

AEQUITAS LEGAL GROUP
 A Professional Law Corporation
 1156 E. Green Street, Suite 200
 Pasadena, California 91106

Ronald H. Bae (SBN 186826)
 Olivia D. Scharrer (SBN 291470)
 Carson M. Turner (SBN 345992)
 AEQUITAS LEGAL GROUP
 A Professional Law Corporation
 1156 E. Green Street, Suite 200
 Pasadena, California 91106
 Telephone: (213) 674-6080
 Facsimile: (213) 674-6081

Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID LIZARRAGA

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

09/07/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: C. Vargas Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT

DAVID LIZARRAGA, individually, and on
 behalf of other members of the general public
 similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LANDCARE USA LLC, a Delaware limited
 liability company; LANDCARE HOLDINGS,
 INC., a Delaware corporation, doing business
 as LANDCARE USA; and DOES 1 through
 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21STCV14473

[Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable
 Stuart M. Rice, Dept. 1]

CLASS ACTION

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT &
 ENFORCEMENT ACTION UNDER THE
 PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,
 CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET
 SEQ.**

- (1) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, and 1198 (Failure to Pay Regular and Overtime Wages);
- (2) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1771, 1774, 1194, 1811, and 1815 (Failure to Pay Prevailing Wages on Public Works Projects);
- (3) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a) (Failure to Provide Compliant Meal Periods or Pay Premium Compensation in Lieu Thereof);
- (4) Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7 (Failure to Provide Compliant

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

	Rest Periods or Pay Premium Compensation in Lieu Thereof);
	(5) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 (Failure to Pay Wages Timely Upon Termination);
	(6) Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 (Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses);
	(7) Violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) (Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements);
	(8) Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, <i>et seq.</i> ; and
	(9) Penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, <i>et seq.</i> (Private Attorneys General Act).
	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiff DAVID LIZARRAGA, individually and on behalf of all other members of the public similarly situated, alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff DAVID LIZARRAGA (“Plaintiff”) is at least 18 years of age and is a resident of the County of Los Angeles in the State of California.
2. Defendant LANDCARE USA, LLC, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware limited liability company, and at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout this county and in the State of California.
3. Defendant LANDCARE HOLDINGS, INC., doing business in California as LANDCARE USA, was and is, upon information and belief, a Delaware corporation, and at all times hereinafter mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout this county and in the State of California.

5 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 100
6 are the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers or employees of LANDCARE USA, LLC
7 and LANDCARE HOLDINGS, INC. and were acting on behalf of LANDCARE USA, LLC and
8 LANDCARE HOLDINGS, INC. at all relevant times.

9 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the acts
10 and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to LANDCARE USA, LLC
11 and LANDCARE HOLDINGS, INC. and DOES 1 through 100 (collectively “Defendants”), each
12 acting as the agent for the other, with legal authority to act on the other’s behalf. The acts of any
13 and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent the official policy of Defendants.

7. At all relevant times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

18 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said
19 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts,
20 omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This class action is brought pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The monetary damages and restitution sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial. The amount in controversy for each class representative, including claims for compensatory damages and pro rata share of attorneys' fees, is less than \$75,000.

28 10. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,

Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court “original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other courts.” The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

11. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, each party is either a citizen of California, has sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over it by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

12. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, one or more of the named Defendants reside, transact business, or have offices in this county and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

13. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf, as well as on behalf of each and all other persons similarly situated, and thus, seeks class certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

14. All claims alleged herein arise under California law for which Plaintiff seeks relief authorized by California law.

15. Plaintiff’s proposed class consists of and are defined as:

All non-exempt employees who have worked for Defendants in the State of California at any time between April 15, 2017 and the date of final judgment in this action.

16. Plaintiff reserves the right to establish additional subclasses as appropriate.

17. There is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the class is readily ascertainable:

(a) **Numerosity**: The members of the class (and each subclass, if any) are so numerous that joinder of all members would be unfeasible and impractical. The membership of the entire class is unknown to Plaintiff at

1 this time, however, the class is estimated to be greater than fifty (50)
2 individuals and the identity of such membership is readily ascertainable by
3 inspection of Defendants' employment records.

4 (b) Typicality: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately protect
5 the interests of each class member with whom he has a well-defined
6 community of interest, and Plaintiff's claims (or defenses, if any) are
7 typical of all class members' as demonstrated herein.

