

ORIGINAL

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
 Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
 phaines@haineslawgroup.com
 Sean M. Blakely (SBN 264384)
 sblakely@haineslawgroup.com
 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
 El Segundo, California 90245
 Tel: (424) 292-2350
 Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

DEC 28 2020

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk
 By Robin Sanchez, Deputy

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

RECEIVED
 DEC 28 2020
 Filing Window
FILED

EDGAR MACABULIT, as an individual and
 on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DMC POWER, INC., a Delaware corporation;
 and DOES 1 through 100,

Defendants.

Case No. 20STCV32034

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
 REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
 COMPLAINT:**

- (1) **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**
 (LABOR CODE §§ 1182.12, 1194,
 1194.2, 1197);
- (2) **FAILURE TO PAY ALL
 OVERTIME WAGES (LABOR
 CODE §§ 204, 510, 1194, 1198);**
- (3) **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
 (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 512, 558);
- (4) **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**
 (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 516, 558);
- (5) **WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS**
 (LABOR CODE § 226 *et seq.*);
- (6) **UNFAIR COMPETITION (BUS &
 PROF CODE § 17200 *et seq.*); and**
- (7) **CIVIL PENALTIES UNDER THE
 PRIVATE ATTORNEYS
 GENERAL ACT (LABOR CODE §
 2698 *et seq.*).**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
 UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE**

1 Plaintiff Edgar Macabulit (“Plaintiff”) hereby brings this First Amended Class and
2 Representative Action Complaint (“Complaint”) against Defendants DMC Power, Inc., a
3 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive (collectively, “Defendants”), and on
4 information and belief alleges as follows:

5 **JURISDICTION**

6 1. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby brings this
7 Complaint for recovery of unpaid wages and penalties under Labor Code §§ 204, 226, 226.7, 510,
8 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, and 2698 *et seq.*, California Business &
9 Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order No. 1 (“Wage
10 Order 1”), in addition to seeking declaratory relief and restitution. This Complaint is brought
11 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants
12 because, upon information and belief, Defendants have sufficient minimum contacts in California,
13 or otherwise intentionally avails itself/themselves to the California market so as to render the
14 exercise of jurisdiction over it/them by the California courts consistent with the traditional notions
15 of fair play and substantial justice.

16 **VENUE**

17 2. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to California Code of Civil
18 Procedure §§ 395(a) and 395.5, as at least some of the acts and omissions complained of herein
19 occurred in Los Angeles County. Defendants own, maintain offices, transact business, have an
20 agent or agents within Los Angeles County, and/or otherwise are found within Los Angeles
21 County, and Defendants are within the jurisdiction of this Court for purposes of service of process.

22 **PARTIES**

23 3. Plaintiff is an individual over the age of eighteen (18). At all relevant times herein,
24 Plaintiff was and currently is, a California resident. Within the statute of limitations periods
25 applicable to each cause of action pled herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-
26 exempt employee. Plaintiff was, and is, a victim of Defendants’ policies and/or practices
27 complained of herein, lost money and/or property, and has been deprived of the rights guaranteed
28 to him by Labor Code §§ 204, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198,

1 and 2698 *et seq.*, Business and Professions Code Section 17200 *et seq.*, and Wage Order 1, which
2 sets employment standards for the “Manufacturing Industry.”

3 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that during the time
4 period relevant to this action, Defendants did (and do) business by manufacturing, engineering,
5 and supplying component parts for military, commercial, and business aircraft as well as for the
6 spacecraft industry.

7 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
8 mentioned herein, Defendants were licensed to do business in California and were the employers
9 of Plaintiff and of the members of the Classes (as defined in Paragraph 17).

10 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names or capacities, whether individual, partner,
11 or corporate, of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, and for that reason, said
12 defendants are sued under such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will seek leave from this Court to
13 amend this Complaint when such true names and capacities are discovered. Plaintiff is informed,
14 and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of said fictitious defendants, whether individual,
15 partners, or corporate, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged herein,
16 and proximately caused Plaintiff and the Classes (as defined in Paragraph 17) to be subject to the
17 unlawful employment practices, wrongs, injuries and damages complained of herein.

18 7. Plaintiff is informed, and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned
19 herein, Defendants were and are the employers of Plaintiff and all members of the Classes.

