

Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)
Kristen M. Agnew (State Bar No. 247656)
Nicholas Rosenthal (State Bar No. 268297)
DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.
515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 488-6555
(213) 488-6554 facsimile

William L. Marder, Esq. (State Bar No. 170131)
Polaris Law Group LLP
501 San Benito Street, Suite 200
Hollister, CA 95023
Tel: (831) 531-4214
Fax: (831) 634-0333

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

LARRY HILL, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ROSS DRESS FOR LESS, INC., a
Virginia corporation; and DOES 1 through
50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: **RIC2001821**

**CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR:**

**(1) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §
226(a);**

**(2) VIOLATION OF CAL. LABOR CODE §§
2698, *ET SEQ.***

DEMAND OVER \$25,000.00

1 Plaintiff Larry Hill ("Plaintiff") hereby submits this Class and Representative Action
2 Complaint ("Complaint") against Defendant Ross Dress for Less, Inc. ("Defendant") and Does 1
3 through 50 (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants"), on behalf of himself and a class
4 of all other similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants for civil and statutory
5 penalties under the California Labor Code as follows:

6 **INTRODUCTION**

7 1. This class and representative action is within the Court's jurisdiction under
8 California Labor Code sections 226 and 2698 *et seq.*

9 2. This Complaint challenges systemic illegal employment practices resulting in
10 violations of the California Labor Code against individuals who worked for Defendants.

11 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants,
12 jointly and severally, have acted intentionally and with deliberate indifference and conscious
13 disregard to the rights of all employees in Defendants' failure to provide accurate itemized wage
14 statements to Plaintiff and Class Members.

15 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 have engaged in, among other things a system of willful violations of the California Labor Code
17 by creating and maintaining policies, practices and customs that knowingly deny employees the
18 above stated rights and benefits.

19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 5. This Court has jurisdiction over the violations of California Labor Code sections
21 226 and 2698 *et seq.*

22 6. Venue is proper in Riverside County because Defendants maintains business
23 locations in Riverside County, and Plaintiff performs work for Defendants in Riverside County.

24 **PARTIES**

25 7. Plaintiff began working for Defendants in or about 2016. Plaintiff works as a
26 releaser in Defendants' warehouse facility, and is a non-exempt, hourly employee.

27 8. Plaintiff was and is the victim of the policies, practices, and customs of
28 Defendants complained of in this action in ways that have deprived him of the rights guaranteed

1 by California Labor Code sections 226 and 2698 *et seq.*

2 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Ross Dress for
3 Less, Inc. was and is a Virginia corporation that operates retail stores and warehouses throughout
4 the State of California, including locations in Riverside County.

5 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
6 herein mentioned Defendants are and were business entities, individuals, and partnerships,
7 licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California. As such, and based
8 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business, Defendants are subject to
9 the California Labor Code.

10 11. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner
11 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 50, inclusive, and for that reason,
12 said defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to amend this
13 complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and believes and
14 based thereon alleges that each of said fictitious defendants was responsible in some way for the
15 matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and members of the general public and
16 class to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

17 12. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
18 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the
19 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants and employees of each of the other
20 Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned, were
21 acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

22 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
23 material hereto, each of the Defendants named herein was the agent, employee, alter ego and/or
24 joint venturer of, or working in concert with each of the other co-Defendants and was acting
25 within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, or concerted activity. To
26 the extent said acts, conduct, and omissions were perpetrated by certain Defendants, each of the
27 remaining Defendants confirmed and ratified said acts, conduct, and omissions of the acting
28 Defendants.

1 14. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were members of,
2 and engaged in, a joint venture, partnership and common enterprise, and acting within the course
3 and scope of, and in pursuance of, said joint venture, partnership and common enterprise.

4 15. At all times herein mentioned, the acts and omissions of various Defendants, and
5 each of them, concurred and contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the
6 other Defendants in proximately causing the injuries and damages as herein alleged. At all times
7 herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission
8 complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and
9 abetted the acts and omissions of each and all of the other Defendants in proximately causing the
10 damages as herein alleged.

11 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

12 16. **Definition:** The named individual Plaintiff seeks class certification, pursuant to
13 California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. Plaintiff proposes the following class: all current
14 and former non-exempt employees of Defendants in the State of California who were paid
15 overtime wages such as “BC OT” wages, at any time between April 6, 2019, through the present
16 (the “Class”).

17 17. **Numerosity:** The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all
18 members would be impractical, if not impossible. The identity of the members of the Class is
19 readily ascertainable by review of Defendant’s records, including payroll records. Plaintiff is
20 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendant failed to provide accurate
21 itemized wage statements to employees in violation of Labor Code section 226.

22 18. **Adequacy of Representation:** The named Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all
23 necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the Class defined above.
24 Plaintiff’s attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the Class and
25 Plaintiff. Plaintiff’s attorneys have prosecuted and settled wage-and-hour class actions in the past
26 and currently have a number of wage-and-hour class actions pending in California state and
27 federal courts.

28 19. Defendant uniformly administered a corporate policy, practice of failing to

1 provide accurate itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and the Class in violation of Labor Code
2 section 226.

