

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
 SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
 PHILLIP SONG (SBN 326572)
 HAIG HOGDANIAN (SBN 334699)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
 751 N. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 101
 Pasadena, California 91103
 Tel: (818) 230-7502
 Fax: (818) 230-7259

FILED
 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
 COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
 SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

JUN 15 2022

BY *Daisy B. Saylor*
 DAISY SAYLOR, DEPUTY

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

KEVIN MCNEIL and GUADALUPE
 ROMULO, individually, on behalf of other
 members of the general public similarly
 situated, and on behalf of aggrieved
 employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys
 General Act ("PAGA");

Plaintiffs,

v.

KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, a Delaware
 limited liability company; KIK POOL
 ADDITIVES, INC., a California corporation;
 KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC., a Texas
 corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
 inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CIVDS1915438
 [Consolidated with Case No. CIVDS2023661]

**FIRST CONSOLIDATED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION AMENDED
 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES,
 RESTITUTION, AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510 and 1198 (Unpaid Overtime);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Unpaid Meal Period Premiums);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Unpaid Rest Period Premiums);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 (Unpaid Minimum Wages);
- (5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 (Final Wages Not Timely Paid);
- (6) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Non-Compliant Wage Statements);
- (7) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Unreimbursed Business Expenses);

By Fax

1 (8) Violation of Labor Code § 2698, *et*
2 *seq.* (California Labor Code
3 Private Attorneys General Act of
4 2004); and

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiffs KEVIN MCNEIL and Guadalupe Romulo (“Plaintiffs”), individually, on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”) and allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiffs exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

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

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

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants maintain offices, have agents, employ individuals, and/or transact business in the State of California, County of San Bernardino. The majority of acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiffs and the other class members took place in the State of California, including the County of San Bernardino. In addition, Defendants employed Plaintiffs in the County of San Bernardino. Moreover, this action is brought on behalf of the State of California as a private attorney general and has jurisdiction in this venue.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff KEVIN MCNEIL is an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Plaintiff GUADALUPE ROMULO is an individual residing in the State of California.

7. Defendant KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware limited liability company, and at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Bernardino.

8. Defendant KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC., at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a California corporation, and at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Bernardino.

9. Defendant KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC., at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, a Texas corporation, and at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of San Bernardino.

10. At all relevant times, Defendants KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC., and KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. were the “employers” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable California laws and statutes.

11. At all times herein relevant, Defendants KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC., KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

///

///

///

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

13. Defendant KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC., KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC., KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS INC., KIK INTERNATIONAL LLC, and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

14. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs and the other class members and aggrieved employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

16. The proposed class is defined as follows:

Any and all hourly-paid or non-exempt individuals who worked for Defendants (whether employees of Defendants or a third-party staffing agency) within the State of California during the time period from May 21, 2015, to final judgment.

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

///

///

1 a. Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class
2 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown
3 to Plaintiffs at this time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than
4 two thousand two hundred (2,200) individuals and the identity of such
5 membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants'
6 employment records.

7 b. Typicality: Plaintiffs' claims are typical of all other class members' claims
8 as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the
9 interests of the other class members with whom he has a well-defined
10 community of interest.

11 c. Adequacy: Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of each
12 class member, with whom they have a well-defined community of interest
13 and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein. Plaintiffs have no
14 interest that is antagonistic to the other class members. Plaintiffs'
15 attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are versed in the rules governing
16 class action discovery, certification, and settlement. Plaintiffs have
17 incurred, and during the pendency of this action will continue to incur,
18 costs and attorneys' fees, that have been, are, and will be necessarily
19 expended for the prosecution of this action for the substantial benefit of
20 each class member.

