

Carolyn H. Cottrell (SBN 166977)
 Samantha Smith (SBN 233331)
 Andrew Weaver (SBN 318935)
SCHNEIDER WALLACE
COTTRELL KONECKY LLP
 2000 Powell Street, Suite 1400
 Emeryville, California 94608
 Telephone: (415) 421-7100
 Facsimile: (415) 421-7105
 ccottrell@schneiderwallace.com
 sasmith@schneiderwallace.com
 aweaver@schneiderwallace.com

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943)
LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC
 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203
 Glendale, California 91203
 Tel: (818) 265-1020
 Fax: (818) 265-1021

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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

RUBY BONNER and CHRISTOPHER
 HENDERSON, individually, and on behalf
 of other aggrieved employees pursuant to
 the California Private Attorneys General
 Act;

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM -
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, an unknown
 business entity; PROVIDENCE HEALTH
 & SERVICES, an unknown business entity;
 and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 21BBCV00573

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
 ENFORCEMENT UNDER THE PRIVATE
 ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT,
 CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 2698, ET
 SEQ.**

Violation of California Labor Code §
 2698, et seq. (California Labor Code
 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

FILED

Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles

12/20/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: D. Quispe Deputy

COMES NOW, Plaintiffs RUBY BONNER and CHRISTOPHER HENDERSON (“Plaintiffs”), individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This representative action is brought pursuant to the California Labor Code section 2698, et seq. The civil penalties sought by Plaintiffs exceed the minimal jurisdiction limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

2. 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 other 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.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, upon information and belief, each Defendant is 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.

4. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, each Defendant maintains offices, has agents, and/or transacts business in the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff RUBY BONNER is an individual residing in the State of California. Plaintiff CHRISTOPHER HENDERSON is an individual residing in the State of California.

6. Defendant PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief and at all times herein mentioned, an employer whose employees are engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

7. Defendant PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES at all times herein mentioned, was and is, upon information and belief, an employer whose employees are

engaged throughout the State of California, including the County of Los Angeles.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA and PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES were the “employer” of Plaintiffs within the meaning of all applicable state laws and statutes.

9. At all times herein relevant, PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES, and DOES 1 through 100, and each of them, were the agents, partners, joint venturers, joint employers, representatives, servants, employees, successors-in-interest, co-conspirators and assigns, each of the other, and at all times relevant hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, partners, joint venturers, representatives, servants, employees, successors, co-conspirators and/or assigns, and all acts or omissions alleged herein were duly committed with the ratification, knowledge, permission, encouragement, authorization and/or consent of each defendant designated as a DOE herein.

10. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiffs who sue said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based on that information and belief allege, that each of the defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and unlawfully caused the injuries and damages to Plaintiffs as alleged in this Complaint. Plaintiffs will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.

11. PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES, and DOES 1 through 100 will hereinafter collectively be referred to as “Defendants.”

12. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants including the unknown defendants identified as DOES, directly or indirectly controlled or affected the working conditions, wages, working hours, and conditions of employment of Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees so as to make each of said Defendants employers and employers liable under the statutory

provisions set forth herein.

PAGA ALLEGATIONS

13. At all times herein set forth, PAGA was applicable to Plaintiffs' employment by Defendants.

14. At all times herein set forth, PAGA provides that any provision of law under the California Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA for violations of the California Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of herself and other current or former employees pursuant to procedures outlined in California Labor Code section 2699.3.

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

16. Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants and the alleged violation was committed against them during their time of employment and they are, therefore, aggrieved employees. Plaintiffs and the other employees are "aggrieved employees" as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations were committed against them.

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

a. The aggrieved employee shall give written notice by online submission (hereinafter "Employee's Notice") to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency (hereinafter "LWDA") and by U.S. Certified Mail to the employer of the specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support the alleged violations.

b. The LWDA shall provide notice (hereinafter "LWDA Notice") to the employer and the aggrieved employee by certified mail that it does not

1 intend to investigate the alleged violation within sixty (60) calendar days
2 of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice. Upon receipt of the
3 LWDA Notice, or if the LWDA Notice is not provided within sixty-five
4 (65) calendar days of the postmark date of the Employee's Notice, the
5 aggrieved employee may commence a civil action pursuant to California
6 Labor Code section 2699 to recover civil penalties in addition to any
7 other penalties to which the employee may be entitled.

8 18. On April 19, 2021, Plaintiff Bonner provided written notice by online
9 submission to the LWDA and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant PROVIDENCE HEALTH
10 SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA and PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES of the
11 specific provisions of the California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the
12 facts and theories to support the alleged violations. Plaintiff Bonner has not received an
13 LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the date of Plaintiff Bonner's notice. On
14 July 27, 2022, Plaintiffs provided amended written notice by online submission to the LWDA
15 and by U.S. Certified Mail to Defendant PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN
16 CALIFORNIA and PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES of the specific provisions of the
17 California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support
18 the alleged violations and their intent to add Plaintiff Henderson as an additional
19 representative. Plaintiffs have not received an LWDA Notice within sixty-five (65) calendar
20 days of the date of Plaintiffs' amended notice.

