

Thomas D. Rutledge
Attorney-at-Law
113 West G Street, Suite 231
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 886-7224
Facsimile: (619) 259-5455

1 Thomas D. Rutledge (SBN 200497)
2 Attorney-at-Law
3 113 West G Street, Suite 231
4 San Diego, California 92101
5 Telephone: (619) 886-7224
6 Facsimile: (619) 259-5455

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

9 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO-CENTRAL DIVISION

10 ALVAN RAMIREZ, individually and on)
11 behalf of himself and others similarly)
12 situated,)

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 KOLOA PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION)
16 INC., a California corporation; and)
17 DOES 1 through 50 inclusive)

18 Defendants.)

Case No.: 37-2020-00026391-CL-OE-CTL

Judge: Hon. Ronald L. Styn
Dept.: C-74

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR:**

1. Failure to Provide Employee Records;
2. Failure to Pay State Minimum/Prevailing/Vacation Wages;
3. Failure to Pay State Overtime/Prevailing Wages;
4. Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Separation of Employment;
5. Meal and Rest Break Labor Code Violations;
6. Failure to Provide Accurate Wage Statements;
7. Failure to Maintain Records; and
8. Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*)

Complaint Filed: July 28, 2020

1 Plaintiffs ALVAN RAMIREZ (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself and acting for
2 the interests of other current and former employees (“Aggrieved Employees”) and all
3 other similarly situated individuals (cumulatively “Plaintiffs”), alleges the following:

4 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. This is a wage and hour individual, class, and representative action under
6 Code Civil Procedure § 382 and the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) of
7 2004, as amended, Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* case seeking unpaid wages and
8 related remedies.

9 2. By this action, Plaintiffs seek all legal remedies available to them caused
10 by Defendants’ violations of California law.

11 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 3. Pursuant to Article VI, § 10 of the California Constitution, subject matter
13 jurisdiction is proper in the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego, State
14 of California because Plaintiffs allege claims arising under California law.

15 4. This Court has jurisdiction over the Defendants because each is an
16 association, corporation, business entity, or individual that conducts substantial
17 business in the State of California, County of San Diego.

18 5. Pursuant to § 395 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, venue is
19 proper in the Superior Court of California for the County of San Diego because this is
20 where the wrongful misconduct alleged in this Complaint occurred.

21 **THE PARTIES**

22 6. Plaintiff ALVAN RAMIREZ is an individual that resides in San Diego
23 County, California.

24 7. Defendant KOLOA PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION INC. (“KOLOA”) is a
25 California corporation doing business in the San Diego County, California.

26 8. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate,
27 or otherwise of the Defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 50, are unknown to
28 Plaintiffs at this time. Plaintiffs therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious

1 names pursuant to § 474 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiffs will
2 seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of DOES
3 1 through 50 when the correct identities are ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and
4 believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the DOE Defendants is in some
5 manner liable to Plaintiffs for the events and actions alleged herein. All named
6 Defendants and DOES 1 through 50 are collectively referred to as “Defendants.”

7 9. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that at all
8 times relevant herein each Defendant was acting as an agent, joint venture, or as an
9 integrated enterprise and/or alter ego for each of the other Defendants, and each was a
10 co-conspirator with respect to the acts and the wrongful conduct alleged herein, so
11 that each is responsible for the acts of the other in connection with the conspiracy and
12 in proximate connection with the other Defendants.

13 10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each
14 Defendant was acting partly within and partly without the scope and course of their
15 employment, and was acting with the knowledge, permission, consent, and
16 ratification of every other Defendant.

17 11. Plaintiff are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each of
18 the Defendants was an agent, managing general partner, managing member, owner,
19 co-owner, partner, employee, and/or representative of each of the Defendants, and
20 were at all times material hereto, acting within the purpose and scope of such agency,
21 employment, contract and/or representation, and that each of them are jointly and
22 severally liable to Plaintiffs for the acts alleged herein

23 12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each
24 of the Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs under legal theories and doctrines including
25 but not limited to (1) joint employer; (2) integrated enterprise; (3) agency; and/or (4)
26 alter ego, based in part, on the facts set forth below.

27 13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege that each of
28 the named Defendants are part of an integrated enterprise and have acted or currently

1 act as the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiffs, making each of them liable for
2 the wage and hour violations alleged herein.

3 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 14. Defendants are in the construction business.

5 15. At all times relevant and within a year of this Complaint, Defendants
6 employed Plaintiff RAMIREZ on an hourly basis as a non-exempt nonunion worker
7 who performed work in San Diego, California from about October 13, 2019 until
8 Defendants terminated him on or about June 24, 2020.

9 **Failure to Provide Records Claims in Violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 1198.5**

10 16. On or about July 7, 2020, Plaintiff RAMIREZ, via counsel, sent a letter
11 via Fax and regular U.S. Mail to Defendants requesting access to Plaintiff's payroll
12 records and employee personnel files.

13 17. On or about July 22, 2020, Defendants purportedly produced Plaintiff's
14 personnel file and what appeared to be copies of wage statements Defendants issued
15 to the Plaintiff during his employment.

16 18. Upon close inspection, however, when comparing the original wage
17 statements Defendants issued to the Plaintiff with the copies Defendants provided in
18 response to Plaintiff's letter of July 7, 2020, the copies do not match the originals.

