

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Gregory Keosian

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC

Matthew J. Matern (SBN 159798)

Email: mmatern@maternlawgroup.com

Tagore O. Subramaniam (SBN 280126)

Email: tagore@maternlawgroup.com

Max N. Sloves (SBN 217676)

Email: msloves@maternlawgroup.com

1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200

Manhattan Beach, California 90266

Telephone: (310) 531-1900

Facsimile: (310) 531-1901

Attorneys for Plaintiff FRANCISCO

MALAGON individually, and on behalf of

other aggrieved employees

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FRANCISCO MALAGON, individually, and
on behalf of other aggrieved employees

Plaintiff,

vs.

STAK KING CORPORATION, a corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: **21STCV31865**

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF
THE CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT OF 2004**

[California Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 PLAINTIFF FRANCISCO MALAGON (“PLAINTIFF”), individually and on behalf of
2 all other aggrieved employees, demanding a jury trial, hereby alleges as follows:

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 1. PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of himself and all other aggrieved
5 employees of Defendants SNAK KING CORPORATION, a corporation; and DOES 1 through 50
6 inclusive, (collectively, “DEFENDANTS”) to recover penalties arising from unpaid wages earned
7 and due, including but not limited to unpaid and illegally calculated overtime compensation,
8 illegal meal and rest period policies, failure to pay all wages due to discharged or quitting
9 employees, failure to maintain required records, failure to provide accurate itemized wage
10 statements, failure to timely pay wages during employment, failure to indemnify employees for
11 necessary expenditures and/or losses incurred in discharging their duties.

12 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13 2. The Superior Court of the State of California has jurisdiction in this matter because
14 PLAINTIFF is a resident of the State of California and DEFENDANTS are citizens and residents
15 of, and/or regularly conduct business in California. Further, no federal question is at issue
16 because the claims are based solely on California law.

17 3. Venue is proper in this judicial district and the County of LOS ANGELES,
18 California because PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees performed work for
19 DEFENDANTS in the County of LOS ANGELES and many of DEFENDANTS’ unlawful
20 actions and omissions, as set forth herein, occurred in the County of LOS ANGELES.

21 **PARTIES**

22 4. PLAINTIFF FRANCISCO MALAGON is a resident of the State of California. At
23 times material to this complaint, PLAINTIFF was employed by DEFENDANTS as a non-exempt
24 employee within the State of California.

25 5. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DEFENDANT
26 SNAK KING CORPORATION is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation authorized
27 to conduct business in the State of California, and does conduct business in the State of
28 California. Specifically, upon information and belief, DEFENDANT SNAK KING

1 CORPORATION, maintains offices and conducts business in the County of LOS ANGELES,
2 State of California.

3 6. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to
4 PLAINTIFF at this time, and PLAINTIFF therefore sues such defendants under fictitious names.
5 PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant designated as a
6 DOE is in some manner highly responsible for the occurrences alleged herein, and that
7 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees' injuries and damages, as alleged herein, were
8 proximately caused by the conduct of such DOE defendants. PLAINTIFF will seek leave of the
9 court to amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such DOE defendants
10 when ascertained.

11 7. At all relevant times herein, DEFENDANTS were the joint employers of
12 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon
13 alleges, that at all times material to this complaint DEFENDANTS were the alter egos, divisions,
14 affiliates, integrated enterprises, joint employers, subsidiaries, parents, principals, related entities,
15 co-conspirators, authorized agents, partners, joint venturers, and/or guarantors, actual or
16 ostensible, of each other. Each defendant was completely dominated by his, her, or its co-
17 defendant, and each was the alter ego of the other.

18 8. At all relevant times herein, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees were
19 employed by DEFENDANTS under employment agreements that were partly written, partly oral,
20 and partly implied. In perpetrating the acts and omissions alleged herein, DEFENDANTS, and
21 each of them, acted pursuant to, and in furtherance of, their policies and practices of not paying
22 PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all wages earned and due, through methods and
23 schemes which include, but are not limited to, failing to pay overtime premiums; failing to
24 provide rest and meal periods; failing to properly maintain records; failing to provide accurate
25 itemized statements for each pay period; failing to timely pay wages during employment; failing
26 to properly compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for necessary expenditures;
27 and requiring, permitting or suffering the employees to work off the clock, in violation of the
28 California Labor Code ("Labor Code") and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission

1 (“IWC”) Wage Order.

