

JAMES HAWKINS APLC
James R. Hawkins, Esq. (#192925)
Gregory Mauro, Esq. (#222239)
Michael Calvo, Esq. (#314986)
9880 Research Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 387-7200
Fax: (949) 387-6676
Email: James@jameshawkinsaplc.com
Email: Greg@jameshawkinsaplc.com
Email: Michael@jameshawkinsaplc.com

MJB LAW GROUP, APC
Michael J. Berry, Esq. (#303519)
2082 Business Center Dr., Ste. 255
Irvine, CA 92612
Tel: (949) 266-0880
Fax: (949) 266-0890
Email: michael@mjbfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHARLES STRICKLAND,
on behalf of all the general public as private attorney general,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**

CHARLES STRICKLAND, on behalf of the
general public as private attorney general,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DIAMOND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES,
LP a California Limited Partnership; and DOES
1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.
ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO:
JUDGE:
DEPT:

**PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO THE
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
(Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq*).**

COMES NOW Plaintiff CHARLES STRICKLAND (“Plaintiff”), on behalf the general public and all non-exempt aggrieved employees, acting on behalf of the California Attorney General as private attorney general, asserts claims against Defendants DIAMOND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, LP; and DOES 1-50, inclusive (collectively “Defendants”) as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is a representative action for recovery of penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (“PAGA”), Cal. Lab. Code sections 2698 *et seq.* PAGA permits “aggrieved employees” to bring a lawsuit as a representative action on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other current and former aggrieved employees, to recover civil penalties and address an employer’s violations of the California Labor Code.

2. In this case, Defendants violated various provisions of the California Labor Code. As set forth below, Defendants implemented policies and practices which led to unpaid wages resulting from Defendant’s: (a) to pay wages including overtime, (b) failure to provide meal periods for every work period exceeding more than ten (10) hours per day and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay or accurately pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a meal period; (c) failure to provide rest breaks for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and failure to pay an additional hour’s of pay or accurately pay an additional hour’s of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (d) failing to pay all wages earned and owed upon separation from Defendant’s employ, (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements and (f) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses. As a result Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other aggrieved employees.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The California Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts.” The statutes under which

1 this action is brought do not give jurisdiction to any other court.

2 4. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief,
3 each Defendant either has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally
4 avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the
5 California Courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

6 5. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this judicial district pursuant to Code of
7 Civil Procedure section 395. Defendants are doing business throughout California, including but
8 not limited to San Joaquin County, and each Defendant is within the jurisdiction of this Court for
9 service of process purposes. The unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and
10 all other aggrieved employees within the State of California. Defendants employ numerous
11 aggrieved employees in in the State of California.

12 6. On information and belief, Defendants have conducted business within the State of
13 California during the purported liability period and continue to conduct business throughout the
14 State of California. The unlawful acts alleged herein have had a direct effect on Plaintiff, and the
15 similarly situated non-exempt aggrieved employees within California.

16 7. The California Superior Court also has jurisdiction in this matter because on
17 information and belief there are no federal questions at issue, as the issues herein are based solely
18 on California statutes and law, including the California Labor Code, the IWC Wage Orders, the
19 California Code of Civil Procedure, the California Civil Code, and the California Business and
20 Professions Code.

21 8. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
22 the present ("liability period"), Defendant consistently maintained and enforced against
23 Defendant's Non-Exempt Aggrieved Employees, among others, the following unlawful practices
24 and policies, in violation of California state wage and hour laws: (a) to pay wages including
25 overtime, (b) failure to provide meal periods for every work period exceeding more than ten (10)
26 hours per day and failure to pay an additional hour's of pay or accurately pay an additional hour's
27 of pay in lieu of providing a meal period; (c) failure to provide rest breaks for every four hours or
28

1 major fraction thereof worked and failure to pay an additional hour's of pay or accurately pay an
2 additional hour's of pay in lieu of providing a rest period; (d) failing to pay all wages earned and
3 owed upon separation from Defendant's employ, (e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage
4 statements and (f) failure to reimburse necessary business expenses.

5 9. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
6 the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to provide its Non-Exempt
7 Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, unfettered, uninterrupted, duty free
8 rest periods of at least (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fraction thereof and failing
9 to pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation for each
10 workday that the rest period is not provided, as required by California state wage and hour laws.

11 10. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
12 the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to pay wages including overtime
13 wages for hours worked while subject to the control of Defendants.