19 19. In particular, Defendants' purported copies of Plaintiff's wage and
20 earnings statements do not show "all of the information required by" Labor Code §
21 226(a) because the original wage and earnings statements Defendants issued Plaintiff
22 were missing the employer's address required under § 226(a)(8) and they did not
23 include information regarding "Paid Time Off," two categories of information
24 suspiciously added to the copies Defendants provided in response to Plaintiff's letter
25 of July 7, 2020.

26 20. Moreover, Defendants did not provide all of Plaintiff's wage and earning
27 statements, the last pay date of which one was provided was May 1, 2020, yet
28 Defendants terminated Plaintiff on June 24, 2020.

21. On August 7, 2020, after the original Complaint in this case was filed and served on the Defendant, Defendant provided Plaintiff's missing wage and earning statements from May 1, 2020 to the date of this termination, but Defendant neglected to provide a penalty payment for their untimely production or any other records that may be responsive to Plaintiff's request for his personnel file, such as Plaintiff's prevailing wage records within the meaning of Labor Code § 1776, *et seq.*

22. Based on the foregoing and among other things, Plaintiffs seek the remedies set forth in this Complaint.

Wage Statement Claims

23. From at least four years before the filing of this action and continuing to the present, and pursuant to company policy and/or practice and/or direction, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore allege that Defendants issued Plaintiff RAMIREZ and other Class Members erroneous wage and earning statements.

24. In particular, the wage and earning statements Defendants issued to Plaintiff RAMIREZ and presumably other Class Members are missing the "address of the legal entity that is the employer" in violation of Labor Code § 226(8).

25. In addition to the foregoing stand-alone claim under Labor Code § 226, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore allege that Plaintiff's paystubs and those of similarly situated employees of Defendants were inaccurate because Defendants failed to pay them all wages to which they had a right to receive, as alleged herein, supporting a derivative claim under Labor Code § 226.

26. As to Plaintiffs' PAGA case, this claim is also premised, in part, on Plaintiff's right to pursue all Labor Code claims on behalf of Aggrieved Employees per *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

Wage Claims

27. From at least four years before the filing of this action and continuing to the present, and pursuant to company policy and/or practice and/or direction,

1 Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore allege, that Defendants employed
2 Plaintiff RAMIREZ and Class Members to work on government projects and, upon
3 information and belief, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs prevailing wages as required
4 by law.

5 28. Within the relevant period on various dates during his employment,
6 Defendants, for example, required Plaintiff RAMIREZ and Class Members to work
7 on a variety of construction projects believed to be public works projects, such as
8 Merge 56, San Diego Juvenile Hall, among other government projects evidenced in
9 Plaintiff's timesheets Defendants produced in response to Plaintiff's request for his
10 personnel file.

11 29. During the foregoing projects, Defendants directed Plaintiff RAMIREZ
12 to leave the truck he drove to the worksite to perform mechanical repairs on
13 construction equipment located on public works job sites, often spending hours
14 replacing parts, repairing equipment, refilling fluids that had run low, and other
15 manual labor on public works projects.

16 30. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff RAMIREZ and, upon information and
17 belief, other Class Members prevailing wages for their work on public works projects
18 despite Defendants' requirements under California law.

19 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereupon allege that at
20 various times Defendants did not fully compensate Class Members for their labor
21 pursuant to the prevailing wage laws of California by, for example, making any fringe
22 benefit contributions that could offset the prevailing wage rate of pay for the
23 classification of their labor or paying the higher rate of pay as required under the
24 prevailing wage laws of California, among other reasons.

25 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereupon allege that at
26 various times Defendants also did not comply with Labor Code § 1776 because
27 Defendants did not maintain or retain records required to be maintained per § 1776.

28 33. California's "prevailing wage is a minimum wage, and therefore the

1 workers may assert their express rights to recover their unpaid prevailing wages under
2 the minimum wage provisions of section 1194.” (*Kirby v. Immoos Fire Prot., Inc.*
3 (2012) 53 Cal.4th 1244, 1252; *Road Sprinkler Fitters Local Union No. 669 v. G&G*
4 *Fire Sprinklers, Inc.* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 765, 770.)

5 34. In addition to the foregoing, Defendants’ written policy documented in
6 its Employee Handbook (page 27) provided Plaintiffs and similarly situated and
7 Represented Employees with paid vacation through an employer policy, which
8 purports to provide eligible employees with paid vacation to be accrued depending on
9 length of employment, starting with a minimum of working six months.

10 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereupon alleges that
11 Plaintiff RAMIREZ and other Aggrieved Employees worked long enough to accrue
12 vacation pay within the meaning of Defendants’ vacation policy.

13 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereupon alleges that
14 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and, upon information and belief the
15 Class/Aggrieved Employees, accrued vacation pay, despite Plaintiff RAMIREZ
16 having worked more than six months per Defendants’ Employee Handbook (page
17 27).

18 37. As to Plaintiffs’ PAGA case, this claim is also premised, in part, on
19 Plaintiff’s right to pursue all Labor Code claims on behalf of Aggrieved Employees
20 per *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

21 **Failure to Pay Meal and Rest Break Premiums**

22 38. From at least four years before the filing of this action and continuing to
23 the present, and pursuant to company policy and/or practice and/or direction,
24 Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereupon allege that Defendants
25 deprived Plaintiffs and other hourly employees from taking lawful meal and rest
26 periods and did not pay and refused to pay premium pay Plaintiffs premium pay
27 despite knowing its workers involuntarily missed their meal and rest breaks.