20 8. At all times herein mentioned, each of said Defendants participated in the doing
21 of the acts hereinafter alleged to have been done by the named Defendants; and furthermore, the
22 Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, and employees of each and every one of
23 the other Defendants, as well as the agents of all Defendants, and at all times herein mentioned
24 were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment. Defendants, and each
25 of them, approved of, condoned, and/or otherwise ratified each and every one of the acts or
26 omissions complained of herein.

27 9. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants, and each of them, were members of
28 and engaged in a joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise, and acted within the course

1 and scope of and in pursuance of said joint venture, partnership, and common enterprise. Further,
2 Plaintiff alleges that all Defendants were joint employers for all purposes of Plaintiff and the
3 Classes (as defined in Paragraph 17).

4 **GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 10. Plaintiff has been employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in the
6 packaging department from approximately February 2007 to the present.

7 11. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Defendants utilized a
8 timekeeping system which resulted in Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees not being
9 compensated for all hours actually worked, whether by rounding, time-shaving, or otherwise.
10 Specifically, Defendants rounded Plaintiff's timekeeping entries in an uneven manner to a quarter
11 of an hour increment, so that, over a period of time, Plaintiff was deprived of all earned minimum
12 and overtime wages. Upon information and belief, Defendants' timekeeping system regularly,
13 systematically, and impermissibly rounded the hours worked by Plaintiff and non-exempt
14 employees in Defendants' favor, resulting, over a period of time, in the failure to compensate
15 Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all hours worked. As a result, Plaintiff and other
16 non-exempt employees were not compensated for all required minimum and overtime wages.

17 12. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendants, Plaintiff worked over 8.0 hours
18 per workday and/or more than 40.0 hours per workweek, but did not receive overtime
19 compensation equal to one and one-half times his regular rate of pay for working overtime hours.
20 Specifically, Defendants paid Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees non-discretionary
21 incentive pay, including but not limited to, bonus payments denoted on their payroll records as
22 "BONUS," and/or other forms of pay that are not excludable from an employee's "regular rate"
23 of pay (hereinafter the aforementioned forms of pay are collectively referred to as "Incentive
24 Pay"). However, Defendants failed to properly calculate Plaintiff's and other non-exempt
25 employees' regular rates of pay as a result of their receipt of Incentive Pay, thereby miscalculating
26 and underpaying the overtime wages owed to them.

27 13. Plaintiff was not provided with all legally compliant meal periods because
28 Defendants' meal period policies/practices failed to provide Plaintiff with a second 30-minute

meal period for shifts in excess of 10.0 hours, nor were Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees provided with a second meal period for shifts over 10.0 hours. On the occasions when Plaintiff was not provided with all legally-compliant meal periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required meal period premium for each workday in which he experienced a meal period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the putative class period, Defendants maintained no payroll code or other mechanism for the payment of meal period premiums under Labor Code § 226.7 in the event a legally compliant meal period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

14. Plaintiff was not authorized and permitted to take all legally compliant rest periods due to Defendants' rest period policies/practices, which fail to authorize and permit an off-duty rest period for every four hours worked, or major fraction thereof. Specifically, Plaintiff was not authorized and permitted to take a third rest period on shifts in excess of 10.0 hours due to Defendants' rest period policies/practices, which fail to authorize and permit non-exempt employees to take a third rest period on occasions when they worked over 10.0 hours in a workday. On the occasions when Plaintiff was not provided with all legally-compliant rest periods to which he was entitled, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff with the required rest period premium for each workday in which he experienced a rest period violation as mandated by Labor Code § 226.7. Upon information and belief, during at least a portion of the putative class period, Defendants maintained no payroll code or other mechanism for the payment of rest period premiums as required by Labor Code Section 226.7 in the event a legally compliant rest period was not provided to their non-exempt employees.

15. As a result of Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and other non-exempt employees for all minimum wages, overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages earned, Defendants maintained inaccurate payroll records and failed to issue accurate, compliant, itemized wage statements.

16. Pursuant to California Judicial Council Emergency Rule 9, statutes of limitations of more than 180 days are suspended from April 6, 2020 through October 1, 2020. Accordingly, the relevant time period for each cause of action pled herein have been calculated based on a filing

1 date of April 6, 2020.

