

JAMES HAWKINS APLC

James R. Hawkins, Esq. (#192925)

Gregory Mauro, Esq. (#222239)

Michael Calvo, Esq. (#314986)

9880 Research Drive, Suite 200

Irvine, CA 92618

Tel.: (949) 387-7200

Fax: (949) 387-6676

Email: James@jameshawkinsaplc.com

Email: Greg@jameshawkinsaplc.com

Email: Michael@jameshawkinsaplc.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID TOWNSEND,

On behalf of the general public as private attorney general

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DAVID TOWNSEND, On behalf of the general
public as private attorney general,

Plaintiff,

v.

J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT SERVICES, INC.,
an Arkansas Corporation; J.B. HUNT
TRANSPORT INC., an Arkansas Corporation,
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:

JUDGE:

DEPT:

**[PROPOSED] PAGA
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq*).**

COMES NOW Plaintiff **DAVID TOWNSEND**, (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of the general public and all non-exempt aggrieved employees, acting on behalf of the California Attorney General as private attorney general, asserts claims against Defendants J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT SERVICES, INC., and J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT INC., and DOES 1-50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a representative action for recovery of penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Cal. Lab. Code sections 2698 *et seq.* PAGA permits “aggrieved employees” to bring a lawsuit as a representative action on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other current and former aggrieved employees, to recover civil penalties and address an employer’s violations of the California Labor Code.

2. In this case, Defendants violated various provisions of the California Labor Code. As set forth below, Defendants implemented policies and practices which led to unpaid wages resulting from Defendant’s: (a) to pay minimum wages, (b) failure to provide meal periods for every work period exceeding more than ten (10) hours per day and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay or accurately pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a meal period; (c) failure to provide rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay or accurately pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (d) failing to pay all wages earned and owed upon separation from Defendant’s employ, (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (f) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses. As a result of these unpaid wages enumerated under Labor Code §2699.5, Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees..

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statutes under which

1 this action is brought do not give jurisdiction to any other court.

2 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
3 each Defendant either has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally
4 avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the
5 California Courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

6 5. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Code of
7 Civil Procedure section 395. Defendants are doing business throughout California, including but
8 not limited to Los Angeles County, and each Defendant is within the jurisdiction of this Court for
9 service of process purposes. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and
10 all other aggrieved employees within the State of California. Defendants employ numerous
11 aggrieved employees in in the State of California.

12 6. On information and belief, Defendants have conducted business within the State of
13 California during the purported liability period and continue to conduct business throughout the
14 State of California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have had a direct effect on Plaintiff, and the
15 similarly situated non-exempt aggrieved employees within California.

16 7. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because on
17 information and belief there are no federal questions at issue, as the issues herein are based solely
18 on California statutes and law, including the California Labor Code, the IWC Wage Orders, the
19 California Code of Civil Procedure, the California Civil Code, and the California Business and
20 Professions Code.

21 8. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
22 the present ("liability period"), Defendant consistently maintained and enforced against
23 Defendant's Non-Exempt Aggrieved Employees, among others, the following unlawful practices
24 and policies, in violation of California state wage and hour laws: (a) to pay minimum wages, (b)
25 failure to provide meal periods for every work period exceeding more than ten (10) hours per day
26 and failure to pay an additional hour's of pay or accurately pay an additional hour's of pay in lieu
27 of providing a meal period; (c) failure to provide rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction
28

1 thereof worked and failure to pay an additional hour's of pay or accurately pay an additional hour's
2 of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (d) failing to pay all wages earned and owed upon
3 separation from Defendant's employ, (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and
4 (f) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses.

5 9. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
6 the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide its Non-Exempt
7 Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, unfettered, uninterrupted, duty free
8 rest periods of at least (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and failing
9 to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation for each
10 workday that the rest period is not provided, as required by California state wage and hour laws.

11 10. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
12 the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages for hours worked
13 while subject to the control of Defendants.

14 11. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
15 the present (rest and meal period liability period), Defendants have had a consistent policy of
16 requiring its Non-Exempt Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, to work at
17 least five (5) and or ten (10) hours without a meal period and failing to pay or accurately pay such
18 employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation for each workday
19 that the meal period is not provided, as required by California state wage and hour laws.