28 39. During all times relevant, for example, Defendants were on notice that

1 Plaintiffs and, upon information and belief, other Aggrieved Employee, were not
2 reporting the time taken for meal breaks on their timesheets or that their breaks were
3 too late in the workday to comply with California law.

4 40. Further, based on the nature of work Defendants assigned the Plaintiffs,
5 it was unreasonable in many circumstances, the exact amount to be proven at trial, for
6 Plaintiffs to take an uninterrupted meal break because they often had to skip their
7 meals to perform work on job sites before dusk, otherwise it would be too dark to see
8 what they were doing.

9 41. On October 14, 2019, Plaintiff RAMIREZ, for example, worked from
10 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., more than seven hours and 59 minutes, and then took an
11 untimely meal break at 4:00 p.m.

12 42. Similarly, on January 14, 2020, Plaintiff RAMIREZ, for example,
13 worked from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and was deprived of taking a meal break due to
14 the exigency of the job assignments Defendants issued him, the time of the year, and
15 the darkness on the jobsites.

16 43. Also because of Defendants' policy, Defendants prevented Plaintiffs and
17 Aggrieved Employees from taking all their uninterrupted rest breaks to which they
18 had the right to enjoy in an amount to be proven at trial, and Defendants failed to pay
19 them premium pay as required under California law. (*See Augustus v. ABM Security*
20 *Services* (2016) 2 Cal.5th 257.)

21 44. As to Plaintiffs' PAGA case, this claim is also premised, in part, on
22 Plaintiff's right to pursue all Labor Code claims on behalf of Aggrieved Employees
23 per *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 745.

24 **Derivative Claims.**

25 45. From at least four years before the filing of this action and continuing to
26 the present, and pursuant to company policy and/or practice and/or direction,
27 Plaintiffs and others did not receive their final paychecks immediately upon
28 involuntary termination or within 72 hours of voluntary separation, were not paid

1 final wages at the location of employment, and said final paychecks did not include
2 all wages due to the employee.

3 46. Pursuant to the above-mentioned policies, Plaintiffs worked more than
4 40 hours a week and/or 8 hours in a workday.

5 47. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore allege, that Defendants
6 did not pay Plaintiffs time and a half for all wages as required by law.

7 48. When Defendants terminated Plaintiff RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs are
8 informed and believe, and therefore allege, that Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff
9 RAMIREZ, and other similarly situated workers, all unpaid wages in their final
10 paycheck or in a timely manner.

11 49. Based on the foregoing misconduct, Defendants issued Plaintiffs
12 erroneous paystubs.

13 50. To date, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and therefore allege, that
14 Defendants have not paid Plaintiffs all of Plaintiffs' wages due and payable, in an
15 amount to be proven at trial.

16 51. As to Plaintiffs' PAGA case, Plaintiffs' derivative claims are also
17 premised, in part, on Plaintiff's right to pursue all Labor Code claims on behalf of
18 Aggrieved Employees per *Huff v. Securitas Security Services USA, Inc.* (2018) 23
19 Cal.App.5th 745.

20 **REPRESENTATIVE ACTION (PAGA) CLAIMS**

21 52. The duties and business activities of the Aggrieved Employees were
22 essentially the same as the duties and activities of the Plaintiff described above.

23 53. This wage and hour representative action filed pursuant to PAGA, §§
24 2698, 2699 generally consists of the following group:

25 **All current or former nonexempt employees who worked in**
26 **the state of California from August 11, 2019 to the present.**

27 54. All members of the represented group will be referred to as the
28 "Aggrieved Employees."

1 55. The “Representative Period” means from **August 11, 2019 to the**
2 **present.**

3 56. Plaintiff further alleges, on information and belief, that Aggrieved
4 Employees, did not receive all wages due at the time their employment ended with
5 Defendants.

6 57. On information and belief, Defendants current and former employees
7 were subject to wage and hour violations by Defendants, including failing to be paid
8 for all wages due.

9 58. California law provides that an employee may file an action against an
10 employer for penalties in connection with violations of the Labor Code and Wage
11 Orders provided the aggrieved employee file an action on behalf of him or herself and
12 similarly situated current and former employees.

13 59. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 50 were and/or
14 are Aggrieved Employees’ employers or persons acting on behalf of Aggrieved
15 Employees’ employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who
16 violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
17 Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any Order of the
18 Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
19 underpaid employee as set for in Labor Code § 558.

20 60. As set forth in further detail below, as a result of the analysis and
21 investigation of the Plaintiff’s claims, Plaintiff’s attorneys sent letters to the
22 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (hereinafter referred to as
23 “LWDA”) and to Defendants informing Defendants of Plaintiff’s claims and
24 Plaintiff’s intent to pursue litigation.

25 **EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

26 61. As to penalty claims under PAGA, on **August 11, 2020**, Plaintiffs, *et al.*,
27 via counsel, sent correspondence to the LWDA and Defendants via certified U.S.
28 Mail indicating that Plaintiffs are pursuing the claims alleged in this Complaint.

62. The statutory period for Plaintiffs have expired for the letter alleged above and the LWDA did not serve Plaintiffs with notice of intent to assume jurisdiction over the applicable penalty claims and did not provide notice as set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A) within the statutory period.

