

COPY

Fernandez & Lauby LLP
www.California-EmploymentLawyers.com

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

AUG 03 2020

BY Sandra Ortega
SANDRA ORTEGA/DEPUTY

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
FERNANDEZ & LAUBY LLP
4590 Allstate Drive
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 320-1444
Fax: (951) 320-1445
bjm@fernandezlauby.com
pjc@fernandezlauby.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

CIV DS 2016569

JOSEPH GREENDALE, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

ANDERSEN DISTRIBUTION, INC., a
Delaware Corporation; ANDERSEN
LOGISTICS SACRAMENTO LLC, a
Minnesota Limited Liability Company;
ANDERSEN WINDOWS, INC., a Minnesota
Corporation; RENEWAL BY ANDERSEN,
LLC, a Minnesota Limited Liability
Company; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.:

COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Pay Vested Vacation;
- (6) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (7) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (8) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (9) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (10) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (11) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (12) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (13) Failure to Pay Vested Vacation;
- (14) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Each Period;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages; and
- (16) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 Plaintiff Joseph Greendale (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis,
2 and on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Defendants Andersen
5 Distribution, Inc., Andersen Logistics Sacramento LLC, Anderson Windows, Inc., Renewal By
6 Anderson, LLC, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf of all
7 current and former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the “Class” or
8 “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
9 all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide meal
10 periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to pay vested vacation, failure to timely pay wages,
11 failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and failure to provide suitable seating.

12 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately April 2019 through
13 June 2020.

14 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were
15 subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations
16 to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

17 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
18 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
19 worked.

20 5. Additionally, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented Employees on an
21 hourly basis but also paid additional earned compensation in the form of awards, gifts, bonuses,
22 and similar pay. However, during workweeks where the Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
23 worked overtime hours and earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed
24 to include this additional nondiscretionary compensation in the calculations for the regular rate
25 of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-
26 established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

27 6. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were denied 30-minute
28 off-duty meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants’ policies and

1 practices, the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were:
2 (1) unable to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal periods while
3 under Defendants' control, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal occurred, after the 5th
4 hour of work, and (4) not provided mandated second meal periods for shifts over 10 hours.

5 7. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
6 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
7 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Represented
8 Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being
9 overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
10 were not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of California law.
11 Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked in excess of
12 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest break.

13 8. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants utilized a policy and practice through
14 which Plaintiff and the Represented Employees accrued vacation and/or PTO hours (collectively,
15 "vacation hours"). However, on the occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
16 had accrued but unused vacation hours upon separation of employment, Defendants failed to pay
17 for these earned wages as required by Labor Code § 227.3.

18 9. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
19 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
20 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
21 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
22 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
23 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, among others.

24 10. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
25 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a), as detailed below.

26 11. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' violations of the wage and hour components of
27 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
28

level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over its competitors.

12. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the Represented Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees' employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

13. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys' fees, penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 1199, among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right to name additional representatives throughout the State of California.

14. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), on June 15, 2020, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff then sent an amended/supplemental notice on July 20, 2020 to clarify and add certain claims. As such, Plaintiff is currently complying with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California Labor Code § 2699.3, and this Complaint will be deemed amended to include the PAGA allegations enumerated below when more than sixty-five (65) days have passed since the amended Notice was mailed to Defendants and the LWDA chooses not to investigate the allegations herein.

II. JURISDICTION

15. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

1 **III. VENUE**

2 16. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
3 Procedure § 395(a) and § 395.5. Defendants transact business in San Bernardino County and the
4 unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in
5 San Bernardino County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and
6 Represented Employees in San Bernardino County.

7 **IV. PARTIES**

8 **Plaintiff**

9 17. Plaintiff and Class Representative Joseph Greendale was employed by Defendants
10 from approximately April 2019 through June 2020 and performed work for Defendants in San
11 Bernardino County.

12 **Defendants**

13 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Andersen
14 Distribution, Inc., is a Delaware corporation authorized to and doing business in San Bernardino
15 County, California, and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented
16 Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

17 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Andersen
18 Logistics Sacramento LLC is a Minnesota limited liability company authorized to and doing
19 business in San Bernardino County, California, and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff
20 and the Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

21 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Andersen
22 Windows, Inc., is a Minnesota corporation authorized to and doing business in San Bernardino
23 County, California, and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the Represented
24 Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

25 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant Renewal By
26 Andersen LLC is a Minnesota limited liability company authorized to and doing business in San
27 Bernardino County, California, and is and/or was the legal employer of Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

1 22. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
2 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
3 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
4 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
5 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
6 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
7 Defendants when ascertained.