2 9. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and every one
3 of the acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, and/or attributable to, all
4 DEFENDANTS, each acting as agents and/or employees, and/or under the direction and control
5 of, each of the other DEFENDANTS, and that said acts and failures to act were within the course
6 and scope of said agency, employment and/or direction and control.

7 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

8 10. Pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”),
9 Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF brings this action on behalf of himself and all current
10 and former non-exempt aggrieved employees of DEFENDANTS in the State of California at any
11 time within the period beginning one (1) year and sixty five (65) days prior to the filing of this
12 action, and ending at the time this action settles or proceeds to final judgment (“PENALTY
13 PERIOD”).

14 11. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3, PLAINTIFF gave written notice on September
15 20, 2018 by online submission to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency
16 (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to DEFENDANTS of the specific provisions of the Labor Code
17 and IWC Wage Orders alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
18 the alleged violations. PLAINTIFF has not received any response from the LWDA. As
19 PLAINTIFF has waited more than sixty-five (65) days from the September 20, 2018 date of
20 PLAINTIFF’S written notice before filing this action, PLAINTIFF has complied with all of the
21 requirements set forth in Labor Code § 2699.3 to commence a representative action under PAGA.

22 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

23 **Failure to Provide Required Meal Periods**

24 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512; IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 11]**

25 12. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS’ illegal policies and
26 practices to deprive their current and former non-exempt employees all wages earned and due,
27 DEFENDANTS required, suffered or permitted PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to
28 take less than the 30-minute meal period, or to work through them, and have failed to otherwise

1 provide the required meal periods to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees pursuant to
2 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Order No. 9-2001, § 11.

3 13. DEFENDANTS further violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage
4 Order No. 9-2001, § 11 by failing to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees
5 who were not provided with a meal period, in accordance with the applicable IWC Wage Order,
6 one additional hour of compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that
7 a meal period was not provided.

8 **Failure to Provide Required Rest Periods**

9 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226.7; IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 12]**

10 14. At all times relevant herein, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal policies and
11 practices to deprive their current and former non-exempt employees all wages earned and due,
12 DEFENDANTS failed to provide rest periods to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees as
13 required under Labor Code § 226.7, and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 12.

14 15. DEFENDANTS further violated Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-
15 2001, § 12 by failing to pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees who were not provided
16 with a rest period, in accordance with the applicable IWC Wage Order, one additional hour of
17 compensation at each employee's regular rate of pay for each workday that a rest period was not
18 provided.

19 **Failure to Pay Overtime Wages**

20 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1198; IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 3]**

21 16. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 3,
22 DEFENDANTS are required to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all
23 overtime, which is calculated at one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate of pay for all hours
24 worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week, and for the first
25 eight (8) hours on the seventh consecutive workday, with double time for all hours worked in
26 excess of twelve (12) hours in any workday and for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours
27 on the seventh consecutive day of work in any workweek.

28 17. PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees are current and former non-exempt

1 employees of DEFENDANTS entitled to the protections of Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and
2 IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to
3 compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all overtime hours worked as
4 required under the foregoing provisions of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Order by, among other
5 things: failing to pay overtime at one and one-half (1 ½) or double the regular rate of pay as
6 provided by Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 3; requiring,
7 suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work off the clock;
8 requiring, permitting or suffering PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees to work through
9 meal breaks; illegally and inaccurately recording time in which PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
10 employees worked; failing to properly maintain PLAINTIFF'S and other aggrieved employees'
11 records; failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
12 employees for each pay period; and other methods to be discovered.

13 18. DEFENDANTS have knowingly and willfully refused to perform their obligations
14 to compensate PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for all wages earned and all hours
15 worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 510, 1194 and 1198 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 3.

16 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

17 **[Cal Labor Code §§ 1194, 1197; IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 4]**

18 19. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-
19 2001, § 4, payment to an employee of less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours
20 worked in a payroll period is unlawful.

21 20. During the PENALTY PERIOD and in violation of California Labor Code §§ 1194
22 and 1197 and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 4, DEFENDANTS failed to pay PLAINTIFF and
23 other aggrieved employees the applicable minimum wages for all hours worked in a payroll
24 period by, among other things: requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved
25 employees to work off the clock; requiring, suffering or permitting PLAINTIFF and other
26 aggrieved employees to work through meal breaks; illegally and inaccurately recording time in
27 which PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees worked; failing to properly maintain
28 PLAINTIFF's and other aggrieved employees' records; failing to provide accurate itemized wage

1 statements to PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees for each pay period; and other methods
2 to be discovered.