2 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

3 17. Class Definitions: Plaintiff brings this Complaint on behalf of himself and the
4 following Classes pursuant to Section 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure:

5 a. The Minimum Wage Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
6 exempt employees in California who were subject to Defendants' timekeeping
7 policies and/or practices, during the period of April 6, 2016 through the present.

8 b. The Overtime Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-exempt
9 employees in California who worked more than 8.0 hours per day and/or 40.0
10 hours per week and: (i) received Incentive Pay during a corresponding time period;
11 and/or (ii) were subject to Defendants' timekeeping policies and/or practices,
12 during the period of April 6, 2016 through the present.

13 c. The Meal Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
14 exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0
15 hours without a second meal period of at least 30 minutes in duration commencing
16 prior to the conclusion of the tenth hour of work as reflected in their timekeeping
17 records, and who do not have a corresponding meal period premium payment
18 made for such shifts, during the period of April 6, 2016 through the present.

19 d. The Rest Period Class consists of all of Defendants' current and former non-
20 exempt employees in California who worked at least one shift in excess of 10.0
21 hours, during the period of April 6, 2016 to through the present.

22 e. The Wage Statement Class consists of all members of the Minimum Wage Class,
23 Overtime Class, Meal Period Class, and/or Rest Period Class who have received a
24 wage statement from Defendants during the period of April 6, 2019 through the
25 present.

26 18. **Numerosity/Ascertainability**: The members of the Classes are so numerous that
27 joinder of all members would be unfeasible and not practicable. The membership of the classes
28 and subclasses are unknown to Plaintiff, at this time; however, it is estimated that the Classes

number is in excess of 100 individuals as to each class. The identity of such membership is readily ascertainable via inspection of Defendants' employment records.

19. **Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate/Well Defined Community of Interest:** There are common questions of law and fact as to Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees, which predominate over questions affecting only individual members including, without limitation, to:

- i. Whether Defendants paid all minimum wages owed to members of the Minimum Wage Class for all hours worked pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2 and 1197;
- ii. Whether Defendants violated the applicable Labor Code provisions, including, but not limited to, §§ 510 and 1194 by requiring members of the Overtime Class to perform overtime work and not paying for said work in accordance with the overtime laws of the State of California;
- iii. Whether Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices resulted in the failure to properly compensate members of the Overtime Class and Minimum Wage Class;
- iv. Whether Defendants provided legally compliant meal periods to members of the Meal Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
- v. Whether Defendants correctly paid meal period premium payments for non-compliant meal periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7;
- vi. Whether Defendants authorized and permitted legally compliant rest periods to members of the Rest Period Class pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516;
- vii. Whether Defendants correctly paid rest period premium payments for non-compliant rest periods pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7; and
- viii. Whether Defendants furnished legally compliant wage statements to members of the Wage Statement Class pursuant to Labor Code § 226.

20. **Predominance of Common Questions:** Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions that affect only individual members of the Classes. The common questions of law and fact set forth above are numerous and substantial and stem from Defendants'

uniform policies and/or practices applicable to each individual class member including, but not limited to, Defendants' uniform timekeeping policies and/or practices, and meal and rest period policies and/or practices. As such, the common questions predominate over individual questions concerning each individual class member's showing as to his or her eligibility for recovery or as to the amount of his or her damages.

21. **Typicality:** The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Classes because Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt employee in California during the statutes of limitation applicable to each cause of action pled in this Complaint. As alleged herein, Plaintiff, like the members of the Classes, was not properly paid minimum and overtime wages due to Defendants' timekeeping policies/practices, overtime wages due to a miscalculation of his regular rate of pay, was not provided all required meal periods, was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest periods, did not receive meal and rest period premium wages for missed and/or non-compliant meal and rest periods, and/or was not issued accurate itemized wage statements.

22. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is fully prepared to take all necessary steps to represent fairly and adequately the interests of the members of the Classes. Moreover, Plaintiff's attorneys are ready, willing, and able to fully and adequately represent the members of the Classes and Plaintiff. Plaintiff's attorneys have prosecuted and defended numerous wage-and-hour class actions in state and federal courts in the past and are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes.