63. Therefore, Plaintiffs have exhausted Plaintiffs' administrative remedies to pursue claims and remedies as authorized by PAGA.

64. The Causes of Action alleged herein are appropriately suited for a Representative Action under PAGA (Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*) because:

a. This action involves allegations of violations of provisions of the California Labor Code that provide for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA or any departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees;

b. Plaintiffs are "aggrieved employees" because Plaintiffs were employed by the alleged violator and had one or more of the Labor Code violations alleged on this Complaint committed against them; and

c. Plaintiffs have satisfied the procedural requirements of Labor Code § 2699.3, as set forth above.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

65. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated as a Class Action.

66. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class composed of and defined as follows:

All current and former employees who worked in the state of California from August 11, 2016 to the present for the Defendants

67. Plaintiffs also seek to represent the following subclasses defined as follows:

Unpaid Minimum/Prevailing Wage Subclass: All members of the Plaintiff Class who worked less than eight hours a day or

less than 40 hours in a workweek on public works projects for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid non-exempt employee during the applicable statute of limitations period.

Unpaid Overtime/Prevailing Wage Subclass: All members of the Plaintiff Class who worked more than eight hours a day or more than 40 hours in a workweek on public works projects for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid non-exempt employee during the applicable statute of limitations period.

Unpaid Vacation Pay Subclass: All members of the Plaintiff Class who accrued and were not paid vacation by the Defendants pay during the applicable statute of limitations period.

Wage Statement Subclass: All members of the Plaintiff Class who worked for Defendants in California and did not receive accurate itemized wage statements as required by Labor Code § 226 during the applicable statute of limitations period.

Meal and Rest Break Subclass: All members of the Plaintiff Class who, during the applicable statute of limitations period worked for Defendants in California as an hourly-paid non-exempt employee and were not provided compliant meal and/or rest breaks and were not provided one hour of pay at their regular rate of compensation in lieu thereof during the applicable statute of limitations period.

Waiting Time Penalty Subclass: All nonexempt members of the Plaintiff Class whose employment was terminated during the applicable statute of limitations period and did not receive all wages in a timely manner as required by Labor Code §§ 201-204.

UCL Subclass: All Members of the Plaintiff Class, who, during the relevant period, Defendants owe restitution in the form of (1) unreimbursed expenses and/or (2) wages earned and unpaid because of Defendants' uniform pay policies and procedures.

68. The above-mentioned class-members will collectively be referred to as "Class Members."

69. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into Classes or limitation to particular issues.

70. This action is brought and may properly be maintained as a Class Action because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed Class Members are easily ascertainable.

A. Numerosity

71. The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous or many, that joinder of all the members of the Class is impracticable.

72. While the precise number of Class Members has not been determined at the time, Defendants currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, more than 100 Class Members.

73. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant periods necessarily increases the number substantially.

B. Commonality

74. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that predominates over any questions affecting only individual Class Members.

75. Common questions of law and fact include, without limitation and subject to possible further amendment, the following:

a. Whether Defendants' policy or practice of not paying Plaintiffs and other similarly situated employees' the lawful sum of compensation for the hours they worked on public works projects is illegal;

b. Whether Defendants violated California Labor Code § 227.3 by failing to pay all vested vacation wages at the time of termination of employment;

c. Whether Defendants violated Labor Code § 226 by not providing accurate paystubs to and other similarly situated employees;

- d. Whether Defendants violated the meal and rest break laws in California;
- e. Whether Defendants promptly paid all wages owed to Class members after the termination of the Class members' employment; and
- f. Whether Plaintiffs and the members of the Classes may recover remedies pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

C. Typicality

76. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the respective Classes because Plaintiffs and members of the proposed Classes sustained similar injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants' common courses of conduct and policies in violation of laws, regulations that have the force and effect of law and statutes as alleged herein.

D. Adequacy of Representation

77. Plaintiffs do not have any conflicts of interest with other Class Members and will prosecute the case vigorously on behalf of the Classes.

78. Counsel representing Plaintiffs and the putative Classes are competent and experienced in litigating employment class actions, including wage and overtime class actions.

79. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class Members.

E. Superiority of Class Action and Manageability

80. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy because individual joinder of all Class Members is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Classes predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Classes.

81. Each Class Member was damaged or suffered injury and may recover

1 remedies because of Defendants' illegal policies and/or practices.

2 82. Class Action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to
3 litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties
4 and the judicial system.

5 83. Plaintiffs are unaware of any difficulties likely to be encountered in the
6 management of this action that would preclude maintenance as a Class Action.

7 84. At the appropriate time, Plaintiffs will present a trial methodology and
8 plan that will streamline the action, base liability and damages on common evidence
9 and common modes of proof through Defendants' corporate records, testimony of
10 corporate common policy and practices, representative evidence, sampled and
11 presented in a manner consistent with recognized scientific and statistical principles.

12 85. Such methodology may include bifurcation of liability and damages, the
13 use of professionally administered survey evidence, seeking adjudication of class-
14 wide legal issues of specific claims or preliminary factual issues, and other methods
15 or proposals to manage class-wide determinations common to all persons in the
16 proposed Class.