20 12. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
21 the present (rest and meal period liability period), Defendants have had a consistent policy of
22 requiring its Non-Exempt Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, to work in
23 excess of four hours and or ten (10) hours without authorizing and permitting a rest period and
24 failing to pay or accurately pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate
25 of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not authorized and permitted, as required
26 by California state wage and hour laws.

27 13. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
28

1 the present, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees accurate itemized
2 wage statements.

3 14. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
4 the present, Defendants have failed to reimburse necessary business expenses to Plaintiff and
5 aggrieved employees.

6 15. Plaintiff on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other
7 aggrieved employees bring this action pursuant to Labor Code 2698, et. seq. for violations
8 enumerated under 2699.5 as follows: sections 512, 558, 226, 226.2, 226.7, 266.3, 1174, 1174.5,
9 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, and 2802 seeking penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

10 III. PARTIES

11 A. Plaintiff

12 16. Plaintiff DAVID TOWNSEND, was at all times relevant to this action, a resident
13 of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in approximately July 2019 as a non-exempt
14 employee working as a driver. Plaintiff is still employed by Defendant.

15 17. As Defendants' employee, Plaintiff, and all other aggrieved employees were
16 regularly required to and subsequently suffered:

17 a) perform work subject to the control of the employer without being compensated
18 all wages, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare
19 Commission Wage Order ("IWC");

20 b) work without being permitted or authorized a minimum ten-minute rest period for
21 every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and not compensated one (1) hour of pay at
22 his regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided, all in
23 violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage
24 Orders ("IWC");

25 c) work in excess of six and ten hours per day without being provided meal periods
26 and not compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday
27 that a meal period was not provided, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and
28

1 the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders (“IWC”);

2 d) not provided accurate itemized wage statements; and

3 e) not reimbursed for necessary business expenses incurred.

4 18. On information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to pay all earned wages in
5 the form regular wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, to its Non-Exempt Employees
6 and members of the Representative Group; nor have Defendants returned to Plaintiff or members
7 of the Representative Group, upon or after separation from employment with Defendants, all
8 wages earned and owing. Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of
9 the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees.

10 **B. Defendants**

11 19. Defendants J.B. HUNT TRANSPORT SERVICES INC., and J.B. HUNT
12 TRANSPORT INC., are engaged in the ownership and operation of a freight and logistics
13 company. On information and belief, Defendants maintain trucking terminals throughout Southern
14 California. Plaintiff estimates there are in excess of 100 Non-Exempt Employees who work or
15 have worked for Defendants over the last year.

16 20. Other than identified herein, Plaintiff is unaware of the true names, capacities,
17 relationships and extent of participation in the conduct alleged herein, of the defendants sued as
18 DOES 1 through 50, but is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said defendants are
19 legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these defendants by
20 such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint when their true names and capabilities
21 are ascertained.

22 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant, directly
23 or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and other members of the
24 Representative Group , and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions.
25 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each defendant acted in all respects
26 pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business
27 plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable
28

1 to the other defendants.

2 **IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

3 22. At all times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons in
4 the capacity of non-exempt driver positions, however titled, throughout the state of California.

5 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes Aggrieved Employees have at all times
6 pertinent hereto been Non-Exempt within the meaning of the California Labor Code and the
7 implementing rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders.

8 24. Defendants continue to employ Non-Exempt Employees, however titled, in
9 California and implement a uniform set of policies and practices to all non-exempt employees.

10 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants are and were
11 advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, and advisors with knowledge of
12 the requirements of California's wage and employment laws.

13 26. During the relevant time frame, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would typically
14 work twelve to thirteen or more hours a day, five to six days a week.

15 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that during the relevant time
16 frame, Defendants compensated Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees on a piece rate (i.e. per mile
17 basis) that did not always equate to minimum wage for all hours worked.