23. **Superiority:** The California Labor Code is broadly remedial in nature and serves an important public interest in establishing minimum working conditions and standards in California. These laws and labor standards protect the average working employee from exploitation by employers who have the responsibility to follow the laws and who may seek to take advantage of superior economic and bargaining power in setting onerous terms and conditions of employment. The nature of this action and the format of laws available to Plaintiff and members of the Classes make the class action format a particularly efficient and appropriate procedure to redress the violations alleged herein. If each employee were required to file an individual lawsuit, Defendants would necessarily gain an unconscionable advantage since they

1 would be able to exploit and overwhelm the limited resources of each individual plaintiff with
2 their vastly superior financial and legal resources. Moreover, requiring each member of the
3 Classes to pursue an individual remedy would also discourage the assertion of lawful claims by
4 employees who would be disinclined to file an action against their former and/or current employer
5 for real and justifiable fear of retaliation and permanent damages to their careers at subsequent
6 employment. Further, the prosecution of separate actions by the individual class members, even
7 if possible, would create a substantial risk of inconsistent or varying verdicts or adjudications
8 with respect to the individual class members against Defendants herein; and which would
9 establish potentially incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants; and/or legal
10 determinations with respect to individual class members which would, as a practical matter, be
11 dispositive of the interest of the other class members not parties to adjudications or which would
12 substantially impair or impede the ability of the class members to protect their interests. Further,
13 the claims of the individual members of the Classes are not sufficiently large to warrant vigorous
14 individual prosecution considering all of the concomitant costs and expenses attending thereto.
15 As such, the Classes are maintainable as classes under § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

16 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **MINIMUM WAGE VIOLATIONS**

18 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

19 24. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

20 25. Wage Order 1, § 4 and California Labor Code §§ 1197 and 1182.12 establish the
21 right of employees to be paid minimum wages for all hours worked, in amounts set by state law.
22 Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employee who has not been paid the legal
23 minimum wage as required by Labor Code § 1197 may recover the unpaid balance together with
24 attorneys' fees and costs of suit, as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the unpaid
25 wages and interest accrued thereon.

26 26. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to conform their pay practices to
27 the requirements of the law by failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class
28 for all hours worked including, but not limited to, all hours they were subject to the control of

Defendants and/or suffered or permitted to work under the California Labor Code and Wage Order 1.

27. California Labor Code § 1198 makes unlawful the employment of an employee under conditions that the IWC prohibits. California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) and 1194.2(a) provide that an employer who has failed to pay its employees the legal minimum wage is liable to pay those employees the unpaid balance of the unpaid wages as well as liquidated damages in an amount equal to the wages due and interest thereon.

28. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct as alleged herein, Plaintiff and the Minimum Wage Class have sustained economic damages including, but not limited to, unpaid wages and lost interest, in an amount to be established at trial, and are entitled to recover economic and statutory damages and penalties and other appropriate relief as a result of Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 1.

29. The foregoing practices and policies are unlawful and create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and the members of the Minimum Wage Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of minimum wages owing, including interest thereon, liquidated damages, statutory and civil penalties, attorney's fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 558, 1194, 1197, and 1198, Wage Order 1, and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY ALL OVERTIME WAGES

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

30. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

31. This cause of action is brought pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198, which provide that non-exempt employees are entitled to all overtime wages and compensation for all overtime hours worked and provide a private right of action for the failure to pay all overtime compensation for overtime work performed.

32. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were required to properly compensate non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class, for all overtime hours worked pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194 and Wage Order 1. Wage Order 1, § 3

1 requires an employer to pay an employee “one and one-half (1½) times the employee’s regular
2 rate of pay” for work in excess of 8 hours per work day and/or in excess of 40 hours of work in
3 the workweek. Defendants caused Plaintiff to work overtime hours, but did not compensate
4 Plaintiff or members of the Overtime Class with one and one-half times their regular rate of pay
5 for such hours.

6 33. The foregoing policies and practices are unlawful and create an entitlement to
7 recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount
8 of overtime premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, attorneys’ fees, and
9 costs of suit according to California Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 216, 510, 1194, and 1198; and Code
10 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

11 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **MEAL PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

13 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

14 34. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

15 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
16 failed in their affirmative obligation to provide all of their non-exempt employees in California,
17 including Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class, with all legally compliant meal periods
18 in accordance with the mandates of the California Labor Code and Wage Order 1, § 11. Despite
19 Defendants’ violations, Defendants did not pay an additional hour of pay to Plaintiff and members
20 of the Meal Period Class at their respective regular rates of pay, in accordance with California
21 Labor Code §§ 204, 210, 226.7, and 512.