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

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

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

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

- a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;
- b. Whether Defendants had a pattern and practice of failing to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed (short, late, interrupted, and/or missed altogether) meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California law;
- c. Whether Defendants required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work over eight (8) hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required overtime compensation to Plaintiffs and the other class members;
- d. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiffs and the other class members of meal and/or rest periods or required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during meal and/or rest periods without compensation;
- e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiffs and the other class members of recovery or cool-down rest periods;
- f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members for all hours worked;

///

- g. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiffs and the other class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;
- h. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code; including, *inter alia*, section 226;
- i. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;
- j. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;
- k. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;
- l. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and
- m. Whether Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

19. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

20. Defendants employed Plaintiff KEVIN MCNEIL as an hourly-paid or non-exempt employee from approximately in or about July 2006 to August 2017.

21. Plaintiff GUADALUPE ROMULO performed work for Defendants from approximately 2018 to 2019.

22. Defendants hired Plaintiffs and the other class members and classified them as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked, missed meal periods and/or rest breaks.

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

1 24. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
2 Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment for them to be joint employers of Plaintiffs
3 and the other class members.

4 25. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiffs and the other
5 class members.

6 26. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the
7 State of California.

8 27. Plaintiffs and the other class members worked over eight (8) hours in a day, and/or
9 forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

10 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
11 engaged in a pattern and practice of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or non-exempt
12 employees within the State of California, involving, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all regular
13 and/or overtime wages earned, missed meal periods and rest breaks in violation of California
14 law.

15 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
16 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
17 certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for overtime
18 compensation.

19 30. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
20 failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other class members the required rest and meal periods during
21 the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders and
22 thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

1 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
3 all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other class
4 member's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not receive all meal
5 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other class member's
6 regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

7 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
8 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
9 all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other class
10 member's regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not receive all rest
11 periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other class members'
12 regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

13 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
14 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
15 at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum
16 wages for all hours worked.

17 34. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
18 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
19 all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages
20 and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all such wages owed to
21 them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

22 35. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
23 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to receive
24 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did
25 not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies included,
26 *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiffs and the other
27 class members.

36. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other class members were entitled to reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to Plaintiffs and the other class members that they were properly denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

38. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members for all hours worked. Plaintiffs and the other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.

39. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide the requisite uninterrupted meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

40. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

41. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

42. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

43. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

44. During the relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

/ / /

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

46. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 45, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

48. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and were required to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members employed by Defendants, and working more than eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or more than forty (40) hours in a workweek.

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

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

51. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other class members worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day, and/or in excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

52. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay overtime wages owed to Plaintiffs and the other class members.

53. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

54. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 54, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

56. At all relevant times, the IWC Order and California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

57. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

/ / /

///

///

58. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a work period of more than five (5) hours per day without providing the employee with a meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six (6) hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and employee.

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

60. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6) hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or rest period.

61. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs and the other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6) hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or rest period.

62. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium for work performed during meal periods.

/ / /

63. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the full meal period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

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

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

66. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 65, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

67. At all times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiffs' and the other class members' employment by Defendants.

68. At all relevant times, California Labor Code section 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

///

///

///

69. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that “[e]very employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of each work period” and that the “rest period time shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof” unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3 ½) hours.

70. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiffs and other class members to work four (4) or more hours without authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

71. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiffs and the other class members to work during rest periods and failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the full rest period premium for work performed during rest periods.

72. At all relevant times, Defendants were required to provide a “recovery period” or “cool down period” to prevent heat illness.

73. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the full rest period premium due pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7

74. Defendants’ conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section 226.7.

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

///

///

///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, and 1197.1)

**(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM
PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

76. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 75, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

77. At all relevant times, California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful.

78. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay minimum wage to Plaintiffs and the other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1.

79. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Pursuant to those sections Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover the unpaid balance of their minimum wage compensation as well as interest, costs, and attorney's fees, and liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages unlawfully unpaid and interest thereon.

80. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover a penalty of \$100.00 for the initial failure to timely pay each employee minimum wages, and \$250.00 for each subsequent failure to pay each employee minimum wages.

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

///

///

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

82. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 81, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

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

84. During the relevant time period, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages, earned and unpaid, within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendants' employ.

