

DOUGLAS HAN (SBN 232858)
SHUNT TATAVOS-GHARAJEH (SBN 272164)
HAIG HOGDANIAN (SBN 334699)
JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION
751 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Suite 101
Pasadena, California 91103
Telephone: (818) 230-7502
Facsimile: (818) 230-7259

Attorneys for Plaintiff

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

JIMMY ARROYO, 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");

Plaintiff,

v.

BENTLEY MILLS, INC., a Delaware
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: 20PSCV00789

Assigned for All Purposes to:
Honorable Thomas C. Falls
Department R

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES
FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTION 2698 ET SEQ. (PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

- (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, 202, and 203 (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

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

11/10/2021

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: J. Gonzalez Deputy

Expenses);

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

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

Complaint Filed: November 13, 2020

Trial Date: None Set

COMES NOW, Plaintiff Jimmy Arroyo ("Plaintiff") hereby submits his Complaint against Defendants Bentley Mills, Inc., and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive; (collectively, "Defendants"), individually, on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and on behalf of herself and other current and former aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA"), alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceed 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 California Constitution, Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all 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 all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of California law so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the named Defendants transact business, have agents, and/or maintain offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county. The majority of the acts and omissions alleged herein relating to Plaintiff took place in the State of California. Defendants employed Plaintiff within the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Jimmy Arroyo is an individual residing in the State of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the statutory time period.

///

///

1 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants are
2 licensed to do business and actually doing business in the State of California, including the
3 County of Los Angeles.

4 7. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual,
5 partner or corporate, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and for that
6 reason, said Defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff prays for leave to
7 amend this complaint when the true names and capacities are known. Plaintiff is informed and
8 believes and thereon alleges that each of Defendants designated as a DOE was legally
9 responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Plaintiff and the
10 other class members to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs, injuries, and
11 damages complained of herein.

12 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were
13 agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-
14 conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within
15 the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives,
16 servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and assigns, and that all acts or omissions
17 alleged herein were duly committed with ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement,
18 authorization and consent of each Defendant designated herein.

19 9. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants directly or indirectly controlled
20 or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of
21 Plaintiff and the other class members so as to make each of said Defendants employers and
22 employers liable under the statutory provisions set forth herein.

23 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

24 10. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all other
25 members of the general public similarly situated, and, thus, seeks class certification under
26 Code of Civil Procedure section 382.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **11.** The proposed class is defined as follows:

2 Any and all persons who have been employed by Defendants as non-exempt or
3 hourly paid employees in California at any time from September 8, 2019 to the
4 present.

5 **12.** Plaintiff reserves the right to establish subclasses as appropriate.

6 **13.** The class is ascertainable and there is a well-defined community of interest in
7 the litigation:

8 **a.** Numerosity: The class members are so numerous that joinder of all class
9 members is impracticable. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at this
10 time; however, the class is estimated to be greater than two hundred fifty (250) individuals and
11 the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by inspection of Defendants'
12 employment records.

13 **b.** Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of all other class members'
14 claims as demonstrated herein. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the
15 other class members with whom she has a well-defined community of interest.

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

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

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

9 a. Whether Defendants' failure to pay wages, without abatement or
10 reduction, in accordance with the California Labor Code, was willful;

11 b. Whether Defendants failed to pay their hourly-paid or non-exempt
12 employees within the State of California for all hours worked, missed meal periods and rest
13 breaks in violation of California law;

14 c. Whether Defendants required class members to work over eight (8)
15 hours per day and/or over forty (40) hours per week and failed to pay the legally required
16 overtime compensation to class members;

17 d. Whether Defendants properly calculated the regular rate for class
18 members to worked overtime and earned bonuses and/or incentive pay (including but not
19 limited to shift differentials);

20 e. Whether Defendants deprived Plaintiff and other class members of meal
21 and/or rest periods or required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during meal
22 and/or rest periods without compensation;

23 f. Whether Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and other
24 class members for all hours worked;

25 g. Whether Defendant maintained an illegal rounding policy;