18 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that during the relevant time
19 period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to work without being paid
20 minimum wage as a result of the methodology of Defendants' piece-rate payment scheme which
21 is incapable of providing compensation to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for when the vehicle
22 is not moving. For instance, each and every day, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would
23 typically perform the following tasks that went uncompensated, such tasks included but were not
24 limited to conducting pre-trip and post-trip inspections of the truck, trailer, and equipment, filling
25 out freight transportation paper work/inspection reports, waiting for freight loads and unloads, and
26 truck fueling between various legs of their routes ("Non-Driving tasks"), all without payment of
27 minimum wage, as required by California law.
28

1 29. Such time spent performing these tasks would be uncompensated work time. As a
2 result of Defendants' piece rate compensation scheme, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff
3 and Aggrieved Employees accordingly.

4 30. On information and belief, the time records and drivers' logs Defendants are
5 required to maintain will provide the information and details showing the times Defendants' trucks
6 were not moving, resulting in Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not being compensated for such
7 time.

8 31. On information and belief, Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiff and
9 Aggrieved Employees, each and every day, at least minimum wage for their lawfully required rest
10 breaks, due to Defendants' implementation of a piece rate compensation scheme.

11 32. On information and belief, the pre-trip inspections of the trucks, trailers and
12 equipment, along with the post-trip inspections and the completion of freight transportation
13 paperwork/inspection reports cannot be done unless the vehicle is stopped and Plaintiff and
14 Aggrieved Employees physically conduct these inspections and fill out the necessary forms and
15 reports. As Defendant is only compensating Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees by piece rate (i.e.
16 per mile basis), as these activities are again tasks that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees are
17 performing without compensation of at least minimum wage.

18 33. During the relevant time frame, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not
19 accurately paid regular wages, as required under California law as a result of Defendants' unlawful
20 pay practices.

21 34. Defendants would also fail to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees at
22 least minimum wages for their training as their training time was not accounted for.

23 35. On information and belief, Defendants trucks were installed with GPS trackers,
24 which allowed Defendant's management, supervisors, and dispatch to see where any given truck
25 was at any given time.

26 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were
27 caused to endure unprovided, untimely, interrupted meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for
28

1 many of the work days such employees worked more than six hours (6) hours, were not provided
2 uninterrupted second meal periods of at least thirty (30) minutes for any work days such employees
3 worked more than ten (10) hours, and were not paid one (1) hour of wages by Defendants in lieu
4 thereof, all in violation of the California Labor Code, due to Defendant's demands that Plaintiff
5 and Aggrieved Employees complete their deliveries.

6 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were
7 regularly required to work in excess of six (6) hours per day without Defendants providing them a
8 timely, uninterrupted (30) minute meal period as mandated under the California Labor Code and
9 the implementing rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders.

10 38. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were also not provided lawful meal periods and
11 were not provided with one hour of wages in lieu thereof under Defendants' policies and practices,
12 which included work schedules placed upon the Aggrieved Employees from Defendants'
13 management and supervisors to perform work at the expense of their meal periods and Defendants'
14 implementation of a shift schedule and workload requirements that denied Aggrieved Employees
15 all of their authorized meal periods, including second meal periods on shifts when they worked
16 over ten (10) hours in a day. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were also systematically denied
17 a significant number of their required meal periods due to the demands placed upon them by
18 Defendants.
19

20 39. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Class did not waive any of their
21 authorized and required meal periods. Nevertheless, on information and belief, Defendants failed
22 to pay or failed to accurately pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees an extra hour of pay as
23 required by California law where meal periods were not provided, or not provided within the
24 legally required time frames.

25 40. Plaintiff is informed and believes that during the liability period, Plaintiff and
26 Aggrieved Employees were consistently required to work in excess of four (4) hours (or major
27 fraction thereof) without receiving lawful paid ten (10) minute rest periods. On information and
28 belief, throughout the liability period, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not properly

1 compensated by Defendants because they did not receive separate and hourly pay for their statutory
2 rest breaks when they were able to take them, due to Defendants' piece rate compensation.
3 Throughout the liability period, in violation of governing California law, Defendants had a policy
4 and practice of not paying its drivers time spent taking their Labor Code-compliant rest periods.
5 See e.g., *Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.*, 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872-73 ("Thus, contrary to
6 Safeway's argument, a piece rate compensation formula does not compensate separately for rest
7 periods does not comply with California minimum wage law."); *Shook v. Indian River Transport*
8 *Co.*, 2014 WL 7178199 (E.D. Cal. 2014). As a result, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees never
9 received a lawfully compliant paid rest break, yet despite these realities, Plaintiff and Aggrieved
10 Employees were also not provided with one hour wages in lieu thereof in violation of the applicable
11 IWC Wage Orders and Labor Codes.

