

Filed
Superior Court of California,
Sacramento
05/05/2023
leurgac
By _____, Deputy
34-2021-00303083-CU-DI

DANIEL F. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 251488
daniel@gaineslawfirm.com
ALEX P. KATOFISKY, ESQ. SBN 202754
alex@gaineslawfirm.com
EVAN S. GAINES, ESQ. SBN 287668
evan@gaineslawfirm.com
GAINES & GAINES, APLC
4550 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, Suite 100
Westlake Village, California 91362
Telephone: (818) 703-8985
Facsimile: (818) 703-8984

Attorneys for Plaintiff Keenan Patton, on behalf of himself and all "aggrieved employees" pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

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

KEENAN PATTON, on behalf of himself and
all "aggrieved employees" pursuant to Labor
Code § 2698 *et seq.*,

Plaintiff,

v.

MYERS ELECTRIC COMPANY INC., a
California corporation, DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO: 34-2021-00303083

*Assigned to the Hon. Kenneth C. Mennemeier
Dept 38*

**FIRST AMENDED CLASS AND
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
COMPLAINT FOR:**

**1. FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST
PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU
THEREOF (LABOR CODE § 226.7; IWC
WAGE ORDER 16-2001)**

**2. FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL
PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU
THEREOF (LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 510,
512, 1194, AND 1194.2; IWC WAGE ORDER
16-2001)**

**3. FAILURE TO REIMBURSE
NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES
(LABOR CODE § 2802)**

**4. KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT
PROVISIONS (LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e))**

**5. FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES
DUE AT SEPARATION OF
EMPLOYMENT (LABOR CODE §§ 201-
203)**

**6. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND
PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

BY FAX

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

**7. PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR
CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF
LABOR CODE §§ 201-202, 226(a), 226.7,
246(d), 510, 512, 1194 AND 2802 AND
PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(a)
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§
226.3 AND 558**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Complaint Filed: June 28, 2021

Plaintiff KEENAN PATTON (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of himself and on behalf of all similarly situated individuals (the “Class” or “Plaintiff Class”), on behalf of the general public, and under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, complains of MYERS ELECTRIC COMPANY INC., a California corporation, and any subsidiaries or affiliated companies (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) as follows:

I.

INTRODUCTION AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. This is a Class Action and Representative Action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other employees who work or formerly worked for Defendants within the State of California (“Aggrieved Employees”).

2. For at least four (4) years prior to the filing of this action and continuing to the present (the “liability period”), Defendants have had consistent policies of failing to provide legally compliant rest and meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof to Class Members (as defined below); reimburse Class Members for all necessary business expenses; provide accurately itemized wage statements to Class Members; and to timely pay certain Class Members all wage due at the separation of their employment.

3. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and members of the Class, brings this action pursuant to Labor Code §§ 201-202, 226(a), 226.3, 226.7, 246(d), 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, and 2802 seeking compensation for all unpaid wages, liquidated damages, civil and statutory penalties, injunctive and other equitable relief, and reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs.

4. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and Class Members, and pursuant to Business & Professions Code §§ 17200-17208, also seeks injunctive relief, restitution, and disgorgement of all benefits Defendants enjoyed from their failure to pay all wages and expense reimbursement due.

5. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all Aggrieved Employees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*, seek penalties for Defendants' various violations of the California Labor Code.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 395 because Defendants employed Plaintiff and Class Members throughout the State of California, including Sacramento County.

II.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

7. Plaintiff KEENAN PATTON was employed by Defendant from November 2020 through February 2021 as a non-exempt electrician in Sacramento County, California.

8. During his work with Defendants, Plaintiff was:

- a. Willfully denied rest and meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
- b. Willfully denied reimbursement of all necessary business expenses;
- c. Willfully denied accurately itemized wage statements; and
- d. Willfully denied the timely payment of all wages upon separation of their employment.

B. Defendants

9. Defendant MYERS ELECTRIC COMPANY INC. is a California corporation that employed Plaintiff and Class Members throughout the State of California, including Sacramento County, California.

10. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 to 10, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue Defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein. Plaintiff will

1 seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the Defendants
2 designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known.

3 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant acted
4 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants, carried out a joint scheme,
5 business plan or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each Defendant are legally
6 attributable to the other Defendants.

7 12. The Defendants named herein as DOE 1 through DOE 10 are and were persons acting
8 on behalf of, or acting jointly with, Defendants, who violated, or caused to be violated, one or more
9 provisions of the California Labor Code as alleged herein.

10 III.

11 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

12 13. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself, and all others similarly situated as a
13 Class Action pursuant to § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff seeks to represent the
14 following Class composed of and defined as follows:

15 THE CLASS

16 All persons employed in a non-exempt position by Defendants in
17 California from the date four (4) years prior to the filing of this Action
18 and continuing through the present.

19 14. Plaintiff reserves the right under Rule 3.765, California Rules of Court, to amend or
20 modify this class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation
21 to particular issues.

22 15. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under
23 the provisions of § 382 of the Code of Civil Procedure because there is a well-defined community of
24 interest in the litigation and the proposed Class is easily ascertainable.