26 h. Whether Defendants failed to pay all wages due to Plaintiff and other
27 class members within the required time upon their discharge or resignation;

28 ///

i. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay all wages due to Plaintiff and other class members during their employment;

j. Whether Defendants complied with wage reporting as required by the California Labor Code, including, inter alia, section 226;

k. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-related expenses and costs;

1. Whether Defendants' conduct was willful or reckless;

m. Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*;

n. The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, and/or monetary penalties resulting from Defendants' violation of California law; and

o. Whether Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to compensatory damages pursuant to the California Labor Code.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

15. During the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California.

16. Defendants, jointly and severally, hired Plaintiff and other class members and classified them as hourly-paid, non-exempt employees, and failed to compensate them for all hours worked, and/or missed rest periods.

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

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

111

///

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

4 **20.** Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiff and other
5 class members.

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

8 **22.** Plaintiff and 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 **23.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, 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. This scheme involved, inter alia, failing to pay
13 Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours worked, missed meal periods, and
14 missed rest breaks in violation of California law.

15 **24.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive
17 certain wages for overtime compensation and that Plaintiff and other class members were not
18 receiving wages for overtime compensation. This includes but is not limited to that Defendants
19 failed to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours worked and
20 performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift donning and doffing uniforms,
21 waiting in line to clock-in and during meal breaks.

22 **25.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
23 knew or should have known that it had a rounding policy that was neither fair nor neutral and
24 that Plaintiff and other class members were underpaid wages owed to them because of
25 Defendant's illegal rounding policy.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **26.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives (including but not limited to shift
3 differentials) in aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation
4 and therefore Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were entitled to receive certain wages
5 for overtime compensation and other payments but were not paid properly for all hours work and
6 not paid properly for all overtime hours worked.

7 **27.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
8 failed to provide Plaintiff and other class members the required rest and meal periods during
9 the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders
10 and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

11 **28.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
12 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
13 timely and complete meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and
14 the other class members' regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, late or
15 interrupted, and that Plaintiff and other class members did not receive all timely and proper
16 meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at their regular rate of pay when a meal
17 period was missed.

18 **29.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
19 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive all
20 timely rest periods without interruption or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiff
21 and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, late or
22 interrupted, and they did not receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay
23 at Plaintiff' and the other class members' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

24 **30.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
25 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive at
26 least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least minimum
27 wages for all hours worked.

28 ///

1 **31.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
2 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive the
3 wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and minimum wages
4 and meal and rest period premiums, and that Plaintiff and other class members did not, in fact,
5 receive such wages owed to them at the time of their discharge or resignation.

6 **32.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
7 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other class members were entitled to receive
8 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact, they did
9 not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies
10 included, inter alia, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiff and
11 other class members.

12 **33.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
13 knew or should have known that Plaintiff and the other class members were entitled to
14 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses.

15 **34.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
17 for Plaintiff and other class members in accordance with California law, but, in fact, did not
18 keep complete and accurate payroll records.

19 **35.** Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
20 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and other class
21 members pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
22 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely
23 represented to Plaintiff and other class members that they were properly denied wages, all in
24 order to increase Defendants' profits.

25 **36.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
26 Defendants failed to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other class members for all hours
27 worked. Plaintiff and other class members were required to work more than eight (8) hours per
28 day and/or forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.

1 **37.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
2 Defendant consistently underpaid wages owed to Plaintiff and other class members due to its
3 illegal rounding policy.

4 **38.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
5 Defendants failed to provide the requisite uninterrupted and timely meal and rest periods to
6 Plaintiff and other class members.

7 **39.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
8 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members at least minimum wages for all
9 hours worked.

10 **40.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
11 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members the wages owed to them upon
12 discharge or resignation.

13 **41.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
14 Defendants failed to provide complete or accurate wage statements to Plaintiff and other class
15 members.

16 **42.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
17 Defendants failed to keep complete or accurate payroll records for Plaintiff and other class
18 members.

19 **43.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
20 Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the other class members for necessary business-
21 related expenses and costs.