21 19. Therefore, Plaintiffs have satisfied the administrative prerequisites under
22 California Labor Code section 2699.3(a) to recover civil penalties against Defendants, in
23 addition to other remedies, for violations of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203,
24 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802.

25 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 20. At all relevant times set forth herein, Defendants employed Plaintiffs and other
27 aggrieved hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for any of the Defendants in the
28 State of California (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "other aggrieved employees").

1 21. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff Bonner as an hourly-paid,
2 non-exempt employee from approximately January 2019 to approximately November 2020 in
3 the State of California. Defendants, jointly and severally, employed Plaintiff Henderson as an
4 hourly-paid, non-exempt employee from approximately June 2019 to approximately April
5 2021, in the State of California.

6 22. Defendants hired Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees, and failed to
7 compensate them for all hours worked, missed meal periods or rest breaks.

8 23. Defendants had the authority to hire and terminate Plaintiffs and the other
9 aggrieved employees, to set work rules and conditions governing Plaintiffs' and the other
10 aggrieved employees' employment, and to supervise their daily employment activities.

11 24. Defendants exercised sufficient authority over the terms and conditions of
12 Plaintiffs' and the other aggrieved employees' employment for them to be joint employers of
13 Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

14 25. Defendants directly hired and paid wages and benefits to Plaintiffs and the other
15 aggrieved employees.

16 26. Defendants continue to employ hourly-paid or non-exempt employees, within
17 the State of California.

18 27. Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees worked over eight (8) hours in a
19 day, and/or forty (40) hours in a week during their employment with Defendants.

20 28. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
21 engaged in a uniform policy and systematic scheme of wage abuse against their hourly-paid or
22 non-exempt employees. This scheme involved, *inter alia*, failing to pay them for all hours
23 worked and for missed (short, late, interrupted, and altogether missed) meal periods and rest
24 breaks in violation of California law.

25 29. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
26 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
27 receive certain wages for overtime compensation and that they were not receiving wages for
28 overtime compensation.

1 30. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
2 failed to provide Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees the required rest and meal
3 periods during the relevant time period as required under the Industrial Welfare Commission
4 Wage Orders and thus they are entitled to any and all applicable penalties.

5 31. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
6 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
7 receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other
8 aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed, and they did not
9 receive all meal periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other
10 aggrieved employee's regular rate of pay when a meal period was missed.

11 32. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
12 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
13 receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other
14 aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed, and they did not
15 receive all rest periods or payment of one additional hour of pay at Plaintiffs' and the other
16 aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when a rest period was missed.

17 33. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
18 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
19 receive at least minimum wages for compensation and that they were not receiving at least
20 minimum wages for all hours worked.

21 34. Plaintiffs are informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants
22 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
23 receive all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation, including overtime and
24 minimum wages and meal and rest period premiums, and they did not, in fact, receive all such
25 wages owed to them at the time of their discharge.

26 35. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
27 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
28 receive all wages owed to them during their employment. Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved

1 employees did not receive payment of all wages, including overtime and minimum wages and
2 meal and rest period premiums, within any time permissible under California Labor Code
3 section 204.

4 36. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
5 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
6 receive complete and accurate wage statements in accordance with California law, but, in fact,
7 they did not receive complete and accurate wage statements from Defendants. The deficiencies
8 included, *inter alia*, the failure to include the total number of hours worked by Plaintiffs and
9 the other aggrieved employees.

10 37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
11 knew or should have known that Defendants had to keep complete and accurate payroll records
12 for Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California law, but, in fact,
13 did not keep complete and accurate payroll records.

14 38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
15 knew or should have known that Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees were entitled to
16 reimbursement for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

17 39. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that Defendants
18 knew or should have known that they had a duty to compensate Plaintiffs and the other
19 aggrieved employees pursuant to California law, and that Defendants had the financial ability
20 to pay such compensation, but willfully, knowingly, and intentionally failed to do so, and
21 falsely represented to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees that they were properly
22 denied wages, all in order to increase Defendants' profits.

23 40. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay overtime wages
24 to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees. Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees
25 were required to work more than eight (8) hours per day and/or forty (40) hours per week
26 without overtime compensation.

27 41. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide uninterrupted
28 meal and rest periods to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

42. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees at least minimum wages for all hours worked.

43. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees all wages owed to them upon discharge or resignation.

44. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees' wages within any time permissible under California law, including, *inter alia*, California Labor Code section 204.

45. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to provide complete and accurate wage statements to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

46. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to keep complete and accurate payroll records for Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees.

47. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees for necessary business-related expenses and costs.

48. At all material times set forth herein, Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees pursuant to California law in order to increase Defendants' profits.

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of California Labor Code § 2698, et seq.