14 11. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
15 the present (rest and meal period liability period), Defendants have had a consistent policy of
16 requiring its Non-Exempt Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, to work at
17 least five (5) and or ten (10) hours without a meal period and failing to pay or accurately pay such
18 employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate of compensation for each workday
19 that the meal period is not provided, as required by California state wage and hour laws.

20 12. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
21 the present (rest and meal period liability period), Defendants have had a consistent policy of
22 requiring its Non-Exempt Employees within the State of California, including Plaintiff, to work in
23 excess of four hours and or ten (10) hours without authorizing and permitting a rest period and
24 failing to pay or accurately pay such employees one (1) hour of pay at the employees regular rate
25 of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not authorized and permitted, as required
26 by California state wage and hour laws.

27 13. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
28

1 the present, Defendants have had a consistent policy of failing to timely pay wages upon
2 separation.

3 14. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
4 the present, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff and aggrieved employees accurate itemized
5 wage statements.

6 15. On information and belief, during the statutory liability period and continuing to
7 the present, Defendants have failed to reimburse necessary business expense incurred by Plaintiff
8 and aggrieved employees.

9 16. Plaintiff on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other
10 aggrieved employees bring this action pursuant to Labor Code 2698, et. seq. for violations
11 enumerated under 2699.5 as follows: sections 201-203, 510, 512, 558, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 1174,
12 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802 and seeking penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and
13 costs.

14 III. PARTIES

15 A. Plaintiff

16 17. Plaintiff, CHARLES STRICKLAND was at all times relevant to this action, a
17 resident of California. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants in approximately January 2020 as a
18 Non-Exempt Employee and worked during the liability period for Defendants' as a Driver, until
19 his separation from Defendants' employ in approximately April 2020. Plaintiff's duties included
20 but were not limited to the service and cleaning of portable toilets ("porta-potty" or "porta-potties")
21 located at various job sites and residential areas across Southern California.

22 18. As Defendants' employee, Plaintiff, and all other aggrieved employees were
23 regularly required to and subsequently suffered:

- 24 a) perform work subject to the control of the employer without being compensated all
25 wages including overtime, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the
26 Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order ("IWC");

- 27 b) work without being permitted or authorized a minimum ten-minute rest period for
28

1 every four hours or major fraction thereof worked and not compensated one (1) hour of
2 pay at his regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not
3 provided, all in violation of California labor laws, regulations, and the Industrial
4 Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC");

5 c) work in excess of six and ten hours per day without being provided meal periods and
6 not compensated one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each
7 workday that a meal period was not provided, all in violation of California labor laws,
8 regulations, and the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Orders ("IWC");

9 d) not reimbursed for business expenses incurred; and

10 e) not provided accurate itemized wage statements.

11 19. On information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to pay all earned wages in
12 the form regular wages and overtime wages, and meal and rest period premium wages, to its
13 Non-Exempt Employees and members of the Representative Group; nor have Defendants
14 returned to Plaintiff or members of the Representative Group, upon or after separation from
15 employment with Defendants, all wages earned and owing. Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor
16 Code 2698, *et. seq.* on behalf of the general public as private attorney general and all other
17 aggrieved employees..

18 **B. Defendants**

19 20. Defendants DIAMOND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, LP provides sanitation
20 services including pumping and porta-potty rentals, and provides temporary fence, temporary
21 power, emergency services, dumpsters, and storage rentals throughout Southern California.
22 Plaintiff estimates there are in excess of 100 Non-Exempt Employees who work or have worked
23 for Defendants over the last year.

24 21. Other than identified herein, Plaintiff is unaware of the true names, capacities,
25 relationships and extent of participation in the conduct alleged herein, of the defendants sued as
26 DOES 1 through 50, but is informed and believes and thereon alleges that said defendants are
27 legally responsible for the wrongful conduct alleged herein and therefore sues these defendants by
28

1 such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint when their true names and capabilities
2 are ascertained.

3 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant, directly
4 or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and other members of the
5 Representative Group , and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions.
6 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each defendant acted in all respects
7 pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendants, carried out a joint scheme, business
8 plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable
9 to the other defendants.

10 **IV. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

11 23. At all times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other persons in
12 the capacity of non-exempt positions, however titled, throughout the state of California.

13 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes Aggrieved Employees have at all times pertinent
14 hereto been Non-Exempt within the meaning of the California Labor Code and the implementing
15 rules and regulations of the IWC California Wage Orders.

16 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all Aggrieved Employees are citizens of the
17 state of California.

18 26. Defendants continue to employ Non-Exempt Employees, however titled, in
19 California and implement a uniform set of policies and practices to all non-exempt employees, as
20 they were all engaged in the generic job duties of providing sanitation services to Defendants'
21 clients.

22 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants are and were
23 advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees, and advisors with knowledge of
24 the requirements of California's wage and employment laws.

25 28. During the relevant time frame, Defendants compensated Plaintiff and Aggrieved
26 Employees based upon an hourly rate.

27 29. During the relevant time frame, Defendants assigned Plaintiff and Aggrieved
28

1 Employees to various location to service and/or deliver/pick-up porta-potties. These locations
2 varied throughout Southern California but include: Anaheim, Compton, Laguna Hill, San
3 Clemente, Torrance, Long Beach, and Fullerton.

4 30. On information and belief, during the relevant time frame, Plaintiff and Aggrieved
5 Employees frequently worked well over eight (8) hours in a day and forty (40) hours in a work
6 week. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees typically worked 10 – 12 hour shifts. Plaintiff and
7 Aggrieved Employees worked approximately 5 days week Monday through Friday and sometimes
8 Saturdays with a start time of 5:00 a.m.

9 31. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would typically service 30-60 porta potties a
10 day in various locations which include but are not limited to: Anaheim, Compton, Laguna Hill,
11 San Clemente, Torrance, Long Beach, and Fullerton.

12 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees were not
13 compensated for all time worked as Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees as a result of off-the-clock
14 work performed. For instance, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would were ready and able to
15 begin their shifts 10-15 minutes prior to their schedule 5:00 a.m. start times, but were not permitted
16 to clock-in until 3 minutes prior to 5:00 a.m. As a result, Defendants failed to accurately
17 compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees regular and overtime wages. The result of this was
18 a disproportionate underpayment of wages including overtime wages.

19 33. On information and belief, Defendants' also failed to pay wages and overtime
20 wages as a result of unlawful deductions for 30 minute meal periods that were late, cut short,
21 interrupted, or never provided.

22 34. During the relevant time frame, Defendants required Plaintiff and Aggrieved
23 Employees to maintain company provided cellphones on their persons at all times and to monitor
24 and respond to calls from Defendants' office that came through including during rest and meal
25 breaks.

26 35. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were regularly required to work shifts in
27 excess of five hours without being provided a lawful meal period and over ten hours in a day
28

1 without being provided a second lawful meal period as required by law.

2 36. Indeed, during the relevant time, as a consequence of Defendants' staffing and
3 scheduling practices, lack of coverage, work demands, and Defendants' policies and practices,
4 Defendants frequently failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees timely, legally
5 complaint uninterrupted 30-minute meal periods on shifts over five hours as required by law.
6 Similarly, as a consequence of Defendants' staffing and scheduling practices, lack of coverage,
7 work demands, and Defendants' policies and practices, Defendants frequently failed to provide
8 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees legally compliant second meal periods on shifts over ten
9 hours as required by law.

10 37. On information and belief, Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees did not waive their
11 rights to meal periods under the law.

12 38. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with valid lawful on-duty
13 meal periods.

14 39. Despite the above-mentioned meal period violations, Defendants failed to
15 compensate Plaintiff, and on information and belief, failed to compensate Aggrieved Employees,
16 one additional hour of pay at their regular rate as required by California law when meal periods
17 were not timely or lawfully provided in a compliant manner.

18 40. Plaintiff are informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that Defendants know,
19 should know, knew, and/or should have known that Plaintiff and the other Aggrieved Employees
20 were entitled to receive premium wages based on their regular rate of pay under Labor Code §226.7
21 but were not receiving such compensation.

22 41. In addition, during the relevant time frame, Plaintiff and the Non-Exempt
23 Employees were systematically not authorized and permitted to take one net ten-minute paid, rest
24 period for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof, which is a violation of the Labor
25 Code and IWC wage order.

26 42. Defendants maintained and enforced scheduling practices, policies, and imposed
27 work demands that frequently required Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to forego their lawful,
28

1 paid rest periods of a net ten minutes for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof. Such
2 requisite rest periods were not timely authorized and permitted as a result of Defendants' failure
3 to provide relief for Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees to take their lawfully required breaks.

4 43. Despite the above-mentioned rest period violations, Defendants did not compensate
5 Plaintiff, and on information and belief, did not pay Aggrieved Employees one additional hour of
6 pay at their regular rate as required by California law, including Labor Code section 226.7 and the
7 applicable IWC wage order, for each day on which lawful rest periods were not authorized and
8 permitted.

9 44. Defendants also failed to provide accurate, lawful itemized wage statements to
10 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in part because of the above specified violations. In
11 addition, upon information and belief, Defendants omitted an accurate itemization of total hours
12 worked, including premiums due and owing for meal and rest period violations, gross pay and net
13 pay figures from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' wage statements.

14 45. Plaintiff are informed and believe, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
15 mentioned, Defendants knew that at the time of termination of employment (or within 72 hours
16 thereof for resignations without prior notice as the case may be) they had a duty to accurately
17 compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all wages owed including minimum wages,
18 meal and rest period premiums, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
19 compensation, but willfully, knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so in part
20 because of the above-specified violations.

21 46. During the relevant time frame, Defendants failed to adequately reimburse Plaintiff
22 and Aggrieved Employees for business expenditures incurred for the use of personal cellphones.
23 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees would need to utilize their personal cellphones for navigation
24 purposes and Defendants' navigation was not accurate. Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees also
25 had to use their personal cellphones when Defendants' company provided phones were not
26 working to get job instructions. Defendants also would call Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees on
27 their personal cellphones if they could not reach them on the company provided phones. Such
28

business expenditures incurred were incurred in direct consequence of Plaintiff's and Aggrieved Employees' duties pursuant to Labor Code § 2802

47. Upon information and belief, Defendants knew and or should have known that it is improper to implement policies and commit unlawful acts such as:

(a) requiring employees to work four (4) hours or a major fraction thereof without being provided a minimum ten (10) minute rest period and without compensating the employees with one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided;

(b) requiring employees to work in excess of five (5) hours or ten (10) hours per day without being provided an uninterrupted thirty minute meal period and/or a second meal period, and without compensating employees with one (1) hour of pay at the regular rate of compensation for each workday that such a meal period was not provided;

(c) failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for all wages including overtime wages owed;

(d) failing to timely pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees;

(e) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;

(f) failure to reimburse business expenses; and

(g) conducting and engaging in unfair business practices.

48. In addition to the violations above, and on information and belief, Defendants knew they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees for the allegations asserted herein and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, recklessly, and/or intentionally failed to do so.

V. REPRESENTATIVE CLAIMS

THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT- LABOR CODE §§ 2698 et seq.

49. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges each and every allegation contained above, as though fully set forth herein.

1 50. On March 5, 2021 Plaintiff complied with notice requirements pursuant to Labor
2 Code section 2699.3. A copy of the letter sent to the LWDA is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**,
3 indicating that the LWDA and Defendants were put on notice of the claims alleged here and that
4 the notice requirement has been satisfied. Sixty five days have passed and the LWDA has not
5 indicated intent to investigate the claims. Therefore, Plaintiff may proceed with this action in a
6 representative capacity. The substance and violations set forth in this Complaint of which the
7 LWDA was provided timely notice, Plaintiff has also sent a copy of this PAGA Representative
8 Action Complaint to the LWDA.

9 51. Plaintiff is an aggrieved employee as defined in Labor Code Section 2699(a).
10 Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of all current and former California Non-Exempt
11 Employees of Defendants.

12 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(a) Plaintiff seek to recover civil penalties for
13 which Defendants are liable due to numerous Labor Code violations as set forth in this Complaint,
14 including without limitation Labor Code section 201-203, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 558, 512, 1174,
15 1174.5, 1175, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 2802 and, 2698 *et seq.*, applicable IWC Wage Orders and
16 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 11000 *et. seq.*

17 53. At all times relevant, Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees regularly
18 performed non-exempt work in excess of 50% of the time, and thus, were subject to the meal and
19 rest break requirements of the applicable IWC wage order and the Labor Code.
20

21 54. Defendants violated Labor Code section 510, and 1194 by failing to accurately pay
22 overtime wages owed as discussed above due to Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff and
23 Aggrieved Employees for time they were not permitted to clock in and due to Defendants'
24 automatic deduction of meal periods that were non-compliant. Therefore, Defendants violated
25 section 510, and 1194 by not compensating its Non-Exempt Employees for work performed in
26 excess of eight hours (8) in a day or forty hours in a work week (40). Section 510 of the Labor
27 Code codifies the right to overtime compensation at the rate of one and one-half times the regular
28 rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours in a day or forty (40) hours in a work

1 week and to overtime compensation twice the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of
2 twelve (12) hours in a day or in excess of eight (8) hours in a day on the seventh day of work in a
3 particular work week

4 55. Defendants violated Labor Code section 200, 558, 1194, 1197, by failing to
5 accurately pay at least minimum wages due as a result Defendants' failure to compensate Plaintiff
6 and Aggrieved Employees for time they were not permitted to clock in, and due to Defendants'
7 automatic deduction of meal periods that were non-compliant.