12 41. Defendants' policies and practices included Defendants' implementation of a work
13 schedule and workload requirements that denied and failed to authorize and permit the Class all of
14 their entitled rest periods, including first rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes for every shift
15 worked of at least three and a half (3 1/2) to four (4) hours, a first and second rest period of at least
16 ten (10) minutes for every shift worked greater than six (6) hours, and a third rest period of at least
17 ten (10) minutes for every shift worked in excess of ten (10) hours. Further, Plaintiff and Aggrieved
18 Employees were also not relieved of all duty when they were able to take their rest breaks, as they
19 were required to stay with their trucks at all times as they were not allowed to leave their trucks
20 unattended and as a result were under the direction and control of Defendants and Defendants'
21 management at all times.

22 42. On information and belief, during the relevant time frame, Defendants failed to
23 adequately reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for business expenditures incurred for
24 the use of personal cellphones as Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees used their personal
25 cellphones to stay in contact with Defendants management to get updates on their delivery routes
26 and to call Defendants' various customers in order to confirm delivery information. Such business
27 expenditures incurred were incurred in direct consequence of Plaintiff's and Aggrieved
28

1 Employees' duties pursuant to Labor Code § 2802.

2 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants know,
3 should know, knew, and/or should have known that Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees
4 were entitled to receive accurate wages, and premium wages including but not limited to Labor
5 Code § 201-204, 226.7, 512, 558, 1194, 1197 and applicable IWC Wage Orders, and California
6 Code of Regulations, but were not paid all regular and not paid all meal and rest period premiums
7 due.

8 44. Defendants also failed to provide accurate, lawful itemized wage statements to
9 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in part because of the above specified violations. In
10 addition, upon information and belief, Defendants omitted an accurate itemization of total hours
11 worked, including premiums due and owing for meal and rest period violations, gross pay and net
12 pay figures from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' wage statements.

13 45. In addition to the violations above, and on information and belief, Defendants knew
14 they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for the allegations asserted
15 herein and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully,
16 knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so.

17 46. Upon information and belief, Defendants failed to keep accurate records pursuant
18 to Labor Code § 1174.5.

19 47. Upon information and belief, Defendants knew and or should have known that it is
20 improper to implement policies and commit unlawful acts such as:
21

22 (a) requiring employees to work four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof without
23 being provided a minimum ten (10) minute rest period and without compensating the employees
24 with one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a
25 rest period was not provided;

26 (b) requiring employees to work in excess of five (5) hours or ten (10) hours per day
27 without being provided an uninterrupted thirty minute meal period and/or a second meal period,
28 and without compensating employees with one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation

1 for each workday that such a meal period was not provided;

2 (c) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;

3 (d) failure to indemnify necessary business expenditures.

4 48. In addition to the violations above, and on information and belief, Defendants knew
5 they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and aggrieved employees for the allegations asserted
6 herein, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully,
7 knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so.

8 **V. REPRESENTATIVE CLAIMS**

9 **THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT- LABOR CODE §§ 2698 et seq.**

10 49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation
11 contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

12 50. On May 1, 2020 Plaintiff complied with notice requirements pursuant to Labor
13 Code section 2699.3. A copy of the letter sent to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**,
14 indicating that the LWDA and Defendants were put on notice of the claims alleged here and that
15 the notice requirement has been satisfied. Sixty five days have passed and the LWDA has not
16 indicated intent to investigate the claims. Therefore, Plaintiff may proceed with this action in a
17 representative capacity. The substance and violations set forth in this Complaint of which the
18 LWDA was provided timely notice, Plaintiff has also sent a copy of this PAGA Representative
19 Action Complaint to the LWDA.
20

21 51. Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee as defined in Labor Code Section 2699(a).
22 Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of all current and former California Non-Exempt
23 Employees of Defendants.