8 (c) Adequacy: Plaintiff is qualified to, and will, fairly and adequately, protect
9 the interests of each class member with whom he has a well-defined
10 community of interest and typicality of claims, as demonstrated herein.
11 Plaintiff acknowledges that he has an obligation to make known to the
12 Court any relationship, conflicts or differences with any class member.
13 Plaintiff's attorneys, the proposed class counsel, are well-versed in the
14 rules governing class action discovery, certification, and settlement.
15 Plaintiff and his counsel have incurred, and throughout the duration of this
16 action, will continue to incur costs and attorneys' fees that have been, are,
17 and will be necessarily expended for the prosecution of this action for the
18 substantial benefit of each class member.

19 (d) Superiority: The nature of this action makes the use of class action
20 adjudication superior to other methods. A class action will achieve
21 economies of time, effort and expense as compared with separate lawsuits,
22 and will avoid inconsistent outcomes because the same issues can be
23 adjudicated in the same manner and at the same time for the entire class.

24 (e) Public Policy Considerations: Employers in the State of California violate
25 employment and labor laws every day. Current employees are often afraid
26 to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former
27 employees are fearful of bringing actions because they believe their
28 former employers might damage their future endeavors through negative

1 references and/or other means. Class actions provide the class members
2 who are not named in the complaint with a type of anonymity that allows
3 for the vindication of their rights at the same time as their privacy is
4 protected.

5 18. There are common questions of law and fact as to the class (and each subclass, if
6 any) that predominate over questions affecting only individual members, including but not limited
7 to:

- 8 (a) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees no
9 less than the applicable minimum wage for all hours worked, as required
10 by California law;
- 11 (b) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees for all
12 of their overtime hours at the correct hourly rate, as required by California
13 law;
- 14 (c) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and similarly situated employees all of
15 their prevailing wages and benefits for work associated with public works
16 projects;
- 17 (d) Whether Defendants have provided Plaintiff and class members with 30-
18 minute, duty-free meal periods within the first five hours of work, and/or
19 provided a second 30-minute, duty-free meal period on shifts longer than
20 10 hours, and whether Defendants have paid the required premiums when
21 such meal periods were not provided, as required by California law;
- 22 (d) Whether Defendants have provided Plaintiff and class members with 10-
23 minute rest periods for every four hours worked or major fraction thereof,
24 and whether Defendants have paid the required premiums when such rest
25 periods were not provided, as required by California law;
- 26 (e) Whether Defendants paid Plaintiff and class members all wages owed
27 upon the separation of their employment within the time periods required
28 by California law;

- 1 (f) Whether Defendants reimbursed Plaintiff and class members for all
2 necessary business-related expenses;
- 3 (g) Whether Defendants provided accurate, itemized wage statements to
4 Plaintiff and class members, as required by California law;
- 5 (h) Whether Defendants' conduct, as described above, was willful or reckless;
- 6 (i) Whether Defendants engaged in unfair business practices in violation of
7 California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*; and
- 8 (j) The appropriate amount of damages, restitution, or monetary penalties
9 resulting from Defendants' violations of California law.
- 10

11 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

12 19. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
13 persons as non-exempt employees who belong to the class as set forth above.

14 20. Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt, hourly-paid employee from
15 approximately May 22, 2020 to approximately August 14, 2020. Plaintiff worked as an Irrigator
16 Driver at landscaping job sites in Culver City, California and Los Angeles, California. Plaintiff's
17 job duties primarily consisted of performing sprinkler repair and landscaping duties. These tasks
18 included installing and repairing sprinklers, and drenching by hand.

19 21. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants systematically failed to pay
20 overtime wages to Plaintiff and other similarly situated non-exempt employees (sometimes
21 collectively "employees" or "class members"). Plaintiff and class members regularly worked
22 more than 8 hours per day and/or more than 40 hours per week and were not paid for their
23 overtime hours. Defendants' policy and practice was to pay employees for 8 hours per day and/or
24 40 hours per week, even if employees worked longer. The time records typically showed a shift
25 start time of 6:00 a.m. and a shift end time of 2:30 p.m. every day of the workweek. These start
26 and end times were typed on the timesheet. Employees signed and dated their timesheets, but did
27 not fill the timesheets out themselves. At times, the timesheets did not show any shift start or end
28 time at all, only a total number of hours for the day. Meal break times were not recorded.

1 Moreover, when Defendants did pay for overtime work they failed to pay the correct overtime rate
2 to Plaintiff and class members and Defendants did not properly incorporate bonus payments into
3 the regular rate of pay. Defendants also failed to pay all minimum and overtime wages due to
4 improper rounding of employee work time, including rounding of meal periods.

5 22. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay prevailing wages to
6 Plaintiff and other employees for work on public works projects. Plaintiff and other similarly
7 situated employees were paid at less than the applicable prevailing wage rate for all regular hours
8 worked on public works projects. Defendants also failed to pay one-and-a-half times the basic rate
9 of pay for all overtime hours worked on public works projects. As a result of the failure to pay
10 prevailing wages, Defendants failed to maintain and submit accurate certified payroll records.

11 23. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants have failed to provide compliant
12 meal periods to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees, as required by California law.
13 Plaintiff and class members were deprived of the opportunity to take a timely, duty-free meal
14 break of at least 30 minutes for every 5 hours of work due to the working conditions imposed by
15 Defendants. In addition, Defendants did not maintain records of when employees started and
16 stopped their meal breaks, or if meal breaks were taken at all. Defendants' policy and practice
17 was to automatically deduct 30 minutes from every shift for meal breaks, regardless of whether
18 employees actually received an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break.

19 24. Defendants did not pay meal break premiums to Plaintiff and other similarly
20 situated employees when compliant meal periods were not provided.

21 25. Defendants systematically failed to provide Plaintiff and other similarly situated
22 employees with rest periods of at least 10 minutes for each 4 hours worked or major fraction
23 thereof. Defendants' rest period policy did not comply with California law. In addition, Plaintiff
24 and class members were not made aware of Defendants' rest break policy (if any) and were not
25 told that they could take rest breaks. As a result, they did not take rest breaks. Defendants did not
26 pay rest break premiums to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees when compliant rest
27 periods were not provided.

28 26. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and

1 other similarly situated employees for necessary business-related expenses, including, but not
2 limited to, tools and drinking water. Defendants' pattern and practice was to unlawfully shift the
3 costs of doing business onto Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees by requiring them to
4 pay these necessary work-related expenses out of their own pockets.

5 27. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other
6 similarly situated employees all wages owed upon the separation of their employment, including
7 the unpaid regular and overtime wages and prevailing wages described herein.

8 28. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff
9 and other similarly situated employees with accurate itemized wage statements, as required by
10 California Labor Code § 226(a). The number of hours worked and the corresponding hourly rates
11 are inaccurate as a consequence of Defendants' failure to pay regular and overtime wages and
12 prevailing wages, as set forth herein.

13 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
14 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers and other professionals, employees and
15 advisors knowledgeable about California labor and wage law, employment and personnel
16 practices, and about the requirements of California law.

17 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
18 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
19 minimum wage for all hours worked as well as overtime pay at one-and-a-half times the regular
20 rate of pay, but that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were not paid all their hours worked
21 and/or were not paid at the correct hourly rate.

22 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
23 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
24 prevailing wages for all hours worked on public works projects, and that Plaintiff and similarly
25 situated employees were not paid all prevailing wages owed.

26 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
27 should have known that Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were entitled to receive all
28 meal periods as required by California law, or payment of one additional hour of pay at the regular

1 rate of pay when a compliant meal period was not provided.

2 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
3 should have known that Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were entitled to receive all
4 rest periods as required by California law, or payment of one additional hour of pay at the regular
5 rate of pay when a compliant rest period was not provided.

6 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
7 should have known that Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were entitled to timely
8 payment of all wages—including, without limitation, regular and overtime wages and prevailing
9 wages—due upon termination or discharge in accordance with California law, and that they were
10 not timely paid such wages.

11 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendant knew or
12 should have known that Plaintiff and similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
13 reimbursement for all necessary business-related expenses incurred by them, and that Plaintiff and
14 other similarly situated employees did incur such expenses and were not reimbursed.

15 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
16 should have known that Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were entitled to receive
17 complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, and that such wage
18 statements were not provided.

19 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
20 mentioned, Defendants knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff
21 and other similarly situated employees, and that Defendants had the financial ability to pay such
22 compensation, but willfully, knowingly and intentionally failed to do so, and falsely represented to
23 Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees that they were properly denied wages, all in order
24 to increase Defendants' profits.

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

28 39. At all times herein set forth, California Private Attorneys General Act, Labor Code

1 §§ 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) was applicable to Plaintiff’s employment by Defendants.

2 40. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the
3 California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor
4 and Workforce Development Agency for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an
5 alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of
6 himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in
7 California Labor Code § 2699.3.

8 41. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved
9 employee,” who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or
10 more of the alleged violations was committed.

11 42. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed
12 against him during his time of employment and he is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff
13 and other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in
14 that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged
15 violations were committed against them.

16 43. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
17 including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
18 have been met:

19 (a) The aggrieved employee or representative shall give written notice by
20 online filing with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by
21 certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions of this code alleged
22 to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
23 violation.

24 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the
25 employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not
26 intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of
27 the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA
28 Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65)

1 calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the aggrieved
2 employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code
3 § 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which
4 the employee may be entitled.

5 (c) On April 21, 2021, Plaintiff provided the requisite written notice by online
6 filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant, informing them of
7 the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
8 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
9 On May 31, 2023, Plaintiff provided a supplemental written notice by
10 online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendants, informing
11 them of additional provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have
12 been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
13 violations. As of the filing date of this Second Amended Complaint,
14 Plaintiff and his counsel have not received any notification from the LWDA
15 that it intends to investigate the violations alleged in this supplemental
16 notice.

17 44. Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code
18 § 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for
19 violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198,
20 2800 and 2802.

21 22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198**

24 **(Against All Defendants)**

25 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
26 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 44.

27 46. California Labor Code § 1197 codifies the right to compensation at the requisite
28 minimum wage for all hours worked. California Labor Code § 510 codifies the right to overtime

1 compensation at one-and-one-half times the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of 8
2 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week or for the first 8 hours worked on the seventh day of work,
3 and to overtime compensation at twice the regular hourly rate for hours worked in excess of 12
4 hours in a day or in excess of 8 hours in a day on the seventh day of work.

5 47. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members consistently worked in
6 excess of 8 hours in a day, in excess of 12 hours in a day, and/or in excess of 40 hours in a week.

7 48. California Labor Code § 1198 and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission
8 (“IWC”) Wage Order provide that it is unlawful to employ persons without compensating them at
9 a rate of pay either time-and-one-half or two-times that person’s regular rate of pay, depending on
10 the number of hours worked by the person on a daily or weekly basis.

11 49. Specifically, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that Defendants are and
12 were required to pay Plaintiff and class members employed by Defendants, and working more
13 than 8 hours in a day or more than 40 hours in a workweek, at the rate of time-and-one-half for all
14 hours worked in excess of 8 hours in a day or more than 40 hours in a workweek.

15 50. The applicable IWC Wage Order further provides that Defendants are and were
16 required to pay Plaintiff and class members employed by Defendants, and working more than 12
17 hours in a day, overtime compensation at a rate of two times their regular rate of pay.

18 51. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay all wages,
19 including overtime wages, owed to Plaintiff and class members.

20 52. Plaintiff and class members regularly worked more than 8 hours per day and/or
21 more than 40 hours per week and were not paid for their overtime hours. Defendants’ policy and
22 practice was to pay employees for 8 hours per day and/or 40 hours per week, even if employees
23 worked longer. The time records typically showed a shift start time of 6:00 a.m. and a shift end
24 time of 2:30 p.m. every day of the workweek. These start and end times were typed on the
25 timesheet. Employees signed and dated their timesheets, but did not fill the timesheets out
26 themselves. At times, the timesheets did not show any shift start or end time at all, only a total
27 number of hours for the day. Meal break times were not recorded. Moreover, Defendants failed
28 to pay the correct overtime rate in various respects, including that Defendants did not properly

1 incorporate bonus payments into the regular rate of pay. Defendants also failed to pay all
2 minimum and overtime wages due to improper rounding of employee work time, including
3 rounding of meal periods.

4 53. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff's and class members' minimum and overtime
5 wages violates the provisions of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198, and is
6 therefore unlawful.

7 54. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover unpaid wages and such general
8 and special damages as may be appropriate and interest thereon.

9 55. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled
10 to recover their unpaid overtime wages, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

11
12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

13 **Violation of California Labor Code §§ 510, 1171, 1174, 1194, 1811, and 1815**

14 **(Against All Defendants)**

15 56. Plaintiff incorporate by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material
16 allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 55.

17 57. At all relevant times, Defendants performed work pursuant to public contracts, as
18 defined by California Labor Code § 1720, *et seq.* Plaintiff and class members worked on public
19 works projects over one thousand dollars (\$1,000).

20 58. At all relevant times, Defendants were subject to the prevailing wage requirements
21 set forth in California Labor Code § 1770, *et seq.* for work performed under public contracts.

22 59. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees were
23 "workers" within the meaning of California Labor Code § 1723.

24 60. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1771, 1774, and 1194, Defendants had a duty
25 to pay Plaintiff and class members not less than the minimum required prevailing wage rate for all
26 work performed on public works projects.

27 61. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 510, 1811, 1815, Defendants had a duty to
28 pay Plaintiff and class members not less than one-and-a-half times the basic prevailing wage rate

1 for all overtime hours worked on public works projects.

2 62. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and
3 other class members the general prevailing rate of per diem wages for work of a similar character
4 in the locality in which the public work projects were performed.

5 63. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and
6 other class members one-and-a-half times the basic prevailing wage rate for holiday and overtime
7 worked on public works projects.

8 64. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and class members the applicable prevailing
9 rate of per diem wages, as required by California laws, violates the provisions of California Labor
10 Code §§ 510, 1771, 1774, 1194, 1811, and 1815, and is therefore unlawful.

11 65. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194, Plaintiff and class members are entitled
12 to recover the difference between the applicable prevailing wage rate for each hour worked and
13 the amount actually paid, as well as interest, costs, and attorneys' fees.

14
15 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

17 **(Against All Defendants)**

18 66. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
19 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 65.

20 67. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
21 §§ 226.7 and 512(a) were applicable to Plaintiff's and class members' employment by Defendants.

22 68. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer
23 shall require an employee to work during any meal period mandated by an applicable order of the
24 California IWC.

25 69. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code §
26 512(a) provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to work for a
27 period of more than 5 hours per day without providing the employee with an uninterrupted meal
28 period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total work period per day of the employee is

1 not more than 6 hours, the meal period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer
2 and the employee.

3 70. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code
4 section 512(a) further provide that an employer may not require, cause or permit an employee to
5 work for a period of more than 10 hours per day without providing the employee with a second
6 uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes, except that if the total hours worked is not
7 more than 12 hours, the second meal period may be waived by mutual consent of the employer
8 and the employee only if the first meal period was not waived.

9 71. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members who were scheduled
10 to work for a period of time no longer than 6 hours, and who did not waive their legally-mandated
11 meal periods by mutual consent, were required to work for periods longer than 5 hours without an
12 uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

13 72. During the relevant time period, Plaintiff and class members who were scheduled
14 to work for a period of time in excess of 6 hours were required to work for periods longer than 5
15 hours without an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

16 73. During the relevant time period, Defendants willfully required Plaintiff and class
17 members to work during meal periods and failed to compensate Plaintiff and class members for
18 work performed during meal periods.

19 74. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants have failed to provide compliant
20 meal periods to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees, as required by California law.
21 Plaintiff and class members were deprived of the opportunity to take a timely, duty-free meal
22 break of at least 30 minutes for every 5 hours of work due to the working conditions imposed by
23 Defendants. In addition, Defendants did not maintain records of when employees started and
24 stopped their meal breaks, or if meal breaks were taken at all. Defendants' policy and practice
25 was to automatically deduct 30 minutes from every shift for meal breaks, regardless of whether
26 employees actually received an uninterrupted 30-minute meal break.

27 75. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class
28 members the full meal period premium due for non-compliant meal periods pursuant to California

1 Labor Code § 226.7.

2 76. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California
3 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a).

4 77. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b),
5 Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at
6 the employees' regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that a compliant meal
7 period was not provided.

8
9 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **Violation of California Labor Code § 226.7**

11 **(Against All Defendants)**

12 78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
13 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 77.

14 79. At all relevant times herein set forth, the applicable IWC Wage Order and
15 California Labor Code § 226.7 were applicable to Plaintiff's and class members' employment by
16 Defendants.

17 80. At all relevant times, California Labor Code § 226.7 provides that no employer
18 shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the
19 California IWC.

20 81. At all relevant times, the applicable IWC Wage Order provides that "[e]very
21 employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as
22 practicable shall be in the middle of each work period" and that the "rest period time shall be
23 based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours
24 or major fraction thereof" unless the total daily work time is less than three and one-half (3½)
25 hours.

26 82. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and class members
27 to work 4 or more hours without authorizing or permitting a 10-minute rest period per each 4 hour
28 period worked or major fraction thereof.

83. Defendants systematically failed to provide Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees with rest periods of at least 10 minutes for each 4 hours worked or major fraction thereof. Defendants' rest period policy did not comply with California law. In addition, Plaintiff and class members were not made aware of Defendants' rest break policy (if any) and were not told that they could take rest breaks. As a result, they did not take rest breaks. Defendants did not pay rest break premiums to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees when compliant rest periods were not provided.

84. During the relevant time period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and class members the full rest period premium due for non-compliant rest periods pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7.

85. Defendants' conduct violates the applicable IWC Wage Orders and California Labor Code § 226.7.

86. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b), Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular hourly rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period was not provided.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203

(Against All Defendants)

87. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 86.

88. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 provide that if an employer discharges an employee, the wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge are due and payable immediately, and that if an employee voluntarily leaves his or her employment, his or her wages shall become due and payable not later than 72 hours thereafter, unless the employee has given 72 hours previous notice of his or her intention to quit, in which case the employee is entitled to his or her wages at the time of quitting.

89. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees all wages owed upon the separation of their employment, including the unpaid minimum, overtime wages and prevailing wages described herein.

90. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and those class members who are no longer employed by Defendants their wages earned and unpaid at the time of discharge, or within 72 hours of their leaving Defendants' employ, is in violation of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202 and 203.

91. All California employers know or should know that employees must be paid for all hours worked, and must be paid overtime at a rate of one-and-a-half times the regular rate of pay for overtime hours as defined by California law. Defendant's failure to abide by this well-established law is willful and not in good faith.

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

93. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the statutory penalty wages for each day they were not paid, up to a thirty (30) day maximum pursuant to California Labor Code § 203.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802

(Against All Defendants)

94. Plaintiff incorporates by references and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 93.

95. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 2802 provides that an employer must reimburse employees for all necessary expenditures or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties.

96. During the relevant time period, Defendants required Plaintiff and other class

1 members to absorb those necessary expenditures and losses, wrongfully shifting Defendants' cost
2 of doing business onto Plaintiff and other class members.

3 97. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and
4 other similarly situated employees for necessary business-related expenses, including, but not
5 limited to, tools and drinking water. Defendants' pattern and practice was to unlawfully shift the
6 costs of doing business onto Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees by requiring them to
7 pay these necessary work-related expenses out of their own pockets.

8 98. Defendants' pattern and practice was to unlawfully shift the costs of doing business
9 onto Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees by requiring them to pay these necessary
10 work-related expenses out of their own pockets.

11 99. Defendants unlawfully shifted its costs of doing business onto Plaintiff and other
12 similarly situated employees by requiring them to pay for these items out of their own pockets.

13 100. Plaintiff and other class members are entitled to recover from Defendants their
14 business-related expenses and the losses charged to them and incurred during the course and scope
15 of their employment, plus interest and an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to
16 California Labor Code § 2802.

17
18 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

20 **(Against All Defendants)**

21 101. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
22 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 100.

23 102. At all material times set forth herein, California Labor Code § 226(a) provides that
24 every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in
25 writing showing the following information: (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the
26 employee, except for any employee whose compensation is solely based on a salary and who is
27 exempt from payment of overtime under subdivision (a) of Section 515 or any applicable order of
28 the Industrial Welfare Commission; (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable

1 piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all deductions, provided that all
2 deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item; (5)
3 net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid; (7) the
4 name of the employee and his or her social security number, except that by January 1, 2008, only
5 the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other
6 than a social security number may be shown on the itemized statement; (8) the name and address
7 of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay
8 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee

9 103. Defendants have intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with
10 complete and accurate wage statements. The number of hours worked and the corresponding
11 hourly rates are inaccurate as a consequence of Defendants' failure to pay minimum wages,
12 overtime wages and prevailing wages, as set forth herein.

13 104. As a result of Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 226(a), Plaintiff
14 and class members have suffered injury and damage to their statutorily-protected rights.

15 105. Specifically, Plaintiff and other class members have been injured by Defendants'
16 intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) because they were denied both their legal
17 right to receive, and their protected interest in receiving, accurate, itemized wage statements under
18 California Labor Code § 226(a). Plaintiff and other class members have been injured by
19 Defendants' intentional violation of California Labor Code § 226(a) in that it has caused confusion
20 over whether they had received all of the wages owed them, in addition to their difficulty and
21 expense in reconstructing pay records and making mathematical computations to analyze whether
22 the wages paid them did in fact compensate them for all hours worked

23 106. Furthermore, Labor Code § 226(e)(2)(B) provides that an employee is deemed to
24 suffer injury if the wage statement fails to accurately and completely provide certain pieces of
25 information and the employee cannot promptly and easily determine such information from the
26 wage statement alone. In relevant part, Labor Code § 226(e)(2)(B) provides that an employee is
27 deemed to suffer injury if the wage statement does not accurately and completely state the total
28 number of hours worked by the employee, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay

1 period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

2 107. Plaintiff and class members are deemed to have suffered injury because their wage
3 statements did not provide complete and accurate information regarding the total number of hours
4 they worked in a given pay period, the applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period, and
5 the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate.

6 108. Plaintiff and class members are entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of
7 their actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code §
8 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 per employee.

9
10 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.***

12 **(Against All Defendants)**

13 109. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
14 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 108.

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

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

22 112. A violation of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* may be
23 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. In this case, Defendants' policy and
24 practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and class members the proper hourly rates for all hours worked,
25 including overtime hours, violates California Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198;
26 Defendants' policy and practice of failing to pay prevailing wages violates California Labor Code
27 §§ 510, 1771, 1774, 1194, 1811, and 1815; Defendants' policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff
28 and class members to work through their meal and rest periods without paying them proper

1 compensation violates California Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512(a); Defendants' policy and
2 practice of not timely paying all wages owed to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees
3 upon resignation or termination violates California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203; Defendants'
4 policy and practice of not reimbursing Plaintiff and class members for necessary business-related
5 expenses violates California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802; and Defendants' policy and practice
6 of failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements violate California Labor Code § 226.

7 113. Plaintiff and putative class members have been personally injured by Defendants'
8 unlawful business acts and practices as alleged herein, including but not necessarily limited to the
9 loss of money and/or property.

10 114. Pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, Plaintiff and
11 putative class members are entitled to restitution of the wages withheld and retained by
12 Defendants during a period that commences four years prior to the filing of this complaint; a
13 permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all outstanding wages due to Plaintiff and class
14 members; an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and
15 other applicable laws; and an award of costs.

16
17 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Penalties pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2698, *et seq.***

19 **(Private Attorneys General Act)**

20 **(Against all Defendants)**

21 115. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein the
22 material allegations set out in paragraphs 1 through 114.

23 116. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiff's employment by
24 Defendants.

25 117. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the
26 California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA
27 for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
28 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or

1 former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code § 2699.3.

2 118. Pursuant to PAGA, a civil action under PAGA may be brought by an “aggrieved
3 employee,” who is any person that was employed by the alleged violator and against whom one or
4 more of the alleged violations was committed.

5 119. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants and the alleged violations were committed
6 against him during his time of employment and he is, therefore, an aggrieved employee. Plaintiff
7 and other employees are “aggrieved employees” as defined by California Labor Code § 2699(c) in
8 that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged
9 violations were committed against them.

10 120. Pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 2699.3 and 2699.5, an aggrieved employee,
11 including Plaintiff, may pursue a civil action arising under PAGA after the following requirements
12 have been met:

- 13 (a) The aggrieved employee or representative shall give written notice by
14 online filing with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency
15 (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to the employer of the specific provisions
16 of this code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories
17 to support the alleged violation.
- 18 (b) The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter “LWDA Notice”) to the
19 employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not
20 intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days of
21 the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice. Upon receipt of the LWDA
22 Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five (65)
23 calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee’s Notice, the aggrieved
24 employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California Labor Code
25 § 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any other penalties to which
26 the employee may be entitled.
- 27 (c) On April 21, 2021, Plaintiff provided the requisite written notice by online
28 filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant, informing them of

1 the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been
2 violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.
3 On May 31, 2023, Plaintiff provided a supplemental written notice by
4 online filing to the LWDA and by certified mail to Defendant, informing
5 them of additional provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have
6 been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged
7 violations. As of the filing date of this Second Amended Complaint,
8 Plaintiff and his counsel have not received any notification from the LWDA
9 that it intends to investigate the violations alleged in this supplemental
10 notice.

11 121. Plaintiff has satisfied the administrative prerequisites under California Labor Code
12 § 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in addition to other remedies, for
13 violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 226, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 1194, 1197, 1198,
14 2800 and 2802.

15
16 **REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL**

17 Plaintiff requests a trial by jury.

18
19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 Plaintiff, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, prays for relief and judgment
21 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

22 **As to the First Cause of Action**

23 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
24 Labor Code §§ 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to
25 pay all wages, including overtime wages, due to Plaintiff and class members;

26 2. For general unpaid wages at the applicable wage rates and such general and special
27 damages as may be appropriate;

28 3. For pre-judgment interest on any unpaid wages commencing from the date such

1 amounts were due;

2 4. For reasonable attorneys' fees and for costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
3 California Labor Code § 1194(a); and

4 5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

5 As to the Second Cause of Action

6 6. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
7 Labor Code §§ 510, 1771, 1774, 1191, 1811, and 1815 by willfully failing to pay the applicable
8 prevailing wage rates due to Plaintiff and class members;

9 7. For general unpaid wages at the applicable wage rates and such general and special
10 damages as may be appropriate;

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

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

15 10. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

16 As to the Third Cause of Action

17 11. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California
18 Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and applicable IWC Wage Orders by willfully failing to provide all
19 meal periods to Plaintiff and class members;

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

23 13. For all actual, consequential, and incidental losses and damages, according to
24 proof;

25 14. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(b);

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

28 16. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fourth Cause of Action

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

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

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

20. For premiums pursuant to California Labor Code § 226.7(b);

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

22. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Fifth Cause of Action

23. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, and 203 by willfully failing to pay Plaintiff and class members all compensation owed to them at the time of their termination of the employment;

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

25. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 203; and

26. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Sixth Cause of Action

27. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Labor Code § 2802 by unlawfully failing to indemnify Plaintiff and other class members for losses caused by Defendants' want of ordinary care and for the necessary expenditures or losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants

28. For all actual damages, according to proof;

29. For pre-judgment interest on any necessary expenditures or losses paid by Plaintiff and other class members, from the date such amounts were paid; and

30. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 2802(c).

As to the Seventh Cause of Action

31. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the record keeping provisions of California Labor Code § 226(a) and applicable IWC Wage Orders as to Plaintiff and class members, and willfully failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements thereto;

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

33. For statutory penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e); and

34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

As to the Eighth Cause of Action

35. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* by failing to pay Plaintiff and class members all wages due to them, including minimum wages, overtime wages and prevailing wages; failing to provide compliant meal and rest periods to Plaintiff and class members and failing to pay premium wages when compliant meal and rest periods were not provided; failing to timely pay all wages due upon employees' resignation or termination under California Labor Code § 201 – 203; failing to reimburse Plaintiff and class members for necessary business-related expenses under California Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802; and failing to provide Plaintiff and class members with compliant wage statements under California Labor Code § 226.

36. For restitution of unpaid wages to Plaintiff and all class members and prejudgment interest from the day such amounts were due and payable;

37. For the appointment of a receiver to receive, manage and distribute any and all funds disgorged from Defendants and determined to have been wrongfully acquired by Defendants as a result of violations of California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*;

38. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to

1 California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5; and

2 39. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

3 As to the Ninth Cause of Action

4 40. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(f) and (g) in the
5 amount of \$100 dollars for each violation per pay period for the initial violation and \$200 for each
6 aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation, plus attorneys' fees and costs;
7 and,

8 41. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

9
10 Dated: September 7, 2023

AEQUITAS LEGAL GROUP

11
12 By: 

13 RONALD H. BAE
14 OLIVIA D. SCHARRER
15 CARSON M. TURNER

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff DAVID LIZARRAGA
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18, and my business address is 1156 E. Green Street, Suite 200, Pasadena, California 91106.

On September 7, 2023, I served the document described as **SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT & ENFORCEMENT ACTION UNDER THE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT, CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.** on the following interested parties and/or their counsel in this action by the method(s) noted below:

Meryl C. Maneker
Michaela P. Delacruz
WILSON TURNER KOSMO LLP
402 West Broadway, Suite 1600
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 236-9600
Facsimile: (619) 236-9669
Email: mmaneker@wilsonturnerkosmo.com
kgallacher@wilsonturnerkosmo.com
mdelacruz@wilsonturnerkosmo.com

Attorneys for Defendants LANDCARE USA LLC and LANDCARE HOLDINGS, INC.

- ☐ **(BY FIRST CLASS MAIL):** I caused an envelope containing the above-described document to be deposited in the United States mail at Pasadena, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.
- ☐ **(BY EXPRESS MAIL):** I placed the above-described document in an envelope for collection and delivery on this date in accordance with the standard express mail procedures of the United States Postal Service.
- ☐ **(BY EMAIL):** The above-described document was emailed to the above addressee(s)' email address(es) as a courtesy.
- ☒ **(BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE):** I caused the above-described document to be served electronically via Case Anywhere (authorized and court-approved Electronic Filing Service Provider).
- ☐ **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE):** I personally served the above-described document to the above addressee(s) on this day.
- ☒ **(STATE):** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on September 7, 2023 at Pasadena, California.


IGNACIA MORALES