17 86. For the reasons alleged in this Complaint, this action should be certified
18 as a Class Action.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Individual Claim for**

21 **Failure to Provide Access to Employee Personnel File**

22 **and Payroll Records in Violation of**

23 **California Labor Code §§ 226, 432, 1776, and 1198.5**

24 (Against all Defendants)

25 87. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing
26 allegations as though set forth herein.

27 88. California Labor Code § 226, subdivision (b), requires employers doing
28 business in the State of California to "afford current and former employees the right

1 to inspect or copy records pertaining to their employment, upon a reasonable request
2 to the employer...” and subdivision (c), requires employers to produce such records
3 within “21 calendar days from the date of the request.”

4 89. For the purposes of complying with California Labor Code § 226,
5 subdivision (a), a “‘copy’ includes a duplicate of the itemized statement provided to
6 an employee or a computer generated record that accurately shows all of the
7 information required by this subdivision.”

8 90. California Labor Code § 1198.5, *et seq.*, similarly provides current and
9 former employees the right to inspect their employee personnel records and requires
10 the employer to provide the employee access to such records no later than 30 calendar
11 days from the date the employer receives a written request.

12 91. California Labor Code § 1776, *et seq.*, similarly provides current and
13 former employees the right to inspect their employee prevailing wage records and
14 requires the employer to provide the employee access to such records no later than 30
15 calendar days from the date the employer receives a written request.

16 92. Plaintiff maintains the records he requested fall within the meaning of
17 Labor Code §§ 226, 432, 1776, and 1198.5, *et seq.* because they were part of and/or
18 related to Plaintiff’s personnel file.

19 93. As alleged above, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff timely access to
20 Plaintiff’s complete employee personnel file and/or the records to which he had rights
21 to obtain within the meaning of the foregoing statutes on multiple occasions in a
22 timely manner in violation of the above described statutes.

23 94. Because of the statutory violations, Plaintiff suffered damages, in an
24 amount to be determined according to proof at trial.

25 95. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that
26 Defendant continues to withhold records required to be provided under the foregoing
27 statutes and asserts he has been left without an adequate remedy at law, and should be
28 afforded the right to appropriate injunctive relief from this Court including, but not

1 limited to, an order by the Court requiring Defendants to turnover copies of remaining
2 portions, if any, of Plaintiff's complete employee personnel file.

3 96. Plaintiff seeks the recovery of costs and attorneys' fees as provided by
4 applicable law, including but not limited to California Labor Code § 226, subdivision
5 (h), § 1776, and § 1198.5, subdivision (l).

6 97. Plaintiff seeks the recovery of penalties as provided by applicable law,
7 including but not limited to California Labor Code §§ 226, subdivision (f) and 1198.5,
8 subdivision (k).

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Individual, Class, and Representative Claim via PAGA for** 11 **Failure to Pay State Minimum/Prevailing/Vacation Wages** 12 **in Violation of California Labor Code § 227.3, 1194, 1197, 1771, 1774, 1776,** 13 **1811, and 1815, and the applicable Wage Order**

14 (Against all Defendants)

15 98. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the foregoing
16 allegations as though set forth herein.

17 99. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1771, 1774, 1776, 1811,
18 1815, and 1198, it is unlawful for a California employer to suffer or permit an
19 employee to work without paying wages for all hours worked, as required by the
20 applicable Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC") Wage Order.

21 100. Labor Code § 227.3 provides that "[u]nless otherwise provided by a
22 collective bargaining agreement, whenever a contract of employment or employer
23 policy provides for vacation time, all vested vacation shall be paid to him as wages in
24 accordance with such contract or employment or employer policy respecting
25 eligibility or time served; provided, however, that an employment contract or
26 employer policy shall not provide for the forfeiture of vested vacation time upon
27 termination."

28 101. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereupon allege that

1 during all times relevant, Plaintiffs were not paid minimum/regular/prevaling wages
2 for all hours suffered or permitted to work on public works projects in violation of
3 California law.

4 102. Plaintiffs are also informed and believe and based thereupon allege that
5 Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees for vacation pay they accrued.

6 103. During all times relevant, Defendants were required to pay Plaintiffs and
7 other members of the Aggrieved Employees their respective hourly rate for all hours
8 worked and/or minimum wages and/or prevailing wages per state law or applicable
9 local law.

10 104. During all times relevant, at least one of the IWC Wage Orders applied
11 to Plaintiffs' employment with Defendants.

12 105. Pursuant to the applicable Wage Order, "hours worked" include the time
13 during which an employee is "suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required
14 to do so."

15 106. During the proposed Aggrieved Employees Period and based on the
16 misconduct alleged above, Defendants did not pay Plaintiffs and Aggrieved
17 Employees minimum/regular wages for all hours suffered or permitted to work in
18 violation of state and/or local law and/or prevailing wage law.

19 107. Labor Code § 1194 subdivision (a) permits an action to recover wages
20 because of the payment of a wage less than the minimum wage "applicable to the
21 employee" including attorneys' fees, costs, and interest.

22 108. At all material times, Defendants were and/or are Aggrieved
23 Employees' employers or persons acting on behalf of Aggrieved Employees'
24 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code §§ 558 and 558.1, who
25 violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
26 Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any Order of the
27 Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are subject to civil penalties for each
28 underpaid employee as set for in Labor Code § 558.