22 **44.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
23 Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and other class members pursuant to
24 California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

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

28 ///

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44, 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 Plaintiff and other class members employed by Defendants, who work(ed) 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 Plaintiff and 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 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 set forth herein, Plaintiff and 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. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay and/or properly calculate overtime wages owed to Plaintiff and other class members.

1 **53.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
2 Defendant intentionally and willfully maintained a rounding policy that was neither fair nor
3 neutral that resulted in Plaintiff and other class members being underpaid wages owed.

4 **54.** Defendants failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives (including
5 but not limited to shift differentials) in aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of
6 overtime compensation and therefore Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees were entitled to
7 receive certain wages for overtime compensation and other payments but were not paid properly
8 for all hours work and not paid properly for all overtime hours worked.

9 **55.** Defendants' pattern and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and other class
10 members the unpaid balance of overtime compensation, as required by California laws, violates
11 the provisions of California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198, and is therefore unlawful.

12 **56.** Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194, Plaintiff and other class
13 members are entitled to recover unpaid overtime compensation, as well as interest, costs, and
14 attorneys' fees.

15 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

18 **57.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
19 through 54, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
20 forth herein.

21 **58.** During the relevant time period set forth herein, the IWC Wage Order and
22 California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and other class
23 members' employment by Defendants.

24 **59.** During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
25 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any meal or rest
26 period mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

14 **62.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff
15 and other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than six (6)
16 hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
17 required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of
18 not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

19 **63.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff
20 and other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time no longer than twelve
21 (12) hours, and who did not waive their legally mandated meal periods by mutual consent, were
22 required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted meal period of
23 not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

24 **64.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff
25 and other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of six (6)
26 hours were required to work for periods longer than five (5) hours without an uninterrupted meal
27 period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

28 ///

1 **65.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Plaintiff
2 and other class members who were scheduled to work for a period of time in excess of twelve
3 (12) hours were required to work for periods longer than ten (10) hours without an uninterrupted
4 meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes and/or without a rest period.

5 **66.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
6 Defendants intentionally and willfully required Plaintiff and other class members to work during
7 meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and the other class members the full meal period
8 premium for work performed during meal periods.

9 **67.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
10 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members the full meal period premium due
11 pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7.

12 **68.** Defendants' conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor
13 Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

14 **69.** Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code section
15 226.7(b), Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
16 additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the
17 meal or rest period is not provided.

18 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **(Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7)**

20 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

21 **70.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
22 through 67, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
23 forth herein.

24 **71.** During the relevant time period set forth herein, the applicable IWC Wage Order
25 and California Labor Code section 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and the other class
26 members' employment by Defendants.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **72.** During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code section
2 226.7 provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period
3 mandated by an applicable order of the California IWC.

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

10 **74.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
11 Defendants required Plaintiff and other class members to work four (4) or more hours without
12 authorizing or permitting a ten (10) minute rest period per each four (4) hour period worked.

13 **75.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
14 Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and the other class members to work during rest periods
15 and failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium for work
16 performed during rest periods. Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and non-
17 exempt employees to take the request number of meal and rest breaks, including second meal
18 breaks and third rest breaks, when working shifts exceeding 10 hours in length.

19 **76.** As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein,
20 Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the other class members the full rest period premium due
21 pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7

22 **77.** Defendants’ conduct violates applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor
23 Code section 226.7.

24 **78.** Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code section
25 226.7(b), Plaintiff and the other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one
26 additional hour of pay at the employees’ regular hourly rate of compensation for each workday
27 that the rest period was not provided.

28 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

79. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 76 and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

80. During the relevant time period set forth herein, California Labor Code sections 1194 and 1197 provide that the minimum wage to be paid to employees, and the payment of a lesser wage than the minimum so fixed, is unlawful.

81. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay minimum wages to Plaintiff and other class members as required, pursuant to California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197.1, and 1197. This includes, but is not limited to, that Defendant did not provide Mr. Arroyo 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, donning and doffing uniforms, waiting in line to clock-in and during meal breaks.