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

86. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

87. Plaintiffs and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code section 203.

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

3 **(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOLADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM**
4 **PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

5 88. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
6 through 87, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
7 forth herein.

8 89. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code section 226(a)
9 provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized
10 statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee,
11 (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid
12 on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of
13 the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive
14 dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and his or her
15 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer, and (9)
16 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
17 worked at each hourly rate by the employee. The deductions made from payments of wages
18 shall be recorded in ink or other indelible form, properly dated, showing the month, day, and
19 year, and a copy of the statement or a record of the deductions shall be kept on file by the
20 employer for at least three years at the place of employment or at a central location within the
21 State of California.

22 90. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide Plaintiffs and the
23 other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include but
24 are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiffs and the
25 other class members.

26 ///

27 ///

91. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiffs and the other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

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

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

94. Plaintiffs and the other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

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

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

97. Plaintiffs and the other class members incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants.

/ / /

/ / /

1 98. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the
2 other class members for all necessary business-related expenses and costs. Plaintiffs and the
3 other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their business-related expenses and
4 costs incurred during the course and scope of their employment, plus interest accrued from the
5 date on which the employee incurred the necessary expenditures at the same rate as judgments
6 in civil actions in the State of California.

7 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation of Labor Code Section 2698, et seq. ("PAGA"))**

9 **(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM**
10 **PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

11 99. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
12 through 98, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
13 herein.

14 100. The Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") expressly establishes that
15 any provision of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and
16 collected by the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA"), or any of its
17 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
18 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee
19 on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

20 101. On August 12, 2020, Plaintiff GUADALUPE ROMULO provided written notice
21 to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contends were
22 violated, and the theories supporting her contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and
23 incorporated by reference is a copy of the written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiffs believe that on
24 or about October 16, 2020, the sixty-five (65) day notice period expired as to all Defendants, and
25 the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, Plaintiffs
26 exhausted the statutory time period to bring this action.

27 ///

1 102. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved
2 employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former
3 employees (whether hired directly or through staffing agencies or labor contractors) of Defendants
4 who worked for Defendants at any time during the period from August 12, 2019 to the present,
5 and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

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

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

11 104. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other
12 aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all
13 minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

14 105. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the other
15 current and former aggrieved employees for off-the-clock work, including work during pre-shift,
16 post-shift, and meal breaks. Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiffs and other current and
17 former aggrieved employees for off-the-clock work while they waited in line to record time and
18 while they were donning and doffing uniforms.

19 106. As a policy and practice, Defendants maintained an illegal rounding policy that
20 negatively affected Plaintiffs and the other current and former aggrieved employees’ time and pay.

21 107. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to include non-discretionary bonuses
22 and incentives in aggrieved employees’ regular rate for purposes of overtime compensation.

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

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

1 109. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other
2 aggrieved current and former employees with legally-mandated meal periods and rest breaks and
3 failed to pay proper compensation for this failure.

4 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages During Employment**

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

7 111. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved
8 current and former employees all wages due and owing them, including for uncompensated off-
9 the-clock work, uncompensated overtime premiums from excluding non-discretionary bonuses
10 and incentives from the regular rate, and premium wages for failing to provide meal and rest
11 breaks, within the required time period.

12 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

13 112. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
14 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor Code §§
15 201 to 204.

16 113. As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants failed
17 to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages, including for
18 uncompensated off-the-clock work, uncompensated overtime premiums from excluding non-
19 discretionary bonuses and incentives from the regular rate, and premium wages for failing to
20 provide meal and rest breaks, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting
21 time penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

22 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

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

7 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

8 116. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its employees
9 for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct consequences
10 of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802.

11 117. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved
12 current and former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them, such as personal
13 cell phone and vehicle use, within the required time period.