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

4 **[Cal. Labor Code § 204]**

5 21. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 204, for all labor performed between the 1st
6 and 15th days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt
7 employees between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed.
8 California Labor Code § 204 also provides that for all labor performed between the 16th and 26th
9 days of any calendar month, DEFENDANTS are required to pay their nonexempt employees
10 between the 1st and 10th day of the following calendar month. In addition, California Labor
11 Code § 204 provides that all wages earned for labor in excess of the normal work period shall be
12 paid no later than the payday of the next regular payroll period.

13 22. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS knowingly and willfully failed
14 to timely pay PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees all the wages for labor performed by
15 the next regular payroll period as required by California Labor Code § 204.

16 **Failure to Pay All Wages Due to Discharged and Quitting Employees**

17 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203]**

18 23. Pursuant to Labor Code § 201, 202 and 203, DEFENDANTS are required to pay
19 all earned and unpaid wages to an employee who is discharged. Labor Code § 201 mandates that
20 if an employer discharges an employee, the employee's wages accrued and unpaid at the time of
21 discharge are due and payable immediately.

22 24. Furthermore, pursuant to Labor Code § 202, DEFENDANTS are required to pay
23 all accrued wages due to an employee no later than 72 hours after the employee quits his or her
24 employment, unless the employee provided 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to
25 quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or wages at the time of quitting.

26 25. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay, in accordance
27 with Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, any wages of an employee who is discharged or who quits, the
28 employer is liable for waiting time penalties in the form of continued compensation to the

1 employee at the same rate for up to 30 workdays.

2 26. During the PENALTY PERIOD and in violation of Labor Code §§ 201 and 202,
3 DEFENDANTS willfully failed to timely pay accrued wages and other compensation to
4 aggrieved employees who were discharged or quit their employment.

5 **Failure to Maintain Required Records**

6 **[Cal. Labor Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d); IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 7]**

7 27. During the PENALTY PERIOD, as part of DEFENDANTS' illegal payroll
8 policies and practices to deprive PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees of all wages earned
9 and due, DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally failed to maintain records as required
10 under Labor Code §§ 226(a) and 1174(d) and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 7, including but
11 not limited to the following records: total daily hours worked by each employee; applicable rates
12 of pay; all deductions; meal periods; time records showing when each employee begins and ends
13 each work period; and accurate itemized statements.

14 **Failure to Furnish Accurate Itemized Wage Statements**

15 **[Cal. Labor Code § 226(a); IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001, § 7]**

16 28. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS routinely failed and continue to
17 fail to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized
18 wage statements in writing showing each employee's gross wages earned, total hours worked, the
19 number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-
20 rate basis, all deductions made, net wages earned, the inclusive dates of the period for which the
21 employee is paid, the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social
22 security number or employee identification number, the name and address of the legal entity or
23 entities employing PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees, and all applicable hourly rates in
24 effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate,
25 in violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) and IWC Wage Order No. 9-2001 § 7.

26 29. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS knowingly and intentionally
27 failed to provide PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees with timely and accurate itemized
28 wage statements in accordance with Labor Code § 226(a).

1 30. During the PENALTY PERIOD, PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees
2 suffered injury as a result of DEFENDANTS' failure to provide timely and accurate itemized
3 wage statements as PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees could not promptly and easily
4 determine from the wage statement alone one or more of the following: the gross wages earned,
5 the total hours worked, all deductions made, the net wages earned, the name and address of the
6 legal entity or entities employing PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees, and/or all
7 applicable hourly rates in effect during each pay period and the corresponding number of hours
8 worked at each hourly rate.

9 **Failure to Indemnify for Necessary Expenditures Incurred in Discharge of Duties**

10 **[Cal. Labor Code § 2802]**

11 31. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires an employer to indemnify an employee for all
12 necessary expenditures or losses incurred by the employee in direct consequence of the discharge
13 of his or her duties, or of his or her obedience to the directions of the employer.

14 32. During the PENALTY PERIOD, DEFENDANTS failed to indemnify PLAINTIFF
15 and other aggrieved employees for all business expenses and/or losses incurred in direct
16 consequence of the discharge of their duties while working under the direction of
17 DEFENDANTS, including but not limited to expenses for cell phone usage, and other
18 employment-related expenses, in violation of Labor Code § 2802.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **VIOLATION OF THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT**

21 **[Cal. Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*]**

22 **(Against All DEFENDANTS)**

23 33. PLAINTIFF incorporates herein by specific reference, as though fully set forth, the
24 allegations in paragraphs 1 through 32.