1 109. In committing the violations of state law as herein alleged, Plaintiffs are
2 informed and believe based there upon allege that Defendants have knowingly and
3 willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate Aggrieved Employees for
4 all wages earned and all hours worked.

5 110. As a direct result, Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to
6 suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such compensation,
7 wages, lost interest on such monies and expenses and attorneys' fees in seeking to
8 compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under state and/or local law.

9 111. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon Defendants, and each of
10 them, a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per
11 pay period for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved
12 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation in which Defendants violated
13 the minimum wage and/or regular wage provisions of the Labor Code, including but
14 not limited to §§ 216, 218, 218.5, 227.3, 558, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1771, 1774, 1776,
15 1811, 1815, 1182.12, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198 the exact amount of the applicable
16 penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

17 112. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees
18 seek to recover from Defendants, and each of them, penalties, attorneys' fees, and
19 costs incurred herein.

20 113. Plaintiff and the Class also request the recovery of the unpaid wages,
21 waiting time penalties, liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs in an
22 amount to be determined at trial.
23
24
25
26
27
28

Thomas D. Rutledge
Attorney-at-Law
113 West G Street, Suite 231
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 886-7224
Facsimile: (619) 259-5455

1 practice and/or direction, Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved
2 Employees to work more than 40 hours per week and/or eight hours in a workday on
3 public works projects to which they had the right to receive prevailing wages and
4 Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all overtime
5 compensation to which they should have received at the prevailing wage rate.

6 122. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to pay Aggrieved Employees all
7 overtime to which they had a right to receive.

8 123. In committing the violations of state law as herein alleged, Defendants
9 have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate
10 Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned and all hours worked.

11 124. At all material times, Defendants were and/or are Aggrieved Employees'
12 employers or persons acting on behalf of Aggrieved Employees' employer, within the
13 meaning of California Labor Code §§ 558 and 558.1, who violated or caused to be
14 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision
15 regulating hours and days of work in any Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission
16 and, as such, are subject to penalties for each underpaid employee as set for in Labor
17 Code § 558.

18 125. In committing the violations of state law as herein alleged, Defendants
19 have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate
20 Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned and all hours worked.

21 126. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon Defendants, and each of them,
22 a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay
23 period for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved
24 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation in which Defendants violated
25 the overtime provisions of the Labor Code, including but not limited to §§ 510, 558
26 and 1194, the exact amount of the penalties sought is in an amount to be shown
27 according to proof at trial.

28 127. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs seek to recover from

1 Defendants, and each of them, penalties, attorneys' fees, and costs incurred herein.

2 128. Plaintiff and the Class also request the recovery of the unpaid wages,
3 waiting time penalties, liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs in an
4 amount to be determined at trial.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **Individual, Class, and Representative Claim via PAGA for**
7 **Failure to Timely Pay Earned Wages Upon Separation of Employment in**
8 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 204b,**
9 **218.5, 218.6, 256, 1198 and the applicable Wage Order**

10 (Against all Defendants)

11 129. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations
12 as though set forth herein.

13 130. Pursuant to Labor Code § 201, "If an employer discharges an employee,
14 the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable
15 immediately."

16 131. Pursuant to Labor Code § 202, "If an employee not having a written
17 contract for a definite period quits his or her employment, his or her wages shall
18 become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has
19 given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the
20 employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting."

21 132. Labor Code § 203 provides, in pertinent part: "If an employer willfully
22 fails to pay, without abatement or reduction, ... any wages of an employee who is
23 discharged or who quits, the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty from
24 the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
25 commenced; but the wages shall not continue for more than 30 days. ..."

26 133. Pursuant to Labor Code § 204, "all wages ... earned by any person in
27 any employment are due and payable twice during each calendar month, on days
28 designated in advance by the employer as the regular paydays."

1 134. Pursuant to Labor Code § 204b, “Labor performed by a weekly-paid
2 employee during any calendar week and prior to or on the regular payday shall be
3 paid for not later than the regular payday of the employer for such weekly-paid
4 employee falling during the following calendar week.”

5 135. Defendants did not properly pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
6 pursuant to the requirements of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 204 and/or 204b and thereby
7 Plaintiffs seek the unpaid wages.

8 136. To date, Defendants have not paid terminated Aggrieved Employees all
9 earned wages as required by law.

10 137. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 50 were and/or
11 are Aggrieved Employees’ employers or persons acting on behalf of Aggrieved
12 Employees’ employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who
13 violated or caused to be violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
14 Labor Code or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any Order of the
15 Industrial Welfare Commission and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
16 underpaid employee as set for in Labor Code § 558.

17 138. In committing the violations of state law as herein alleged, Defendants
18 have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations to compensate
19 Aggrieved Employees for all wages earned and all hours worked.

20 139. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon Defendants, and each of them,
21 a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay
22 period for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved
23 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation in which Defendants violated
24 Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 204b, and 256.

25 140. As alleged above, Defendants have deprived Plaintiffs and Aggrieved
26 Employees of their rightfully earned wages as a direct and proximate result of
27 Defendants’ failure and refusal to pay said compensation and for the reasons alleged
28 in this Complaint.

141. Plaintiffs seek all waiting time penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, damages, and other remedies pursuant to PAGA in an amount to be proven at trial.