(Against PROVIDENCE HEALTH SYSTEM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES, and DOES 1 through 100)

50. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 49, and each and every part thereof with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

51. PAGA expressly establishes that any provision of the California Labor Code which provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the LWDA, or any of its

1 departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or employees for a violation of the
2 California Labor Code, may be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved
3 employee on behalf of himself or herself, and other current or former employees.

4 52. Whenever the LWDA, or any of its departments, divisions, commissions,
5 boards, agencies, or employees has discretion to assess a civil penalty, a court in a civil action
6 is authorized to exercise the same discretion, subject to the same limitations and conditions, to
7 assess a civil penalty.

8 53. Plaintiffs and the other hourly-paid or non-exempt employees are “aggrieved
9 employees” as defined by California Labor Code section 2699(c) in that they are all current or
10 former employees of Defendants, and one or more of the alleged violations was committed
11 against them.

12 **Failure to Pay Overtime**

13 54. Defendants’ failure to pay legally required overtime wages to Plaintiffs and the
14 other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or
15 unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 510 and 1198.

16 **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

17 55. Defendants’ failure to provide legally required meal periods to Plaintiffs and
18 the other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or
19 unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 226.7 and 512(a).

20 **Failure to Provide Rest Periods**

21 56. Defendants’ failure to provide legally required rest periods to Plaintiffs and the
22 other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or
23 unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226.7.

24 **Failure to Pay Minimum Wages**

25 57. Defendants’ failure to pay legally required minimum wages to Plaintiffs and the
26 other aggrieved employees is in violation of the Wage Orders and constitutes unlawful or
27 unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 1194, 1197 and 1197.1.

28 //

1 **Failure to Timely Pay Wages Upon Termination**

2 58. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved
3 employees upon termination in accordance with Labor Code sections 201 and 202 constitutes
4 unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 201 and 202.

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

6 59. Defendants' failure to timely pay wages to Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved
7 employees during employment in accordance with Labor Code section 204 constitutes
8 unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 204.

9 **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Wage Statements**

10 60. Defendants' failure to provide complete and accurate wage statements to
11 Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with Labor Code section 226(a)
12 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code section 226(a).

13 **Failure to Keep Complete and Accurate Payroll Records**

14 61. Defendants' failure to keep complete and accurate payroll records relating to
15 Plaintiffs and the other aggrieved employees in accordance with California Labor Code section
16 1174(d) constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code
17 section 1174(d).

18 **Failure to Reimburse Necessary Business-Related Expenses and Costs**

19 62. Defendants' failure to reimburse aggrieved employees for necessary business-
20 related expenses and costs in accordance with California Labor Code sections 2800 and 2802
21 constitutes unlawful and/or unfair activity prohibited by California Labor Code sections 2800
22 and 2802.

23 63. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699, Plaintiffs, individually, and on
24 behalf of all aggrieved employees, requests and is entitled to recover from Defendants and
25 each of them, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code section 218.5, as
26 well as all penalties pursuant to PAGA against Defendants, and each of them, including but
27 not limited to:

28 a. Penalties under California Labor Code section 2699 in the amount of a

1 hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
2 the initial violation, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved
3 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

4 b. Penalties under California Code of Regulations Title 8 section 11010 et
5 seq. in the amount of fifty dollars (\$50) for each aggrieved employee per
6 pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars (\$100) for
7 each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation;

8 c. Penalties under California Labor Code section 210 in addition to, and
9 entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in the
10 California Labor Code in the amount of a hundred dollars (\$100) for each
11 aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation, and two
12 hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for
13 each subsequent violation; and

14 d. Any and all additional penalties and sums as provided by the California
15 Labor Code and/or other statutes.

16 64. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699(i), civil penalties recovered by
17 aggrieved employees shall be distributed as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) to the Labor
18 and Workforce Development Agency for the enforcement of labor laws and education of
19 employers and employees about their rights and responsibilities and twenty-five percent (25%)
20 to the aggrieved employees.

21 65. Further, Plaintiffs are entitled to seek and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and
22 costs pursuant to California Labor Code sections 210, 218.5 and 2699 and any other applicable
23 statute.

24 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

25 Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
26 California Private Attorneys General Act, requests a trial by jury.

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of other aggrieved employees

1 pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act, prays for relief and judgment against
2 Defendants, jointly and severally, in excess of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000):

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

4 1. For civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code sections 2699(a), (f) and
5 (g), costs/expenses, and attorneys' fees for violation of California Labor Code sections 201,
6 202, 203, 204, 226(a), 226.7, 510, 512(a), 1174(d), 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2800 and 2802;
7 and

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

10 DATED: December 20, 2022

11
12 By: 

13 Carolyn H. Cottrell
14 Samantha Smith
15 Andrew Weaver
16 **SCHNEIDER WALLACE**
17 **COTTRELL KONECKY LLP**

18 Edwin Aiwarzian
19 **LAWYERS FOR JUSTICE, PC**

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28