

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)

david@tomorrowlaw.com

Diego Aviles (SBN 315533)

diego@tomorrowlaw.com

Sara Ehsani-Nia (SBN 326501)

sara@tomorrowlaw.com

8484 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500

Beverly Hills, California 90211

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, MERCEDES
RODRIGUEZ, as an aggrieved employee,
and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

MERCEDES RODRIGUEZ, as an aggrieved
employee, and on behalf of all other aggrieved
employees under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

v.

ULTRA PRO INTERNATIONAL LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company;
CITISTAFF SOLUTIONS INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **21STCV10799**

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$25,000.00]

COMES NOW plaintiff MERCEDES RODRIGUEZ ("Plaintiff"), as aggrieved employees,
and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General
Act of 2004, and alleges as follows:

- 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

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

27

28

2

PAGA COMPLAINT

1 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
2 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
3 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus
4 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former
5 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

6 5. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
7 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
8 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the
9 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

10 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
11 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
12 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226,
13 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 246, *et seq.*, 432, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1197,
14 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 2699, 2802, 2810.3, and 2810.5, among others.

15 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
16 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
17 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures
18 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

19 8. On or around October 14, 2020, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor
20 Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants’
21 violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA,
22 as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

23 9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
24 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants’ alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
25 calendar days of the October 14, 2020 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by
26 Plaintiff to the LWDA and Defendants.

27 / / /

28 / / /

PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS

10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in the State of California in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to attend company meetings off the clock, failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay; editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, and for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring employees: to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; failing to pay reporting time pay; paid time off and vacation time owed; and failing to pay split shift premiums, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted, timely, and complete meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and

1 ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal
2 periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods;
3 not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short
4 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal
5 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal
6 periods; and/or auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which
7 employees worked, as required by California wage and hour laws

8 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
9 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and
10 complete rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions
11 thereof, or compensation in lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest
12 periods all together; interrupting them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-
13 talkies during rest periods not providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to
14 leave the premises; and/or otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods, as required by California
15 wage and hour laws.

16 14. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
17 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
18 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross
19 wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable
20 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
21 hourly rate by the employee; and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226,
22 subdivision (a).

23 15. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
24 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
25 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment
26 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
27 under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to
28

1 calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other
2 Aggrieved Employees.

3 16. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
4 of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages
5 owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime
6 wages, minimum wages, premium wages, paid time off and vacation time owed as required by Labor
7 Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

8 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
9 to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon
10 separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3
11 and applicable Wage Orders.

12 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
13 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
14 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal
15 vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits,
16 separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment (including
17 purchase of scissor), for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans,
18 in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of
19 Defendants, as required by Labor Code 2802.

20 19. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
21 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
22 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
23 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;
24 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the
25 name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information
26 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants
27 under Labor Code section 2810.5.

28 / / /

1 20. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
2 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to
3 California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*), and also did not
4 permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and
5 all other Aggrieved Employees.

6 21. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
7 failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code
8 Section 204, which requires that: “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of
9 any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the
10 labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any
11 calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

12 22. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
13 of preventing Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge
14 and experience they obtained at Defendants for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,
15 without limitation, preventing Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with
16 a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under what
17 circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is informed
18 and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200,
19 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor
20 Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

21 23. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
22 Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants
23 to their managers or outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation
24 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section
25 1102.5. In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants’ herein-described policies
26 and/or practices prevent Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information
27 about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation
28 of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

24. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including, without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of Plaintiff's and/or other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and economic liberty.

25. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

26. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, packaging products, sorting, working on a conveyor belt, operating machinery and other packing tasks. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately August of 2016 through approximately March of 2020.

B. Defendants

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant ULTRA PRO is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant CITISTAFF is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

29. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it shall include ULTRA PRO, CITISTAFF, and any of their parent, subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100 identified herein.

JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer, representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency, employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

31. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded, acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

32. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210 – Against All Defendants)

33. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

34. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that: “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

35. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3, 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

36. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violations of Labor Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor Code section 204.

///

/ / /

1 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3 – Against All Defendants)**

3 37. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
4 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

5 38. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
6 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
7 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
8 wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work;
9 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
10 worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
11 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
12 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

13 39. Labor Code section 226.3 states that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
14 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
15 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
16 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
17 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

18 40. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in
19 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law."

20 41. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
21 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
22 limitation, Plaintiff, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total
23 hours worked; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the
24 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal
25 name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal entity securing the employer's services
26 if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such information as required by Labor Code
27 section 226, subdivision (a).

28 / / /

42. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Labor Code § 558 – Against All Defendants)

43. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

44. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating hours and days of work in any 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 and 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."

45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants, and each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid overtime wages and minimum wages; receive meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; be paid timely wages during their employment and after their employment separation; receive accurate, itemized wage statements; be provided with the opportunity to inspect employment records; be provided with notice as required under Labor Code section 2810.5; be provided with the proper accrual and use of paid sick leave; and/or be paid out all paid time off and/or vacation wages owed at the proper rate

1 of pay.

2 46. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
3 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
4 civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
5 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars
6 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

7 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5 – Against All Defendants)**

9 47. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
10 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

11 48. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required
12 every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the
13 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or
14 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
15 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
16 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
17 or papers of the person.”

18 49. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
19 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
20 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

21 50. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
22 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
23 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
24 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
25 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
26 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
27 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
28 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units

1 earned.”

2 51. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
3 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
4 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
5 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision
6 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

7 52. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
8 willfully failed to maintain the records required by Labor Code subdivision (c), failed to maintain
9 accurate and complete records required by Labor Code subdivision (d), and/or failed to allow
10 inspection of records as required by Labor Code subdivision (b).

11 53. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
12 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
13 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
14 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

15 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **(Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1 – Against All Defendants)**

17 54. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
18 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

19 55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other
20 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
21 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
22 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
23 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
24 Section 203 as follows:

- 25 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
26 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
27 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
28 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section

1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

(2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

(3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

56. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees’ wages for all hours worked or otherwise under Defendants’ control due to, without limitation, routinely failing to accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimental rounding or manipulation of time entries; paying straight pay instead of overtime or otherwise failing to pay overtime hours at the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock.

57. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699 – Against All Defendants)

58. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

///

1 59. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
2 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
3 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
4 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
5 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
6 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

7 60. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor
8 Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for
9 a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person
10 employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved
11 employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved
12 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

13 61. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and
14 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for
15 the failure to: pay overtime wages and minimum wages; provide meal and rest periods or
16 compensation in lieu thereof; provide accurate, itemized wage statements; pay timely wages during
17 employment and after employment separation; provide employees the opportunity to inspect
18 employment records; reimburse Aggrieved Employees for costs incurred in furtherance of their
19 work duties; provide notice as required under Labor Code section 2810.5; provide the proper accrual
20 and use of paid sick leave; paying employees all owed paid time off and vacation time owed by
21 separation at the proper rate of pay; and placing restraints on competition, whistleblowing and
22 freedom of speech, entitling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to civil penalties for each of
23 these Labor Code violations in the amounts set forth in Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f).

24 62. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California
25 whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in
26 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

27 / / /

28 / / /

1 **REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

2 63. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury.

3 **PRAYER**

4 **WHEREFORE**, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for
5 judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 6 A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558,
7 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 8 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
9 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
- 10 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
- 11 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 12 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

13 Dated: March 19, 2021

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

14
15
16 BY: 

DIEGO AVILES

Attorneys for Plaintiff MERCEDES
RODRIGUEZ, as an aggrieved employee, and
on behalf of all other aggrieved employees
under the Labor Code Private Attorneys'
General Act of 2004

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28