8 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that she and the Represented
9 Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and
10 each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
11 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of
12 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a
13 unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as
14 a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

15 24. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
16 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
17 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
18 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
19 Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor
20 operations, and common ownership or financial control.

21 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
22 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
23 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
24 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
25 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
26 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
27 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
28

1 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
2 their remaining co-Defendants.

3 26. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
4 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
5 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
6 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
7 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
8 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the
9 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
10 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

11 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

12 27. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
13 alleged herein.

14 28. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
15 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

16 29. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning
17 four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

18 30. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
19 represent is defined as follows:

20 **California Class**

21 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
22 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

23 31. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

24 **Meal Break Subclass**

25 All nonexempt Represented Employees who worked a shift
26 in excess of 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

27 ///

28 ///

Rest Break Subclass

All nonexempt Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

Vested Vacation Subclass

All Represented Employees who had vested vacation owed upon separation of employment.

Waiting Time Penalties Subclass

All Represented Employees who separated from their employment with Defendants during the period three years before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

Wage Statement Penalties Subclass

All Represented Employees during the period one year before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

32. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

33. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that she seeks to represent.

34. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' personnel and payroll records.

35. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' payroll and personnel records.

1 36. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which
2 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including
3 without limitation:

4 i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
5 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all
6 hours worked;

7 ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
8 IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
9 Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

10 iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
11 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break
12 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
13 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant
14 meal period was not provided;

15 iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable
16 IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break
17 Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass
18 with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest
19 break was not provided;

20 v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
21 compensate Plaintiff and the Vested Vacation Subclass for all accrued but unused vacation hours
22 upon separation of employment pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3;

23 vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
24 timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and
25 the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

26 vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to
27 provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized
28 wage statements;

viii. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, and failure to timely pay final wages; and

ix. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

37. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants' ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to pay vested vacation, failure to timely pay final wages, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

38. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases like this case.

39. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

///

///

///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

40. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

41. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each hour worked.

42. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked.

43. As a result of Defendants' policies or practices described above, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, a were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they were performing.

44. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

45. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

46. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

47. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be

1 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
2 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

3 48. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
4 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

5 49. As a result of the Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
6 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

7 50. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
8 all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of
9 suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven
10 at trial.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

13 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

14 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants*

15 51. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
16 alleged herein.

17 52. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
18 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

19 53. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
20 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
21 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
22 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
23 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
24 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

25 54. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by
26 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to
27 Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked, Plaintiff and the
28 Represented Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

1 55. Additionally, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented Employees on an
2 hourly basis but also paid additional earned compensation in the form of awards, gifts, bonuses,
3 and similar pay. However, during workweeks where the Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
4 worked overtime hours and earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed
5 to include this additional nondiscretionary compensation in the calculations for the regular rate
6 of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-
7 established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

8 56. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
9 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
10 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
11 week without proper overtime compensation.

12 57. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
13 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
14 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

15 58. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
16 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory
17 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

18 59. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
19 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
20 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
21 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
22 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

23 60. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
24 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

25 61. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
26 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.
27
28

62. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS

(Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants

63. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

64. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal periods.

65. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

66. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

67. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B), Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of pay for each meal period that is missed.

68. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal

1 period while under the control of Defendants, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal
2 occurred, after the 5th hour of work, and (4) not provided a mandated second meal period for
3 shifts in excess of 10 hours.

4 69. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
5 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
6 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
7 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

8 70. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
9 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
10 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

11 71. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
12 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
13 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
14 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
15 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
16 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

17 72. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
18 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
19 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
20 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
21 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
22 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

23 73. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
24 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
25 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

26
27 ///

28 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS

(Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants

74. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

75. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

76. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

77. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that 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. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

78. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

79. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest break.

80. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all

1 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
2 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

3 81. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
4 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
5 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

6 82. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
7 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
8 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
9 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
10 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
11 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

12 83. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
13 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
14 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

15 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO PAY VESTED VACATION ON SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT**

17 (Labor Code § 227.3)

18 *Plaintiff and the Vested Vacation Subclass Against All Defendants*

19 84. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
20 alleged herein.

21 85. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did
22 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the payment of vested vacation
23 time and/or paid time off upon separation of employment.

24 86. Pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3, an employer that has implemented a paid
25 vacation, paid time off, or compensated time off policy must, upon an employee's separation
26 from employment, pay to the employee all vested but unused vacation and/or paid time off at her
27 final rate of pay.
28

89. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to pay the Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, all vested but unused vacation time and/or paid time off upon separation from employment, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

12 90. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of
13 them, knowingly refused to perform their obligations to compensate the Represented Employees
14 for all vested but unused vacation time and/or paid time off upon separation from employment.