82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and other class members the minimum wage as required violates California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197.1, and 1197. Pursuant to those sections, Plaintiff and 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.

83. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff 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.

84. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2, Plaintiff and 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, 202, and 203)

(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)

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

86. During the relevant time period set forth herein, 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.

87. As a pattern and practice, during the relevant time period set forth herein, Defendants intentionally and willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and 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.

88. Defendants' pattern and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and 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.

89. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other class members all wages due to them within any time period specified by California Labor Code section 201 and 203, including for all hours worked, uncompensated off-the-clock work and premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks, and therefore is liable under California Labor Code section 203.

///

///

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

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

8 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

11 **92.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through
12 88, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
13 herein.

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

28 ///

1 **94.** As a pattern and practice, Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to
2 provide Plaintiff and other class members with complete and accurate wage statements. The
3 deficiencies include but are not limited to: the failure to include the total number of hours
4 worked by Plaintiff and other class members.

5 **95.** As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code section 226(a), Plaintiff
6 and other class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

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

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

14 **98.** Plaintiff and other class members are also entitled to injunctive relief to ensure
15 compliance with this section, pursuant to California Labor Code section 226(g).

16 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

18 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

19 **99.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through
20 95, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth
21 herein.

22 **100.** Pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802, an employer must
23 reimburse its employee for all necessary expenditures incurred by the employee in direct
24 consequence of the discharge of his or her job duties or in direct consequence of his or her
25 obedience to the directions of the employer. This includes, but is not limited to, that during their
26 employment Plaintiff and other class members incurred necessary business-related expenses and
27 costs that were not fully reimbursed by Defendants, including for purchasing gear they were
28 required to wear while working, purchasing tools they were required to use to perform their

1 duties because the tools provided by the company were defective, fault, outdated and broken,
2 using their personal cellular phones to communicate with management and perform their job
3 duties, and using their personal vehicles to travel to the off-site facility.

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

10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Violation of Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”))**

12 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

13 **102.** Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 98 as
14 though fully set forth herein.

15 **103.** PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code
16 which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the 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
19 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

20 **104.** On September 8, 2020, Brianna Guzman provided written notice to the LWDA
21 and Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code she contends were violated, and the
22 theories supporting her contentions. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** and incorporated by reference
23 is a copy of the September 8, 2020 written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that on or
24 about November 12, 2020, the sixty-five (65) expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did
25 not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. In addition, on February 9, 2021,
26 Plaintiff Jimmy Arroyo provided written notice to the LWDA and Defendants of the specific
27 provisions of the Labor Code he contents were violated, and the theories supporting his
28 contentions. Attached as **Exhibit 2** and incorporated by reference is a copy of the February 9,

2021 written notice to the LWDA. Plaintiff believes that on or about DATE, the sixty-five (65) day period expired as to all Defendants, and the LWDA did not take any action to investigate or prosecute this matter. Therefore, the statutory time period to bring this action has been exhausted.

105. Plaintiff and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees (whether hired directly or through a staffing agency or labor contractor) of Defendants who worked for Defendants at any time during the period from September 8, 2019 to the present, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed against them.

Failure to Pay Minimum and Overtime Wages

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

107. As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and other aggrieved current and former employees for all hours worked, resulting in a failure to pay all minimum wages and overtime wages, where applicable.

Failure to Provide Meal Periods and Rest Breaks

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

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

///

///

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

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

4 **111.** As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved
5 current and former employees all wages due and owing them within the required time period.

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

7 **112.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to pay their employees all
8 wages owed in a timely fashion at the end of employment pursuant to California Labor Code §§
9 201 to 204.

10 **113.** California Labor Code section 204 requires that all wages earned by any person
11 in any employment between the 1st and the 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month, other
12 than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable between the 16th
13 and the 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and that all wages earned
14 by any person in any employment between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar
15 month, other than those wages due upon termination of an employee, are due and payable
16 between the 1st and the 10th day of the following month. California Labor Code section 204
17 also requires that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be paid no
18 later than the payday for the next regular payroll period. Defendant failed to pay Mr. Arroyo and
19 other aggrieved employees all wages due to them within any time period specified by California
20 Labor Code section 204, including for all hours worked, uncompensated off-the-clock work and
21 premium wages for failing to provide legally mandated meal and rest breaks.