24 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) Plaintiff seek to recover civil penalties for
25 which Defendants are liable due to numerous Labor Code violations as set forth in this Complaint,
26 including without limitation Labor Code section 226, 266.2, 266.3, 226.7, 558, 512, 1174, 1174.5,
27 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 2802, 2698 et seq., applicable IWC Wage Orders and California
28 Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 et. seq.

1 53. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees regularly
2 performed non-exempt work in excess of 50% of the time, and thus, were subject to the meal and
3 rest break requirements of the applicable IWC wage order and the Labor Code.

4 54. Defendants violated Labor Code section 200, 558, 1194, 1197, by failing to
5 accurately pay at least minimum wages due as a result Defendants' piece rate compensation
6 scheme as discussed above and Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved
7 Employees for training.

8 55. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 226.7 for failing to provide
9 timely, uninterrupted first and second meal periods and requiring unlawful on duty meal periods,
10 or compensation in lieu thereof. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512, no employer shall employ
11 an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal break of not
12 less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties. An
13 employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day
14 without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes,
15 except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period
16 may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period
17 was not waived.

18 56. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees
19 uninterrupted duty free meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Defendants implemented
20 and enforced policies of on duty meal period practices which required employees to work during
21 their meal periods, to forego their meal periods, and/or to return to work from meal periods prior
22 to thirty (30) uninterrupted minutes. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations,
23 Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount according to proof
24 at time of trial.

25 57. At all relevant times, Labor Code section 226.2 requires employers to pay
26 employees compensated on a piece-rate basis for rest and recovery periods and other non-driving
27 time separate from any piece-rate compensation. Employees shall be compensated for rest and
28

1 recovery periods at a regular hourly rate that is no less than the higher of: (i) an average hourly
2 rate determined by dividing the total compensation for the workweek, exclusive of compensation
3 for rest and recovery periods and any premium compensation for overtime, by the total hours
4 worked during the workweek, exclusive of rest and recovery periods; (ii) the applicable minimum
5 wage. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and Class Members for their statutory required
6 rest breaks, due to Defendants' piece rate compensation.

7 58. Throughout the liability period, in violation of governing California law,
8 Defendants had a policy and practice of not paying its drivers time spent taking their Labor Code-
9 compliant rest periods. *See e.g., Bluford v. Safeway Stores, Inc.*, 216 Cal. App. 4th 864, 872-73.
10 Further, during the liability period, Defendants' failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and
11 Aggrieved Employees their required rest periods pursuant to the IWC wage orders applicable to
12 Plaintiff and Class Members' employment by Defendants and Labor Code §226.7 as Defendants'
13 and their supervisors maintained direction and control over Plaintiff and Class Members during
14 this time, or would prioritize freight delivery at the expense of Plaintiff and Class Members' rest
15 breaks. Despite this, Defendant's failed to pay Plaintiff and Class Members the required premiums
16 owed pursuant to §226.7 or were inaccurately paid the required premiums. Defendants willfully
17 violated the provisions of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512 and the applicable IWC Wage Order.

18 59. On information and belief, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
19 statements which failed to include all hours worked, accurate accounting of the lawful meal and
20 rest period premiums due and owing to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees, and the address of
21 the legal entity that is the employer pursuant to Labor Code section 226(a).

22 60. Additionally, Defendants have no accurate records relating to aggrieved
23 employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, total hours worked per payroll
24 period and applicable pay rates, in violation of Wage Order. Similarly, Defendants failed to
25 maintain accurate records relating to hours worked daily in violation of Labor Code sections
26 1174(d), 1174.5.

27 61. Lastly, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all
28

1 business expenses incurred for the use of their personal cellphones as discussed above pursuant to
2 Labor Code § 2802.

3 62. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees
4 are entitled to penalties to the extent they were not paid at the prevailing wage rate for all hours
5 worked.

6 63. Plaintiff and the Representative Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
7 Penalties and attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2698, et. seq.


8 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, as follows:

- 10 1. For penalties according to proof, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq.;
- 11 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
- 12 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.
- 13

14 Dated: September 9, 2020

JAMES R. HAWKINS, APLC

15 
16

17 James R. Hawkins, Esq.
18 Gregory E. Mauro, Esq.
19 Michael Calvo, Esq.

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff, and the general public
21 as private attorneys general

22

23

24

25

26

27

28