14 **Penalties**

15 118. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of
16 other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from
17 Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant,
18 including but not limited to:

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

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

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

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

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

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

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

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against KIK INTERNATIONAL, LLC, KIK POOL ADDITIVES, INC, KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

125. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 124, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

126. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair, unlawful and harmful to Plaintiffs, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants' competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiffs seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

/ / /

128. A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiffs and the other class members, to work overtime without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally, Defendants' policies and practices of requiring employees, including Plaintiffs and the other class members, to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Defendants' policies and practices of failing to pay minimum wages violate California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1. Moreover, Defendants' policies and practices of failing to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201, and 202. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 2800 and 2802.

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

130. Plaintiffs and the other class members have been personally injured by Defendants' unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the loss of money and/or property.

131. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code sections 17200, et seq., Plaintiffs and the other class members 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; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil procedure section 1021.5 and other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs, individually, on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, requests a trial by jury.

///

/ / /

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually, on behalf of all other members of the general
3 public similarly situated, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, prays
4 for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

5 **Class Certification**

- 6 1. That this action be certified as a class action;
- 7 2. That Plaintiffs be appointed as the representatives of the Class;
- 8 3. That counsel for Plaintiffs be appointed as Class Counsel; and
- 9 4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most
10 current/last known contact information (address, e-mail, and telephone numbers) of all class
11 members.

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

- 13 5. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
14 Labor Code sections 510 and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to pay
15 all overtime wages due to Plaintiffs and the other class members;
- 16 6. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special
17 damages as may be appropriate;
- 18 7. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid overtime compensation commencing
19 from the date such amounts were due;
- 20 8. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
21 California Labor Code section 1194; and
- 22 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

23 **As to the Second Cause of Action**

- 24 10. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
25 Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
26 provide all meal periods (including second meal periods) to Plaintiffs and the other class
27 members;

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

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

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

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

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

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

11 **As to the Third Cause of Action**

12 17. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
13 Labor Code section 226.7 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
14 rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members;

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

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

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

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

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

24 **As to the Fourth Cause of Action**

25 23. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
26 Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to
27 Plaintiffs and the other class members;

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

3 25. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1 for
4 Plaintiffs and the other class members in the amount as may be established according to proof
5 at trial;

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

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

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

11 29. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

12 **As to the Fifth Cause of Action**

13 30. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
14 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the
15 time of termination of the employment of Plaintiffs and the other class members no longer
16 employed by Defendants;

17 31. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
18 proof;

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

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

23 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code section 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiffs and the other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

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

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

39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

40. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other class members for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

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

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

45. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for civil penalties pursuant to statute as set forth in Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, for Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 218.5, 221, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512(a), 558, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;

46. Upon the Eighth Cause of Action, for costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 218.5, 1194, and 2699, and any other applicable statute; and

///

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

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

48. That the Court decree, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to provide Plaintiffs and the other class members all overtime compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the other class members, failing to pay Plaintiffs' and the other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code section 201, and 202 and by violating California Labor Code sections 226(a), 2800 and 2802.

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

50. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violation of California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.*;

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

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

53. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: June 15, 2022

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: 

Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Phillip Song
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 1

August 12, 2020

BY U.S. EMAIL/ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

PAGAfilings@dir.ca.gov
State of California
Labor & Workforce Development Agency
800 Capitol Mall, MIC-55
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: KIK POOL ADDITIVES INC. AND KIK CUSTOM PRODUCTS

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Guadalupe Romulo against KIK Pool Additives Inc., KIK Custom Products, (including any and all affiliates, managers, members, subsidiaries, and parents, and their shareholders, officers, directors, and employees), any individual, owner, officer and managing agent, DOES 1-10 as an "Employer" or person acting on behalf of an "Employer" pursuant to California Labor Code section 558.1, and DOES 11-20¹ for violations of California wage-and-hour laws (hereinafter collectively referred to as "KIK").

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

KIK Pool Additives Inc. is a California corporation located at 5160 E. Airport Dr., Ontario, California 91761. KIK Custom Products is an unknown business entity located at 5160 E. Airport Dr., Ontario, California 91761.