15 91. As a result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code § 227.3, Plaintiff and the
16 Represented Employees seek to recover the unpaid vacation hours, as well as penalties, interest,
17 attorneys' fees, and costs as permitted under California law.

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants

92. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
alleged herein.

24 93. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
25 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
26 and payment of wages.

27 94. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
28 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

1 95. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
2 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
3 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

4 96. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
5 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
6 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

7 97. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
8 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
9 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

10 98. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
11 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
12 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as
13 meal and rest period premiums and vested vacation wages.

14 99. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
15 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
16 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
17 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
18 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
19 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

20 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

22 (Labor Code § 226)

23 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

24 100. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
25 alleged herein.

26 101. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
27 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
28 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

1 102. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
2 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
3 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
4 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
5 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
6 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

7 103. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
8 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a wage
9 statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
10 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

11 104. For instance, at all relevant times, Defendants provided wage statements to
12 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that stated inaccurate and incorrect rates of
13 pay, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). To illustrate, Plaintiff's wage statements indicated
14 that he worked 20.81 overtime hours at a listed overtime rate of \$27.70. However, during this
15 period, Defendants only paid the sum of \$288.22 for these 20.81 hours, despite that $[20.81 \times$
16 $\$27.70 = \$576.44]$.

17 105. Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a) due to the failure to
18 accurately state the name and address of the employer. During certain periods, Defendants' wage
19 statements identified "Andersen Enterprise" and listed its address for the employer, despite that
20 no such employer is registered to do business in California. Similarly, at other times,
21 Defendants' wage statements identified "Andersen Windows and Doors" and listed its address as
22 the employer, yet that entity is also not registered to do business in California. Given that these
23 entities cannot be the legal employer, and given that the wage statements did not list the address
24 of any other entity, this practice violates Labor Code § 226(a)(8).

25 106. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants' wage statements failed to
26 accurately state total hours worked, the hours worked at each hourly rate, and the accurate
27 overtime rate of pay, and further failed to accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions,
28 and net wages earned.

1 107. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
2 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
3 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
4 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

5 108. Defendants' failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
6 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
7 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
8 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
9 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said
10 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
11 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost
12 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
13 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
14 proof at trial.

15 109. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
16 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
17 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
18 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an
19 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
20 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
21 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
22 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
23 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

24 110. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
25 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
26 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

27 111. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
28 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and

one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION

(Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants

112. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

113. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." The Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact, due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

114. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under Business & Professions Code § 17021.

115. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California's wage and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide mandated meal periods and rest breaks, failure to pay vested vacation, and failure to timely pay final wages, all to decrease their costs and increase their profits.

116. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

117. As a result of Defendants' failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants' ongoing violations of the foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

118. Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business

1 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
2 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

3 119. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
4 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
5 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
6 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

7 120. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, et seq. may be
8 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
9 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
10 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
11 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
12 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq.

13 121. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
14 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
15 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
16 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
17 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
18 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said
19 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

20 122. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
21 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
22 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
23 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
24 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
25 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

26 123. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
27 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
28 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from

engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in the future.

124. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and Represented Employees; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION
(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)

125. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

126. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), on June 15, 2020, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff then sent an amended/supplemental notice on July 20, 2020 to clarify and add certain claims.

127. Therefore, once more than sixty-five (65) days have passed since the amended notice, Plaintiff will have fully satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA and this Complaint will be deemed amended to include the PAGA allegations enumerated below. Once this occurs, Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court

1 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Plaintiff is not required to, nor does he, seek
2 class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

3 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

4 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

5 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

6 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

7 128. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
8 alleged herein.

9 129. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
10 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
11 hour worked.

12 130. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
13 regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for hours worked.

14 131. As a result of Defendants' policies or practices described above, Plaintiff and the
15 Aggrieved Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew
16 or should have known they were performing.

17 132. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
18 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
19 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

20 133. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
21 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
22 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

23 134. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
24 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
25 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

26
27 ///

28 ///

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

135. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

136. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were “nonexempt” employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

137. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

138. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

139. Additionally, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees on an hourly basis but also paid additional earned compensation in the form of awards, gifts, bonuses, and similar pay. However, during workweeks where the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked overtime hours and earned additional nondiscretionary compensation, Defendants failed to include this additional nondiscretionary compensation in the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

140. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because

1 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all overtime hours worked,
2 and required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work without being properly
3 compensated for all overtime wages earned.

4 141. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
5 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
6 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and
7 1197.

8 142. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
9 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
10 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

11 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

13 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 143. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
16 alleged herein.

17 144. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
18 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
19 periods.