25 A. Numerosity

26 16. The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that joinder of all Class
27 Members is impracticable. While the precise number of members of the Class has not been
28 ascertained at this time, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants

1 currently employ, and during the relevant time periods employed, over 50 persons in the State of
2 California who fall within the Class definition.

3 17. Accounting for employee turnover during the relevant period necessarily increases this
4 number. Plaintiff alleges Defendants' employment records would provide information as to the
5 number and location of members of the Class. Joinder of members of the Class is not practicable.

6 **B. Commonality**

7 18. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class that predominate over any
8 questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common questions of law and fact include,
9 without limitation:

- 10 a. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide rest periods or compensation in
11 lieu thereof to Plaintiff and Class Members, in violation of Labor Code § 226.7
12 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001;
- 13 b. Whether Defendants failed to properly provide meal periods or compensation
14 in lieu thereof to Plaintiff and Class Members, in violation of Labor Code §§
15 226.7, 510, 512, 1194 and 1194.2, and IWC Wage Order 16-2001;
- 16 c. Whether Defendants failed to reimburse Plaintiff and Class Members for all
17 necessary business expenses, in violation of Labor Code § 2802;
- 18 d. Whether Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members with
19 accurately itemized wage statements, in accordance with Labor Code § 226(a)
20 and (e);
- 21 e. Whether Defendants failed to timely pay Plaintiff and Class Members all
22 wages due and owing at the separation of their employment, in violation of
23 Labor Code §§ 201-203; and
- 24 f. Whether Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to equitable relief pursuant
25 to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*

26 **C. Typicality**

27 19. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of members of the Class.
28 Plaintiff and Class Members sustained injuries and damages arising out of and caused by Defendants'

1 common course of conduct in violation of laws, regulations that have the force and effect of law, and
2 statutes as alleged herein.

3 **D. Adequacy of Representation**

4 20. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of members of
5 the Class. Counsel who represents Plaintiff are competent and experienced in litigating large
6 employment class actions.

7 **E. Superiority of Class Action**

8 21. A class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication
9 of this controversy. Individual joinder of all proposed members of the Class is not practicable, and
10 questions of law and fact common to the proposed Class predominate over any questions affecting
11 only individual members of the proposed Class. Each member of the proposed Class has been
12 damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and/or practices.

13 22. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their
14 claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.
15 Plaintiff are unaware of any difficulties that are likely to be encountered in the management of this
16 action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

17 **IV.**

18 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS**

21 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF**

22 **(LABOR CODE § 226.7 AND IWC WAGE ORDER 16-2001)**

23 27. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 26 of this Complaint as though fully set
24 forth herein.

25 28. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to one hour of pay for each day that
26 Defendants failed to properly provide one or more rest periods as set forth in Labor Code § 226.7 and
27 IWC Wage Order 16-2001.

29. Defendants failed to pay proper premium wages to Plaintiff and Class Members who were denied rest periods, in violation of Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001. Plaintiff and Class Members were routinely unable to take a 10-minute rest period for every four (4) hours of work or major fraction thereof, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay at the correct rate for each missed rest period. Plaintiff and Class Members were not authorized to take many of their first rest periods when they worked shifts over three and one-half hours in length, and no second or third rest periods when they worked shifts over six and ten hours in length, respectively. They never waived their right to take rest periods. This violates Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 558 and IWC Wage Order No. 16-2001.

30. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001, Plaintiff seeks the payment of all rest period compensation that he and Class Members are owed, according to proof.

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

V.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

**FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS OR COMPENSATION IN LIEU THEREOF
(LABOR CODE §§ 226.7, 510, 512, 1194 AND 1194.2 AND IWC WAGE ORDER 16-2001)**

31. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 30 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

32. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to one hour of pay for each day that Defendants failed to properly provide one or more meal periods as set forth in Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001.

33. Defendants failed to pay proper premium wages to Plaintiff and other Class Members who were denied proper meal periods, in violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001. Plaintiff and Class Members were routinely denied, and not authorized to take, a timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded five hours, or a second timely, uninterrupted, 30-minute meal period for every shift worked that exceeded ten hours, but were not paid premium wages of one hour's pay at the correct rate for each missed first or second

1 meal period. When they were able to take a meal period, it was typically late (after the end of the fifth
2 hour of a shift). Plaintiff and Class Members were oftentimes required to clock out for their meal
3 breaks but continue to work, off-the-clock and without pay. These practices violate Labor Code §§
4 226.7, 510, 512, 1194 and 1194.2 and IWC Wage Order 16-2001.

5 34. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7, 510, 512, 1194 and 1194.2 and IWC Wage Order
6 16-2001, Plaintiff seek the payment of all meal period compensation and unpaid wages that Class
7 Members are owed for four years preceding the filing of this Action, according to proof.

8 Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

9 **VI.**

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS**

12 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE NECESSARY BUSINESS EXPENSES**

13 **(LABOR CODE § 2802)**

14 35. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 34 of this Complaint as though fully set
15 forth herein.