22 **114.** As a result of Defendants' Labor Code violations alleged above, Defendants
23 failed to pay Plaintiff and the other aggrieved former employees their final wages pursuant to
24 Labor Code §§ 201 to 204 and accordingly owe waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
25 203.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

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

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

10 **117.** The violations include, but are not limited to, the failure to include (1) gross
11 wages earned by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr.
12 Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any
13 applicable piece rate by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr.
14 Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Arroyo and other
15 aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Arroyo and other
16 aggrieved employees are paid, (7) the name of the aggrieved employee and only the last four
17 digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a
18 social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer and (9)
19 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of
20 hours worked at each hourly rate by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees.

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

1 **Failure to Reimburse Business Expenses**

2 **119.** At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to reimburse its
3 employees for any and all necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employees in direct
4 consequences of the discharge or his or her duties pursuant to the mandate of Labor Code §§
5 2800 and 2802.

6 **120.** As a policy and practice, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved
7 current and former employees all business expenses incurred and owing them within the
8 required time period.

9 **Penalties**

10 **121.** Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf
11 of other current and former aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from
12 Defendants, and each of them, civil penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant,
13 including but not limited to:

14 **122.** Penalties under California Labor Code § 2699 in the amount of a hundred dollars
15 (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred
16 dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

17 **123.** Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 § 11040 in the amount of
18 fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one
19 hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent
20 violation;

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

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

4 **126.** Any and all additional penalties as provided by the Labor Code and/or other
5 statutes; and

6 **127.** Attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code §§ 210, 1194, and 2699, and
7 any other applicable statute.

8 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

10 **(Against BENTLEY MILLS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100)**

11 **128.** Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1
12 through 121, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set
13 forth herein.

14 **129.** Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be unfair,
15 unlawful and harmful to Plaintiff, other class members, to the general public, and Defendants'
16 competitors. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to enforce important rights affecting the public interest
17 within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5.

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

21 **131.** A violation of California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.* may
22 be predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this instant case, Defendants' pattern
23 and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other class members work overtime hours without paying
24 them proper compensation violate California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198. Additionally,
25 Defendants' pattern and practice of requiring Plaintiff and other class members, to work through
26 their meal and rest periods without paying them proper compensation violate California Labor
27 Code sections 226.7 and 512(a). Moreover, Defendants' pattern and practice of failing to timely
28 pay wages to Plaintiff and other class members violate California Labor Code sections 201 and

202. Defendants also violated California Labor Code sections 226(a), 1194, 1197, 2800 and 2802.

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

133. Plaintiff and 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.

134. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code section 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and 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

Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, requests a trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually, on behalf of all other members of the general public similarly situated, and as a representative of other current and former aggrieved employees pursuant to PAGA, prays for judgment as follows:

Class Certification

1. That this action be certified as a class action;
2. That Plaintiff be appointed as representative of the class;
3. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed as class counsel; and
4. That Defendants provide to Class Counsel immediately the names and most current contact information (address, e-mail, and telephone numbers) of all class members.

///

///

///

As to the First Cause of Action

5. For general unpaid wages at overtime wage rates and such general and special damages as may be appropriate;

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

7. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194; and

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

As to the Second Cause of Action

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

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

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

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

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

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

As to the Third Cause of Action

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

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

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

- 1 18. For premium wages pursuant to California Labor Code section 226.7(b);
2 19. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages from the date such amounts were
3 due; and
4 20. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

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

6 21. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
7 Labor Code sections 1194, 1197, and 1197.1 by willfully failing to pay minimum wages to
8 Plaintiff and the other class members;

9 22. For general unpaid wages and such general and special damages as may be
10 appropriate;

11 23. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
12 amounts were due;

13 24. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
14 California Labor Code section 1194(a);

15 25. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code section 1194.2; and