142. Plaintiff and the Class also request the recovery of the waiting time penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, costs and related remedies in an amount to be determined at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Individual, Class, and Representative Claim via PAGA for Failure to Comply with the Meal and Rest Break Requirements Under Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 1198, and the applicable IWC Wage Order

(Against all Defendants)

143. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as though set forth herein.

144. Based on the misconduct alleged in this Complaint, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees premium pay for all their missed meal and rest breaks and failed to comply with Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 1198.

145. Because of Defendants' illegal pay practices, said Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all meal and rest breaks despite their requirement under California law and, as such, all culpable Defendants are required to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for rest break and/or meal break premium wages.

146. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff, and Aggrieved Employees, legally-compliant meal and rest periods, or compensation in lieu thereof, during their employment by said Defendants.

147. Cal. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon all culpable Defendants a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation in which all culpable Defendants violated Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, the exact amount of the applicable penalty is all in

1 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

2 148. Wherefore, Plaintiffs request all remedies available to them and to the
3 Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

4 149. Plaintiff and the Class also request the recovery of the unpaid premium
5 pay, interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and related remedies in an amount to be
6 determined at trial.

7 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **Individual, Class, and Representative Claim via PAGA for** 9 **Violations of California Labor Code §§ 226, 226.3, 226.6, 1198,** 10 **and the applicable IWC Wage Order**

11 (Against all Defendants)

12 150. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations
13 as though set forth herein.

14 151. Plaintiffs allege that Labor Code § 226 subdivision (a) requires, in
15 pertinent part, that every employer shall, "semimonthly or at the time of each
16 payment of wages, shall furnish to his or her employees, either as a detachable part of
17 the check, draft, or voucher paying the employee's wages, or separately if wages are
18 paid by personal check or cash, an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1)
19 gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee. . . (3) the number of
20 piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a
21 piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written
22 orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages
23 earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the
24 name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security
25 number..., (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer. . . , and
26 (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding
27 number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee and, beginning July 1,
28 2013, if the employer is a temporary services employer as defined in Section 201.3,

1 the rate of pay and the total hours worked for each temporary services assignment. . .”
2 (Labor Code § 226 subdivision (a).)

3 152. Upon information and belief, during all times relevant to this action,
4 Defendants did not provide accurate wage statements throughout the Aggrieved
5 Employees Period and, thus, Plaintiffs assert this claim both as a stand-alone claim
6 and derivative of their unpaid wage claims.

7 153. On numerous occasions, an exact amount by which will be proven at
8 trial, Defendants violated various provisions of § 226, including but not limited to
9 subdivisions (a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(4), (a)(5), and (a)(9) by failing to provide Plaintiffs and
10 the Aggrieved Employees accurate itemized statement in writing accurately showing
11 gross wages earned, total hours worked by the employee, net wages earned, rates of
12 pay, among other things.

13 154. Cal. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon all culpable Defendants a
14 penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period
15 for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per
16 pay period for each subsequent violation in which all culpable Defendants violated
17 the applicable Cal. Labor Code provisions alleged in this Complaint, the exact amount
18 of the applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

19 155. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiffs and Aggrieved Employees
20 seek to recover from Defendants, and each of them, penalties, attorneys’ fees, and
21 costs incurred herein under §§ 226, 226.3, and 226.6 in an amount to be proven at
22 trial.

23 156. Plaintiff and the Class also request the recovery of penalties, damages,
24 interest, attorneys’ fees, costs, and related remedies in an amount to be determined at
25 trial.
26
27
28

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Representative Claim for PAGA Penalties
For Failure to Maintain Required Records in Violation of California
Labor Code §§ 1174 and the Applicable Wage Order and/or § 1198
(Against All Defendants)

157. As a separate and distinct cause of action, Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, all the allegations contained in this Complaint, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.

158. Section 7 of the typical Wage Order requires every employer to maintain time and payroll records.

159. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon alleges that during all times relevant, Defendants failed to comply with § 7 of the applicable IWC Orders and with Labor Code § 1174 by failing to maintain certain records which employers are required to maintain, including but not limited to, an accurate record indicating the number hours worked by the Plaintiffs.

160. Cal. Labor Code § 2699, *et seq.* imposes upon all culpable Defendants a penalty of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred (\$200.00) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation in which all culpable Defendants violated the applicable Cal. Labor Code provisions alleged in this Complaint, the exact amount of the applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

161. For the reasons alleged herein, Plaintiffs seek all available remedies pursuant to PAGA in an amount to be proven at trial including but not limited to penalties, attorneys' fees, costs, and interest pursuant to law.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**Claim for Remedies for Violation of the
California Unfair Business Practices Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***

(Against all Defendants)

162. As a separate and distinct cause of action, Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth herein, all the allegations contained in this Complaint, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.

163. Defendants, and each of them, are “persons” as defined under Business and Professions Code § 17021.

164. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and based thereon allege that Defendants committed the unfair business practices, as defined by Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*, by violating the laws alleged to have been violated in this Complaint and which allegations are incorporated herein by reference and which allegations include, but are not limited to:

- a. Failing to provide the Class and Plaintiff an accurate itemized wage statement in violation of § 226 of the Labor Code;
- b. Failing to pay meal and rest break premiums;
- c. Failing to pay the Class and Plaintiff all wages due and owing including minimum/regular/prevaling wages and overtime compensation; and
- d. Failure to pay Class Members, including Plaintiff, wages in a timely manner upon their termination or resignation.

165. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged above, constitutes unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent activity prohibited by Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

166. The unlawful and unfair business practices conducted by Defendants, and each of them, are ongoing and present a threat and likelihood of continuing against Plaintiffs and, accordingly, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief where appropriate.

167. Plaintiffs have suffered injuries in fact and lost money or property

1 because of the above alleged unfair competition.

2 168. Because of their improper acts, Defendants, and each of them, have
3 reaped and continue to reap unfair benefits and illegal profits at the expense of
4 Plaintiff and other employees and former employees of Defendants, and each of
5 them.

6 169. Defendants, and each of them, should be enjoined from this activity and
7 made to disgorge these ill-gotten gains and restore to Plaintiff and the Class the
8 wrongfully withheld wages and/or penalties, pursuant to Business and Professions
9 Code §§ 17202 and/or 17203.

10 170. Plaintiff and the Class have also incurred and continue to incur attorneys'
11 fees and legal expenses in an amount according to proof at the time of trial and for
12 which they seek compensation pursuant to law including but not limited to Code of
13 Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 16 1. An order that this action may proceed and be maintained as a class action;
- 17 2. For appointment of Plaintiff RAMIREZ as the representative of the Class;
- 18 3. For appointment of Plaintiffs' counsel as Class Counsel;
- 19 4. That Defendants be found liable to Plaintiffs;
- 20 5. That Defendants, and each of them, be ordered and enjoined to pay
21 restitution to Plaintiff and/or the Class and/or Aggrieved Employees
22 pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-05;
- 23 6. That Defendants, and each of them, be required to issue to Plaintiff and/or
24 the Class and/or Aggrieved Employees accurate wage and earning
25 statements;
- 26 7. For disgorgement through restitution of all ill-gotten and/or ill-gained
27 profits, including unpaid wages and/or penalties to Plaintiff and/or the Class
28 and/or Aggrieved Employees, resulting from Defendants' unfair business

- practices pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17200-05;
8. For an order by the Court requiring Defendants, and each of them, to show cause, if any they have, as to why to Plaintiff and/or the Class and/or Aggrieved Employees should not have been issued itemized wage statements as required by § 226 of the Labor Code and why Defendants should not be required to pay Plaintiff minimum wages and overtime compensation under applicable state law;
9. For all remedies available to Plaintiff under the applicable provisions of the Labor Code via PAGA Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.* including an award of attorneys' fees, costs, interest, liquidated damages, damages, penalties and waiting time penalties according to proof to the extent permitted by law;
10. For maximum civil penalties available under the Labor Code and applicable Wage Order as described more particularly in this Complaint, representative PAGA claims including the payment of wages as set forth in Labor Code § 558;
11. For Labor Code § 203 penalties in an amount to be proven at trial;
12. For special and general damages;
13. That Plaintiff and/or the Class and/or Aggrieved Employees be awarded reasonable attorneys' fees where available by law, including but not limited to pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5, and/or other applicable laws; and
14. For any other relief the Court may deem just, proper and equitable in the circumstances.

Dated: October 19, 2020

By: Thomas D. Rutledge
/s/Thomas D. Rutledge, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

3 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

4 I, THOMAS D. RUTLEDGE, the undersigned, am employed in the County of
5 San Diego, State of California; I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within
6 action; my business address is 113 West G Street, Suite 231, San Diego, California
92101.

7 On October 19, 2020, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

8 **SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

9 on the interested parties to this action by placing a copy thereof enclosed in a sealed
10 envelope addressed as follows: **See Attached List.**

11 ☐ **(BY MAIL)** I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and
12 processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. This
13 correspondence was deposited with the United States Postal Service this same day in
14 the ordinary course of business at our Firm's office address in San Diego, California.
Service made pursuant to this paragraph, upon motion of a party served, shall be
presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date of postage meter date on the envelope
is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in this affidavit.

15 ☒ **(BY E-MAIL via E-file)** I am readily familiar with the business practice for
16 collection and processing of correspondence for emailing with the Court authorized
third-party vendor. This correspondence was sent via email via this third-party vendor
pursuant to the vendor's policies and practices.

17 ☐ **(BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY SERVICE)** I served the foregoing document by
18 Federal Express, an express service carrier which provides overnight delivery, as
19 follows. I placed true copies of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or
packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed to each interested party
as set forth above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.

20 ☐ **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE)** I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to
21 the offices of the above named addressee(s).

22 ☐ **(BY FACSIMILE)** I caused such documents to be delivered via facsimile to the
23 offices of the addressee(s) at the following facsimile number:

24 Executed October 19, 2020, at San Diego, California.

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

26 THOMAS D. RUTLEDGE
27 /s/THOMAS D. RUTLEDGE
28

Thomas D. Rutledge
Attorney-at-Law
113 West G Street, Suite 231
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 886-7224
Facsimile: (619) 259-5455

SERVICE LIST

David S. Demian, Esquire
Finch, Thornton & Baird, LLP
4747 Executive Drive, Suite 700
San Diego, California 92121
Counsel for Defendant

Christopher W. Olmsted
Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart, P.C.
4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 990
San Diego, California 92122
Counsel for Defendant

Thomas D. Rutledge
Attorney-at-Law
113 West G Street, Suite 231
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 886-7224
Facsimile: (619) 259-5455