///

///

///

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

KIK employed Ms. Romulo as an hourly-paid non-exempt Machine Operator within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about August of 2019²) in the State of California. KIK employed Ms. Romulo through a staffing agency. However, KIK directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Ms. Romulo's employment, including setting her schedule, daily supervision of her work, and the procedures for recording time and taking meal and rest breaks.

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

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

Pursuant to *Huff v. Securitas Security Services*, 23 Cal. App. 5th 745, 751 (2018), an employee who brings a representative action and was affected by at least one of the violations alleged in the complaint has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state not only for that violation, but for violations affecting other employees as well. Accordingly, Ms. Romulo has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at KIK, regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

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

///

///

///

² Per Emergency Rule 9 (Tolling statute of limitations for civil causes of action) of the Judicial Council's Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19, all statute of limitations for civil causes of action that exceed 180 days are tolled from April 6, 2020 until October 1, 2020. Therefore, the one (1) year statute of limitations for Ms. Romulo's PAGA cause of action is tolled.

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

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

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 201 requires that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately. California Labor Code section 202 requires that if an employee not having a written contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting. California Labor Code section 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, in accordance with Labor Code sections 201, 201.3, 201.5, 201.6, 201.8, 201.9, 202, and 205.5, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefor is commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. During the relevant time period, KIK failed to pay Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code sections 201 and 203, including for all hours worked, uncompensated off-the-clock work, uncompensated overtime premiums arising from excluding non-discretionary bonuses and incentives from the regular rate and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. During the relevant time period, KIK failed to pay Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 204, including for all hours worked, uncompensated off-the-clock work, uncompensated overtime premiums arising from excluding non-discretionary bonuses and incentives from the regular rate, and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks.

///

///

///

California Labor Code section 226 requires employers to make, keep and provide complete and accurate itemized wage statements to their employees. During the relevant time period, KIK did not provide Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from KIK were in violation of California Labor Code section 226(a). The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross wages earned by Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees.

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

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

California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1 provide the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed is unlawful. During the relevant time period, KIK did not provide Ms. Romulo and other aggrieved employees with the minimum wages to which they were entitled despite constructive and actual knowledge of failing to pay them for all hours worked and off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift and during meal breaks, and maintaining an illegal rounding policy.

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

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

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

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

Ms. Romulo will seek these penalties and wages on her own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of KIK within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

LWDA
August 12, 2020
Page 7 of 7

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

Very truly yours,

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Han", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas Han, Esq.

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

C T Corporation System
c/o KIK Pool Additives Inc.
818 West Seventh Street, Suite 930
Los Angeles, California 90017
Agent for Service of Process for KIK Pool Additives Inc.

Legal Department
c/o KIK Custom Products
5160 E. Airport Dr.
Ontario, California 91761

CC (By Electronic Mail Only):

Justin Curley, Esq.
jcurley@seyfarth.com
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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

On June 15, 2022, I served the foregoing document described as

**FIRST CONSOLIDATED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION, AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

on interested parties in this action by placing a true and correct copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Gerald L. Maatman, Jr.
Jennifer A. Riley
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, 80th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Justin T. Curley
Shireen Y. Wetmore
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
560 Mission Street, 31st Floor
San Francisco, California 94105

Attorney(s) for KIK International, LLC, et al.

[X] BY U.S. MAIL

As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Pasadena, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing an affidavit.

[X] STATE

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

Executed on June 15, 2022, at Pasadena, California.



Sophia Hanneyan

**PROOF OF SERVICE
1013A(3) CCP**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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

On October 5, 2022, I served the foregoing document described as

**FIRST CONSOLIDATED CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION AMENDED
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION, AND CIVIL PENALTIES**

for the following case: **McNeil, et al v. KIK International, LLC, et al.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM- 802260-20**
Court Case No.: CIVDS1915438
San Bernardino County Superior Court

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

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

[X] BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

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

[X] STATE

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

Executed on October 5, 2022, at Pasadena, California.



Sophia Hanneyan