16 26. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

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

18 27. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California
19 Labor Code sections 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay all compensation owed at the
20 time of termination of the employment of the other class members no longer employed by
21 Defendants;

22 28. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
23 proof;

24 29. For statutory wage penalties pursuant to California Labor Code section 203 for
25 the other class members who have left Defendants' employ;

26 30. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid compensation from the date such
27 amounts were due; and

28 31. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

32. 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 Plaintiff and other class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

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

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

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

36. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802 by willfully failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members (but not all) for all necessary business-related expenses as required by California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802;

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

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

39. For punitive damages and/or exemplary damages according to proof at trial;

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

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

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

42. 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, and the IWC Wage Orders.

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

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

///

As to the Ninth Cause of Action

45. That the Court declare, adjudge, and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code sections 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay at least minimum wages to Plaintiff and other class members all compensation due to them, failing to provide all meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and the other class members, failing to reimburse Plaintiff and other class members for business expenses, and failing to pay Plaintiff's and other class members' wages timely as required by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

47. 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.*;

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

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

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

Dated: November 10, 2021

JUSTICE LAW CORPORATION

By: _____



Douglas Han
Shunt Tatavos-Gharajeh
Haig Hogdanian
Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

September 8, 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: BENTLEY MILLS, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Brianna Guzman against Bentley Mills, Inc. (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 "BENTLEY").

Ms. Guzman 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. Guzman 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.

Bentley Mills, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 14641 East Don Julian Road, City of Industry, California 91746.

///

///

///

¹ Ms. Guzman 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. Guzman will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Ms. Guzman is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Ms. Guzman and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

BENTLEY employed Ms. Guzman as an hourly-paid non-exempt Data Entry Clerk within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about May of 2020²) in the State of California. Empire placed Ms. Guzman at Bentley Mills, Inc. BENTLEY directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Ms. Guzman's employment, including daily supervision of work, meal and rest break procedures, scheduling and timekeeping procedures.

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

BENTLEY 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. Guzman has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at BENTLEY, regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

BENTLEY 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. Guzman'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, aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. BENTLEY failed to compensate aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, and during meal breaks. Additionally, BENTLEY maintained an illegal rounding policy that negatively affected aggrieved employees' time and pay. BENTLEY also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, 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, BENTLEY routinely required Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with BENTLEY policies and expectations. BENTLEY also failed to provide adequate coverage and staffing so Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees could be relieved of work duties and take their meal and rest breaks. Moreover, BENTLEY failed to authorize and permit Ms. Guzman 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, BENTLEY failed to compensate Ms. Guzman 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, BENTLEY failed to pay Ms. Guzman 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 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, BENTLEY failed to pay Ms. Guzman 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 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, BENTLEY did not provide Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from BENTLEY 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. Guzman and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Ms. Guzman 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. Guzman 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. Guzman 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, BENTLEY failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Ms. Guzman 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, BENTLEY did not provide Ms. Guzman 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.

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, Ms. Guzman and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by BENTLEY, including for purchasing gear they were required to wear while working and using their personal cellular phones to communicate with management.

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

LWDA
September 8, 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 long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas Han, Esq.

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

Bentley Mills, Inc.
c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, California 95833
Agent for Service of Process for Bentley Mills, Inc.

EXHIBIT 2

February 9, 2021

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: BENTLEY MILLS, INC.

Dear Representative:

We have been retained to represent Jimmy Arroyo against Bentley Mills, Inc. (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 "BENTLEY").

Mr. Arroyo is pursuing his California Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.*, the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA") claim on a representative basis. Therefore, Mr. Arroyo 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.

Bentley Mills, Inc. is a Delaware corporation located at 14641 East Don Julian Road, City of Industry, California 91746.

BENTLEY employed Mr. Arroyo as an hourly-paid non-exempt Electrician within one year of the date of this letter (until in or about March of 2020²) in the State of California. Empire placed Mr. Arroyo at Bentley Mills, Inc. BENTLEY directly controlled the wages, hours and working conditions of Mr. Arroyo's employment, including direction, retention, scheduling, supervision, and termination.