20 145. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
21 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

22 146. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
23 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
24 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
25 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
26 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
27 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
28 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

1 147. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
2 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
3 pay for each meal period that is missed.

4 148. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied
5 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
6 practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when
7 they were: (1) unable to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal
8 period while under the control of Defendants, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal
9 occurred, after the 5th hour of work, and (4) not provided a mandated second meal period for
10 shifts in excess of 10 hours.

11 149. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
12 Order every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Plaintiff
13 and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory meal periods and
14 Defendants failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of compensation at the
15 regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

16 150. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
17 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
18 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
19 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
20 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

22 151. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
23 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
24 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

25
26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS

(Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

152. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

153. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

154. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

155. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that 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. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

156. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of pay at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

157. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated rest break.

158. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage Order every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Plaintiff

1 and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with all mandatory rest periods and Defendants
2 failed to pay the Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

3 159. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
4 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
5 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

6 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

7 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY VESTED VACATION**

8 (Labor Code § 227.3)

9 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

10 160. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
11 alleged herein.

12 161. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
13 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the payment of vested vacation
14 time and/or paid time off upon separation of employment.

15 162. Pursuant to Labor Code § 227.3, an employer that has implemented a paid
16 vacation, paid time off, or compensated time off policy must, upon an employee's separation
17 from employment, pay to the employee all vested but unused vacation and/or paid time off at her
18 final rate of pay.

19 163. At all relevant times, Defendants utilized a policy and practice through which
20 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees accrued vacation hours. However, on the occasions
21 when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees had accrued but unused vacation hours upon
22 separation of employment, Defendants failed to pay for these earned wages upon separation of
23 employment, and further failed to pay them at the "final rate" as required by Labor Code § 227.3.

24 164. As a result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not receive compensation
25 for all accrued but unused vacation hours upon separation of employment – in violation of Labor
26 Code § 227.3.

1 165. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
2 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
3 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

4 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

6 (Labor Code § 204)

7 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

8 166. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
9 alleged herein.

10 167. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were "nonexempt" employees
11 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
12 timing of payment of wages each period.

13 168. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
14 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
15 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
16 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
17 the following month.

18 169. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states "[t]he requirements of this section shall
19 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
20 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period."

21 170. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
22 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
23 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
24 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
25 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
26 time specified by Labor Code § 204.
27
28

171. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants

172. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

173. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing and payment of final wages.

174. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

175. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid, without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

176. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

177. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums and vested vacation wages, within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

178. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

1 179. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
2 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code §§ 256
3 and 2699, and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted
4 under PAGA.

5 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

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

8 (Labor Code § 226)

9 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

10 180. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the Complaint as if fully
11 alleged herein.

12 181. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
13 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
14 accurate itemized wage statements.

15 182. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
16 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
17 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
18 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
19 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
20 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

21 183. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
22 and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement to Plaintiff
23 and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

24 184. For instance, at all relevant times, Defendants provided wage statements to
25 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that stated inaccurate and incorrect rates of pay, in
26 violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9). To illustrate, Plaintiff's wage statements indicated that he
27 worked 20.81 overtime hours at a listed overtime rate of \$27.70. However, during this period,
28

1 Defendants only paid the sum of \$288.22 for these 20.81 hours, despite that $[20.81 \times \$27.70 =$
2 $\$576.44]$.

3 185. Additionally, Defendants violated Labor Code § 226(a) due to the failure to
4 accurately state the name and address of the employer. During certain periods, Defendants' wage
5 statements identified "Andersen Enterprise" and listed its address for the employer, despite that
6 no such employer is registered to do business in California. Similarly, at other times,
7 Defendants' wage statements identified "Andersen Windows and Doors" and listed its address as
8 the employer, yet that entity is also not registered to do business in California. Given that these
9 entities cannot be the legal employer, and given that the wage statements did not list the address
10 of any other entity, this practice violates Labor Code § 226(a)(8).

11 186. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants' wage statements failed to
12 accurately state total hours worked, the hours worked at each hourly rate, and the accurate
13 overtime rate of pay, and further failed to accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions,
14 and net wages earned.

15 187. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
16 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide complete and
17 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the
18 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

19 188. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code §226(a)(9), Plaintiff seeks
20 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
21 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
22 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
23 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

24 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

25 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
26 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
27 follows:
28

1. As to the Ninth through Sixteenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;
2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;
3. That the First through Eighth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;
4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Eighth Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;
8. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 256, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1198, 1199, among other sections inadvertently omitted;
10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest thereon;
11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and
12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby demands a jury trial as to the First through Sixteenth Causes of Action pled herein.

Dated: July 29, 2020

FERNANDEZ & LAUBY LLP

BY:



Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff