalty of one
17 hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
18 two hundred dollars (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
19 pay period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

20 113. Defendants' conduct violates numerous Labor Code sections, including, but not
21 limited to, the following:

22 (a) Violation of Labor Code sections 201-204, 210, 510, 558, 1194, 1197,
23 1197.1, and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including minimum, regular, and
24 overtime wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during employment and upon
25 separation of employment as herein alleged;

26 (b) Violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal
27 periods to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed
28 meal periods as herein alleged;

1 (c) Violation of Labor Code sections 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to
2 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods
3 as herein alleged;

4 (d) Violation of Labor Code sections 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide
5 accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;

6 (e) Violation of Labor Code sections 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain
7 accurate records regarding the employment of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein
8 alleged; and

9 (f) Violation of Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse
10 necessary business expenses.

11 114. Labor Code section 558(a) provides “[a]ny employer or other person acting on
12 behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section of this chapter or any
13 provision regulating hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission
14 shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each
15 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid . . . (2) For each
16 subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period
17 for which the employee was underpaid.”

18 115. Labor Code section 558.1 provides that any “employer or other person acting on
19 behalf of an employer, who violates, or causes to be violated, any provision regulating minimum
20 wages or hours and days of work in any order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, or violates,
21 or causes to be violated, Sections 203, 226, 226.7, 1193.6, 1194, or 2802 [of the Labor Code], may
22 be held liable as the employer for such violation.”

23 116. Labor Code Section 1174.5 provides a \$500 penalty for an employer’s failure to
24 maintain accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages
25 paid to employees.

26 117. Labor Code section 1197.1 also provides “[a]ny employer or other person acting
27 either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be
28 paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by

1 an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty . . . as follows: (1) For any initial
2 violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid employee
3 for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid . . . (2) For each subsequent violation for
4 the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each
5 pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
6 intentionally committed.

7 118. As set forth above, Defendants have violated numerous provisions of the Labor
8 Code regulating hours and days of work as well as the IWC Wage Orders. Accordingly, Plaintiff
9 also seeks the civil penalties set forth in Labor Code sections 558, 1174.5, and 1197.1 for himself,
10 the underpaid employees, and the State of California.

11 119. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged
12 violators and had one or more of the alleged violations committed against him, and therefore is
13 properly suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

14 120. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code section
15 2699.3 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself
16 and all other aggrieved employees under the PAGA.

17 121. Pursuant to Labor Code sections 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
18 recover civil penalties, in addition to other remedies, for violations of the Labor Code sections cited
19 above.

20 122. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney’s fees and costs incurred
21 herein.

22 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

23 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the proposed Class, and the aggrieved
24 employees, prays for judgment and the following specific relief against Defendants, jointly and
25 severally, as follows:

26 1. That the Court certify the proposed Class and Subclasses, and any other class or
27 subclasses as appropriate under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382;

28 2. That Plaintiff be appointed as the Class Representative;

1 3. That Daily Aljian LLP and the Law Office of Daniel J. Hyun be appointed as Class
2 Counsel for all purposes;

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

4 5. For such general, economic, and/or special damages in an amount according to proof
5 with interest thereon;

6 6. For damages, monetary relief, wages, premiums, reimbursements, benefits and
7 penalties, including interest thereon;

8 7. For waiting time penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203;

9 8. For civil penalties pursuant to PAGA;

10 9. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2;

11 10. For statutory penalties to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to
12 the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;

13 11. For the amounts provided for in California Labor Code section 226.7;

14 12. For attorney's fees, costs of suit, including expert fees, and interest pursuant to
15 California Labor Code sections 218.6, 226, 1194, 2698 *et seq*, 2802 and California Code of Civil
16 Procedure section 1021.5;

17 13. For restitution to Plaintiff and Class Members of all money and property unlawfully
18 acquired by Defendants through unfair or unlawful business practices pursuant to Business and
19 Professions Code sections 17200 *et seq*;

20 14. For an order requiring Defendants to restore and disgorge all funds to each employee
21 acquired by means of any act or practice declared by this Court to be unlawful, unfair or fraudulent
22 and, therefore, constituting unfair competition under Business and Professions Code sections
23 17200, *et seq*;

24 15. For permanent injunctive relief described in the UCL cause of action;

25 16. For prejudgment interest on all sums recovered pursuant to California Labor Code
26 section 218.6, California Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289, and applicable law;

27 17. For post judgment interest on all amounts awarded to Plaintiff and Class Members
28 as provided by law;

1 18. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under
2 California law;

3 19. Such other equitable relief as the Court may deem proper; and

4 20. An award of such other and further relief as this Court may deem appropriate.

5
6 Dated: November 22, 2021

DAILY ALJIAN LLP
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL J. HYUN

7 By: /s/ Shelly D. Song

8 Justin E. D. Daily
9 Simon Kwak
10 Joshua D. Klein
11 Shelly D. Song
12 Daniel J. Hyun
13 Attorneys for Plaintiff Juan Siempre Javier

11 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

12 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby requests a jury trial
13 on all claims so triable.

14
15 Dated: November 22, 2021

DAILY ALJIAN LLP
LAW OFFICE OF DANIEL J. HYUN

16 By: /s/ Shelly D. Song

17 Justin E. D. Daily
18 Simon Kwak
19 Joshua D. Klein
20 Shelly D. Song
21 Daniel J. Hyun
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff Juan Siempre Javier
23
24
25
26
27
28