¹ Mr. Arroyo 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. Mr. Arroyo will amend this notice when the true names and capacities are known. Mr. Arroyo is informed and believes that each DOE was responsible in some way for the matters alleged herein and proximately caused Mr. Arroyo and other current and former aggrieved employees to be subject to the illegal employment practices, wrongs and injuries complained of herein.

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 Mr. Arroyo's PAGA cause of action is tolled.

The “aggrieved employees” that Mr. Arroyo may seek penalties on behalf of are all current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees (whether hired directly or through staffing agencies) of BENTLEY within the State of California.

BENTLEY 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, Mr. Arroyo has standing to pursue penalties on behalf of the state for violations affecting all the aggrieved employees at BENTLEY, regardless of their classification, job title, locations, or whether they were hired directly or through a labor contractor or staffing agency.

BENTLEY 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.

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, Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees routinely worked in excess of 8 hours in a day and 40 hours in a week. BENTLEY failed to compensate Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees for all hours worked and performing off-the-clock work, including pre- and post-shift, donning and doffing uniforms, waiting in line to clock-in and during meal breaks. Additionally, BENTLEY maintained an illegal rounding policy that negatively affected Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees’ time and pay. BENTLEY also failed to include non-discretionary bonuses and incentives in aggrieved employees’ regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime compensation. Therefore, Mr. Arroyo 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, BENTLEY routinely required Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees to work through, interrupt, cut short, and/or delay their meal and rest breaks to comply with BENTLEY policies and expectations. BENTLEY also failed to provide adequate coverage and staffing so Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees could be relieved of work duties and take their meal and rest breaks. Moreover, BENTLEY failed to authorize and permit Mr. Arroyo 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, BENTLEY failed to compensate Mr. Arroyo 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, BENTLEY failed to pay Mr. Arroyo 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 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, BENTLEY failed to pay Mr. Arroyo 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 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, BENTLEY did not provide Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees with complete and accurate itemized wage statements. The wage statements they received from BENTLEY 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 Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (2) total hours worked by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees (4) all deductions for Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (5) net wages earned by Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which Mr. Arroyo 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 Mr. Arroyo 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. Mr. Arroyo 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, BENTLEY failed to keep accurate and complete payroll records showing the hours worked daily and the wages paid, to Mr. Arroyo 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, BENTLEY did not provide Mr. Arroyo 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, donning and doffing uniforms, waiting in line to clock-in and during meal breaks.

///

///

///

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, Mr. Arroyo and other aggrieved employees incurred necessary business-related expenses and costs that were not fully reimbursed by BENTLEY, including for purchasing gear they were required to wear while working, purchasing tools they were required to use to perform their duties because the tools provided by the company were defective, fault, outdated and broken, using their personal cellular phones to communicate with management and perform their job duties, and using their personal vehicles to travel to the off-site facility.

We believe that Mr. Arroyo 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.

Mr. Arroyo will seek these penalties on his own behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated California-based hourly-paid or non-exempt employees of BENTLEY within one year of the date of this letter, as allowed by law.

///

///

///

LWDA
February 9, 2021
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):

Bentley Mills, Inc.
c/o CSC - Lawyers Incorporating Service
2710 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 150N
Sacramento, California 95833
Agent for Service of Process for Bentley Mills, Inc.

CC: (By Electronic Mail Only):

Jon G. Daryanani, Esq.
JDaryanani@perkinscoie.com
Jill L. Ripke, Esq.
Jripke@perkinscoie.com

PERKINS COIE LLP

Counsel of Record for Bentley Mills, Inc.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**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 aokada@justicelawcorp.com

On November 10, 2021, I served the foregoing document described as

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND
COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF LABOR CODE
SECTION 2698 ET SEQ. (PRIVATE ATTORNEYS' GENERAL ACT OF 2004)**

for the following case: **Guzman v. Bentley Mills, Inc.**
LWDA/Court Case No.: **LWDA Case No.: CM-805423-20**
Court Case No.: 20PSCV00789
Los Angeles 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 November 10, 2021, at Pasadena, California.



Anna Okada