25 34. PLAINTIFF is an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of Labor Code
26 § 2699(c), and a proper representative to bring a civil action on behalf of himself and other
27 current and former non-exempt employees of DEFENDANTS pursuant to the procedures
28 specified in Labor Code § 2699.3, because PLAINTIFF is employed by DEFENDANTS and one

1 or more of the alleged Labor Code violations was committed against PLAINTIFF during the
2 PENALTY PERIOD.

3 35. PLAINTIFF seeks to recover civil penalties through a representative action
4 permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46
5 Cal.4th 969. Thus, class certification is not required.

6 36. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698-2699.5, PLAINTIFF seeks to recover civil
7 penalties from DEFENDANTS in a representative action for the violations set forth above,
8 including but not limited to violations of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510,
9 512, 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

10 37. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties for
11 DEFENDANTS' violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is specifically
12 provided, including but not limited to the following:

- 13 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 210, for violations of Labor Code § 204,
14 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of one hundred
15 dollars (\$100) for the initial violation for each failure to pay each employee
16 and two hundred dollars (\$200) per employee for violations in subsequent
17 pay periods.
- 18 b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.3, for violations of Labor Code § 226(a),
19 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred
20 and fifty dollars (\$250) per aggrieved employee for the initial pay period
21 where a violation occurs and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per aggrieved
22 employee for violations in subsequent pay periods.
- 23 c. Pursuant to Labor Code § 558(a), "[a]ny employer or other person acting
24 on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated, a section
25 of this chapter or any provision regulating hours and days of work in any
26 order of the Industrial Welfare Commission," including Labor Code §§ 510
27 and 512, shall be subject to a civil penalty, in addition to any other penalty
28 provided by law, of fifty dollars (\$50) for initial violations for each

1 underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
2 underpaid and one hundred dollars (\$100) for each subsequent violation for
3 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee was
4 underpaid. In addition, PLAINTIFF seeks civil penalties in the amount
5 sufficient to recover unpaid wages owed to aggrieved employees pursuant
6 to Labor Code § 558(a).

7 d. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, for violations of Labor Code § 1174(d),
8 DEFENDANTS are subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars
9 (\$500).

10 e. Pursuant to Labor Code § 1197.1, an employer who pays or causes to be
11 paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an order of
12 the commission, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: for any initial
13 violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars (\$100) for
14 each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the employee is
15 underpaid; and for each subsequent violation of the same offense, two
16 hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay
17 period for which the employee is underpaid regardless of whether the
18 initial violation was intentionally committed.

19 38. Labor Code § 2699(f) provides that for all Labor Code violations for which a civil
20 penalty is not specifically provided, the following civil penalties are established: one hundred
21 dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two
22 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.
23 PLAINTIFF seeks such civil penalties under Labor Code § 2699(f) for DEFENDANTS'
24 violations of Labor Code provisions for which a civil penalty is not specifically provided,
25 including but not limited to Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 226.7, 1194, 1197, 1198, and 2802.

26 39. PLAINTIFF additionally seeks reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to
27 Labor Code § 2699(g)(1).

28 ///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF, individually and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees,
3 pray for relief against DEFENDANTS as follows:

4 1. For civil penalties according to proof, including but not limited to the amount of
5 any unpaid wages of PLAINTIFF and other aggrieved employees and all penalties authorized by
6 the Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699(a) and (f);

7 2. For interest at the legal rate pursuant to Labor Code §§ 218.6, 1194, 2802,
8 California Civil Code §§ 3287, 3288, and/or any other applicable provision providing for pre-
9 judgment interest;

10 3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(g) and/or
11 any other applicable provisions providing for attorney's fees and costs; and

12 4. For such further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

13
14 DATED: August 27, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

15 **MATERN LAW GROUP, PC**

16
17 By: _____

18 Matthew J. Matern
19 Tagore O. Subramaniam
20 Max N. Sloves
21 Attorneys for Plaintiff FRANCISCO
22 MALAGON individually, and on behalf of
23 other aggrieved employees
24
25
26
27
28

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLAINTIFF hereby demands a jury trial with respect to all issues triable of right by jury.

DATED: August 27, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

MATERN LAW GROUP, PC

By:

Matthew J. Matern
Tagore O. Subramaniam
Max N. Sloves
Attorneys for Plaintiff FRANCISCO
MALAGON individually, and on behalf of
other aggrieved employees