22 36. As a result, Defendants are responsible for paying premium compensation for meal
23 period violations pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and Wage Order 1, including interest
24 thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit.

25 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **REST PERIOD VIOLATIONS**

27 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

28 37. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

38. Wage Order 1, § 12 and Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 516 establish the right of employees to be provided with a rest period of at least ten (10) minutes for each four (4) hour period worked, or major fraction thereof.

39. As alleged herein, Defendants failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class to take all required rest periods.

40. The foregoing violations create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class in a civil action for the unpaid amount of rest period premiums owing, including interest thereon, statutory penalties, civil penalties, and costs of suit according to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and Civil Code §§ 3287(b) and 3289.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WAGE STATEMENT VIOLATIONS

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

41. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

42. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants knowingly and intentionally, as a matter of uniform policy and practice, failed to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements that included, among other requirements, all hours worked, total gross wages earned, all rates of pay and corresponding number of hours worked, total net wages earned, and the correct name of the legal entity that is the employer in violation of Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

43. Defendants' failure to furnish Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class with accurate and complete, itemized wage statements resulted in actual injury, as said failures led to, among other things, the non-payment of minimum and overtime wages and meal and rest period premium wages owed, and deprived them of the information necessary to identify the discrepancies in Defendants' reported data.

44. Defendants' failures create an entitlement to recovery by Plaintiff and members of the Wage Statement Class in a civil action for all damages and/or penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*, including statutory penalties, civil penalties, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of suit according to California Labor Code § 226 *et seq.*

1 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

3 **(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)**

4 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all previous paragraphs.

5 46. Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in unfair and/or unlawful
6 business practices in California in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, by:
7 (a) failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Minimum Wage Class all minimum wages; (b)
8 failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the Overtime Class all overtime wages; (c) failing to
9 provide Plaintiff and members of the Meal Period Class with all meal periods to which they are
10 entitled, and/or failing to pay them meal period premium payments; (d) failing to authorize and
11 permit all required duty-free rest periods to Plaintiff and members of the Rest Period Class, and/or
12 failing to pay them rest period premiums payments; and (e) knowingly failing to furnish Plaintiff
13 and the Wage Statement Class with all accurate and complete, itemized wage statements in
14 violation of Labor Code § 226.

15 47. Defendants' utilization of these unfair and/or unlawful business practices deprived
16 Plaintiff and continues to deprive members of the Classes of compensation to which they are
17 legally entitled, constitutes unfair and/or unlawful competition, and provides an unfair advantage
18 over Defendants' competitors who have been and/or are currently employing workers and
19 attempting to do so in honest compliance with applicable wage and hour laws.

20 48. Because Plaintiff is a victim of Defendants' unfair and/or unlawful conduct alleged
21 herein, Plaintiff for himself and on behalf of the members of the Classes, seeks full restitution of
22 monies, as necessary and according to proof, to restore any and all monies withheld, acquired
23 and/or converted by Defendants pursuant to Business and Professions Code §§ 17203 and 17208.

24 49. The acts complained of herein occurred within the period of April 6, 2016 to the
25 present.

26 50. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this Complaint to
27 protect his interests and those of the Classes, to obtain restitution and injunctive relief on behalf
28 of Defendants' current non-exempt employees, and to enforce important rights affecting the

public interest. Plaintiff has thereby incurred the financial burden of attorneys' fees and costs, which he is entitled to recover under Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT

(AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)

51. Defendants have committed several Labor Code violations against Plaintiff, members of the Classes, and other aggrieved employees. Plaintiff, an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, acting on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees, brings this representative action against Defendants to recover the civil penalties due to Plaintiff, the members of the Classes, other aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code § 558 and § 2699 (a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the following Labor Code violations:

- a. Failing to pay minimum wages for all hours worked to Plaintiff, the Minimum Wage Class, and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, and 1198;
- b. Failing to pay Plaintiff, the Overtime Class, and other aggrieved employees all earned overtime compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 558, 1194, and 1198;
- c. Failing to provide all legally required meal periods, and failure to pay meal period

premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Meal Period Class, and other aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, 558, and 1198;

d. Failing to authorize and permit all legally required rest periods, and failure to pay rest period premium wages, to Plaintiff, the Rest Period Class, and other aggrieved employees at the regular rate of compensation in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, 558, and 1198;

e. Failing to furnish Plaintiff, the Wage Statement Class, and other aggrieved employees with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements in violation of Labor Code § 226;

f. Failing to timely pay all final wages and compensation earned by Plaintiff, the Waiting Time Class, and other aggrieved employees at the time of separation in violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203;

g. Failing to pay Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees all earned wages at least twice during each calendar month in violation of Labor Code § 204; and

h. Failing to maintain accurate records on behalf of Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees in violation of Labor Code § 1174.