8 56. Defendants violated Labor Code sections 512 and 226.7 for failing to provide
9 timely, uninterrupted first and second meal periods and requiring unlawful on duty meal periods,
10 or compensation in lieu thereof. Pursuant to Labor Code section 512, no employer shall employ
11 an employee for a work period of more than five (5) hours without providing a meal break of not
12 less than thirty (30) minutes in which the employee is relieved of all of his or her duties. An
13 employer may not employ an employee for a work period of more than ten (10) hours per day
14 without providing the employee with a second meal period of not less than thirty (30) minutes,
15 except that if the total hours worked is no more than twelve (12) hours, the second meal period
16 may be waived by mutual consent of the employer and the employee only if the first meal period
17 was not waived.

18 57. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees
19 uninterrupted duty free meal periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes. Defendants implemented
20 and enforced policies of on duty meal period practices which required employees to work during
21 their meal periods, to forego their meal periods, and/or to return to work from meal periods prior
22 to thirty (30) uninterrupted minutes. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations,
23 Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees have been damaged in an amount according to proof
24 at time of trial.

25 58. Plaintiff, and on information and belief, all aggrieved employees, were
26 systematically not permitted or authorized to take ten minute rest periods for every four hours
27 worked or major fraction thereof, which is a violation of the Labor Code and IWC wage order.
28

1 Plaintiff and on information and belief, aggrieved employees, were not compensated with one hour
2 of wages for every day in which a rest period was missed or untimely as a result of Defendants'
3 policies, practices, or work demands. By failing to authorize and permit a ten-minute rest period
4 for every four hours or major fraction thereof worked per day by its Non-Exempt Employees, and
5 by failing to provide compensation for such non-provided or shortened rest periods, as alleged
6 above, Defendants willfully violated the provisions of Labor Code sections 226.7, 512 and the
7 applicable IWC Wage Order.

8 59. Defendants also willfully violated Labor Code sections 201-203 by failing to
9 provide all owed wages at separation from employment. Labor Code sections 201 and 202 require
10 Defendants to pay their employees all wages due either at time of firing, or within seventy-two
11 (72) hours of voluntary separation, if not sooner. Section 203 of the Labor Code provides that if
12 an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages the employer must, as a penalty, continue to
13 pay the subject employee's wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced.
14 The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

15 60. Plaintiff and all other aggrieved employees who were separated from employment
16 are entitled to compensation for all forms of wages earned, including but not limited to
17 compensation regular and overtime wages, and for non-provided meal and rest periods, but to date
18 have not received such compensation, therefore entitling them to penalties under PAGA for
19 violations of Labor Code sections 201-203.

20 61. On information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages due and
21 owing upon separation from employment. These wages include regular and overtime wages, and
22 meal and rest period premiums.

23 62. On information and belief, Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
24 statements which failed to include all hours worked, including overtime, accurate accounting of,
25 the lawful meal and rest period premiums due and owing to Plaintiff and the aggrieved employees,
26 and the address of the legal entity that is the employer pursuant to Labor Code section 226(a).

27 63. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, any employer who violates subdivision (a)
28

1 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
2 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee
3 for each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a
4 wage deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226.

5 64. Additionally, Defendants have no accurate records relating to aggrieved
6 employees' work periods, meal periods, total daily hours worked, total hours worked per payroll
7 period and applicable pay rates, in violation of Wage Order. Similarly, Defendants failed to
8 maintain accurate records relating to hours worked daily in violation of Labor Code sections
9 1174(d), 1174.5.

10 65. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff and Aggrieved employees
11 are entitled to penalties to the extent they were not paid at the prevailing wage rate for all hours
12 worked.

13 66. Plaintiff and the Representative Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
14 Penalties and attorneys' fees and costs under Labor Code section 2698, et. seq.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants, as follows:

- 17 1. For penalties according to proof, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq.;
- 18 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
- 19 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.
- 20

21

22 Dated: March 4, 2021

JAMES HAWKINS APLC
MJB LAW GROUP, APC

23

24 By: _____

JAMES R. HAWKINS, ESQ.
GREGORY MAURO, ESQ.
MICHAEL CALVO, ESQ.
MICHAEL J. BERRY, ESQ.

25
26
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff CHARLES
28 STRICKLAND on behalf of the general
public as private attorney general