3 20. **Common Question of Law and Fact:** There are predominant common questions
4 of law and fact and a community of interest amongst Plaintiff and the claims of the Class
5 concerning Defendant’s policy and practice of failing to provide proper wage statements to
6 Plaintiff and the Class in violation of Labor Code section 226.

7 21. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of all members of the
8 Class in that Plaintiff suffered the harm alleged in this Complaint in a similar and typical manner
9 as the Class Members. As with other California non-exempt employees, Plaintiff was not
10 provided proper and accurate itemized wage statements, in violation of Labor Code section
11 226(a). Specifically, whenever overtime wages such as “BC OT” wages were paid, the
12 corresponding wage statements did not identify the rates of pay and applicable number of hours
13 worked in violation of Labor Code section 226(a)(9). Accordingly, Plaintiff is a victim of
14 Defendant’s violation of California Labor Code section 226.

15 22. The California Labor Code section upon which Plaintiff bases these claims is
16 broadly remedial in nature. These laws and labor standards serve an important public interest in
17 establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor
18 standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who may seek
19 to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and
20 conditions of employment.

21 23. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and
22 members of the Class identified herein make the class action format a particularly efficient and
23 appropriate procedure to redress the wrongs alleged herein. If each employee were required to
24 file an individual lawsuit, the corporate defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable
25 advantage since it would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each
26 individual plaintiff with their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Requiring each Class
27 Member to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by
28 employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current

1 employer for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damage to their careers at
2 subsequent employment.

3 24. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual Class Members, even if
4 possible, would create a substantial risk of (a) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect
5 to individual Class Members against Defendants and which would establish potentially
6 incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants, and/or (b) adjudications with respect to
7 individual Class Members which would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interest of the
8 other Class Members not parties to the adjudications or which would substantially impair or
9 impede the ability of the Class Members to protect their interests. Further, the claims of the
10 individual members of the Class are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous individual
11 prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses.

12 25. Such a pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy regarding
13 illegal payroll practices described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by
14 Plaintiff and the Class identified herein, in a civil action, for applicable penalties, reasonable
15 attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to the mandate of California Labor Code section 226
16 and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

17 26. Proof of a common business practice or factual pattern, which the named Plaintiff
18 experienced and is representative of, will establish the right of each of the members of the
19 Plaintiff Class to recovery on the causes of action alleged herein.

20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 226**

22 **(BY PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

23 27. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as
24 though fully set forth herein.

25 28. Defendants failed in their affirmative obligation to provide accurate itemized
26 wage statements. Defendants, as a matter of policy and practice, did not provide accurate records
27 in violation of Labor Code section 226(a).

28 29. Plaintiff and Class Members were paid on an hourly basis. As such, the wage

1 statements provided to them should have reflected all applicable hourly rates in effect during the
2 pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate. The wage
3 statements provided to Plaintiff and the Class failed to accurately identify such information.
4 More specifically, whenever overtime wages such as “BC OT” wages were paid to Class
5 Members, the corresponding wage statement did not identify the applicable rate of pay or
6 number of hours worked for those wages.

7 30. Such a pattern, practice and uniform administration of corporate policy as
8 described herein is unlawful and creates an entitlement to recovery by the Plaintiff and the Class
9 identified herein in a civil action, for all penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 226, including
10 interest thereon, attorneys’ fees, and costs of suit according to the mandate of California Labor
11 Code section 226.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE § 2698, *ET SEQ.***

14 **(BY PLAINTIFF, ON BEHALF OF THE STATE AND AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES,**
15 **AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

16 31. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs as
17 though fully set forth herein.

18 32. Plaintiff brings this cause of action as a proxy for the State of California and in
19 this capacity, seeks penalties on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees from June 9, 2019, through
20 the present, for Defendants’ policy and practice of failing to provide proper wage statements in
21 violation of Labor Code section 226(a).

22 33. On or about June 9, 2020, Plaintiff sent written notice to the California Labor &
23 Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) of Defendants’ violations of Labor Code section
24 226(a), pursuant to Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act
25 (“PAGA”). To date, the LWDA has not responded to Plaintiff’s written notice.

26 34. As such, pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a), Plaintiff seeks recovery of any
27 and all applicable civil penalties for Defendants’ violation of Labor Code section 226(a) for the
28 time period described above, on behalf of himself and other Aggrieved Employees.


1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and all others on whose behalf
3 this suit is brought against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- 4 1. For an order certifying the proposed Class;
- 5 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as the representative of the Class;
- 6 3. For an order appointing counsel for Plaintiff as Class Counsel;
- 7 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for penalties pursuant to California Labor Code
8 section 226, and for costs and attorneys' fees;
- 9 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for civil penalties according to proof pursuant
10 to Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, and for costs and attorneys' fees;
- 11 6. On all causes of action for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by California
12 Labor Code sections 226 and 2699, and Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; and
- 13 7. For such other and further relief the Court may deem just and proper.
- 14

15 DATED: June 17, 2020

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.

16
17 By:  _____

Larry W. Lee

Kristen M. Agnew

Nicholas Rosenthal

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28