52. On October 21, 2020, Plaintiff notified Defendants via certified mail, and on October 21, 2020, notified the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) via its website, of Defendants’ violations of the California Labor Code and Plaintiff’s intent to bring a claim for civil penalties under California Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* with respect to the violations of the California Labor Code identified in Paragraph 51 (a)-(h). Now that sixty-five days have passed from Plaintiff notifying Defendants and the LWDA of these violations, and the LWDA has not provided notice that it intends to investigate the violations, Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative requirements for bringing a claim under the Private Attorneys General Act with respect to these violations.

53. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff seeks to represent himself and all Aggrieved Employees, as defined by Labor Code § 2699(c), which includes all current and former non-

1 exempt employees who worked for Defendants in California between October 21, 2019, and the
2 present.

3 54. Plaintiff was compelled to retain the services of counsel to file this court action to
4 protect his interests and the interests of other aggrieved employees, and to assess and collect the
5 civil penalties owed by Defendants. Plaintiff has thereby incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which
6 he is entitled to receive under California Labor Code § 2699(g).

7 **PRAYER**

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment for himself and for all others on whose behalf
9 this suit is brought against Defendants, as follows:

- 10 1. For an order certifying the proposed Classes;
- 11 2. For an order appointing Plaintiff as representative of the Classes;
- 12 3. For an order appointing Counsel for Plaintiff as Counsel for the Classes;
- 13 4. Upon the First Cause of Action, for payment of minimum wages, liquidated
14 damages, and penalties according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, and
15 1197;
- 16 5. Upon the Second Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
17 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 204, 510, 1194, and 1198;
- 18 6. Upon the Third Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
19 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and 558;
- 20 7. Upon the Fourth Cause of Action, for compensatory, consequential, general and
21 special damages according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 516, and 558;
- 22 8. Upon the Fifth Cause of Action, for statutory penalties pursuant to Labor Code §
23 226 *et. seq.*;
- 24 9. Upon the Sixth Cause of Action, for restitution to Plaintiff and members of the
25 Classes of all money and/or property unlawfully acquired by Defendants by means of any acts or
26 practices declared by this Court to be in violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*;
- 27 10. Upon the Seventh Cause of Action, for civil penalties due to Plaintiff, other
28 aggrieved employees, and the State of California according to proof pursuant to Labor Code §§

558 and 2699(a) and (f) including, but not limited to: (1) \$100.00 for each initial violation for each failure to pay each employee and \$200 for each subsequent violation or willful or intentional violation pursuant to Labor Code § 210 for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25% of the amount unlawfully withheld; (2) \$50.00 for each initial violation and \$100 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 558 per employee per pay period; (3) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$250.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1 per employee per pay period; (4) \$250.00 for each initial violation and \$1,000.00 for each subsequent violation pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3 per employee per pay period; and/or (5) \$100.00 for each initial violation and \$200 for each subsequent violation per employee per pay period for those violations of the Labor Code for which no civil penalty is specifically provided, based on the Labor Code violations identified in Paragraph 51 (a)-(h);

11. Prejudgment interest on all due and unpaid wages pursuant to California Labor Code § 218.6 and Civil Code §§ 3287 and 3289;


12. On all causes of action, for attorneys' fees and costs as provided by Labor Code §§ 226, 1194, 2699(g), and Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

13. For such other and further relief, the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: December 28, 2020

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

By:


Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable by jury.

Dated: December 28, 2020

Respectfully submitted,
HAINES LAW GROUP, APC

By:


Paul K. Haines
Attorneys for Plaintiff

- 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

Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 20STCV32034

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 [X] 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180, El Segundo, California 90245.

On December 28, 2020, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

on the interested party(ies) in this action as follows:

[X] (VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL) I caused a true and correct copy of the document(s) described above to be electronically served on counsel of record at the electronic service addresses listed above by transmission to CASE ANYWHERE.

[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 December 28, 2020, at El Segundo, California.

Aaron Clark