16 36. Pursuant to California Labor Code § 2802, Defendants are required to fully reimburse
17 Plaintiff and Class Members for all out-of-pocket expenses incurred by them in the performance of
18 their job duties.

19 37. Defendants required Plaintiff and Class Members to purchase safety boots, safety
20 glasses, fire retardant clothes and tools, among other items for work-related purposes, but failed to
21 reimburse them for their use. Plaintiff and Class Members must be reimbursed for these expenses
22 pursuant to Labor Code § 2802.

23 38. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, Plaintiff and Class Members
24 have been damaged in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

25 39. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2802, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recover
26 from Defendants the full amount of the expenses they incurred in the performance of their job duties
27 that have not been reimbursed, plus interest, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit.

28 Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

VII.
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
KNOWING AND INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ITEMIZED
EMPLOYEE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS
(LABOR CODE § 226(a), (e))

40. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 39 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

41. Section 226(a) of the California Labor Code requires Defendants to provide wage statements to employees. In those wage statements, Defendants must provide an accurate itemized statement in writing showing (1) gross wages earned, (2) total hours worked by the employee..., (3) the number of piece-rate units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis, (4) all deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be aggregated and shown as one item, (5) net wages earned, (6) the inclusive dates of the period for which the employee is paid, (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security number, (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer..., and (9) all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee. Defendants have knowingly and intentionally failed to comply with Labor Code § 226(a).

42. Defendants failed to issue Plaintiff and Class Members wage statements that fully and accurately itemized the requirements set forth in Labor Code § 226(a). As Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid all wages due, as stated above, the wage statements provided by Defendants failed to accurately state all gross wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(1), total hours worked, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(2), net wages earned, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(5), and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate, in violation of Labor Code § 226(a)(9).

43. Separately, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and Class Members written notice that sets forth the amount of paid sick leave available, or paid time off leave an employer provides in lieu of sick leave, for use on either Plaintiff or Class Members' itemized wage statement or in a separate writing provided on the designated pay date with Plaintiff or Class Members' payment of wages, in violation of Labor Code §§ 233, 234, 245-248.5.

44. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in failing to provide Class Members with accurate itemized wage statements, Plaintiff and members of the Class have been injured because they have not been paid all wages due and were issued wage statements which do not reflect, and fail to state, all information required by Labor Code § 226(a). The missing information cannot be discerned at all from the face of the wage statements himself. Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) to recover the greater of all actual damages or \$50 for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and \$100 per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not exceeding an aggregate penalty of \$4,000 per employee, and are entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code § 226(h).

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

VIII.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES DUE AT

SEPARATION OF EMPLOYMENT

(LABOR CODE §§ 201-203)

45. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 44 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

46. California Labor Code § 201 and § 202 require Defendants to pay employees all wages due within 72 hours after resignation of employment or the day of termination of employment. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to timely pay such wages, the employer must, as a penalty, continue to pay the subject employee's daily wages until the back wages are paid in full or an action is commenced. The penalty cannot exceed 30 days of wages.

47. Defendants paid Plaintiff and Class Members their final wages beyond the time frames set forth in Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, in violation of Labor Code § 203. Plaintiff and Class Members were not paid all wages due and owing throughout the course of their employment, as detailed above. Consequently, at the time of their separation from employment with Defendants, they were not paid all final wages due and owing for the entirety of their employment. This violates Labor Code §§ 201-202 and is alleged on behalf of Plaintiff and certain Class Members no longer employed by Defendants.

48. More than 30 days have passed since Plaintiff and Class Members have left Defendants' employ.

49. As a consequence of Defendants' willful conduct in not paying wages owed timely upon separation of employment, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to up to 30 days' wages as a penalty under Labor Code § 203 for Defendants' failure to timely pay legal wages at separation of employment.

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Class he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

IX.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

PLAINTIFF AND THE CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

UNFAIR COMPETITION PURSUANT TO

BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 ET SEQ.

50. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 49 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

51. This is a Class Action for Unfair Business Practices. Plaintiff, on their own behalf and on behalf of the general public, and on behalf of others similarly situated, bring this claim pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* The conduct of all Defendants as alleged in this Complaint has been and continues to be unfair, unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, the general public, and Class Members. Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

1 52. Plaintiff is a “person” within the meaning of Business & Professions Code § 17204,
2 and therefore have standing to bring this cause of action for injunctive relief, restitution, and other
3 appropriate equitable relief.

4 53. Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* prohibits unlawful and unfair business
5 practices.

6 54. Wage and hour laws express fundamental public policies. Properly providing
7 employees with all wages and expense reimbursement due is a fundamental public policy of this State
8 and of the United States. Labor Code § 90.5(a) articulates the public policies of this State to enforce
9 vigorously minimum labor standards, to ensure that employees are not required or permitted to work
10 under substandard and unlawful conditions, and to protect law-abiding employers and its employees
11 from competitors who lower their costs by failing to comply with minimum labor standards.

12 55. Defendants have violated statutes and public policies. Through the conduct alleged
13 in this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, have acted contrary to these public policies, have
14 violated specific provisions of the Labor Code, and have engaged in other unlawful and unfair
15 business practices in violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* depriving Plaintiff,
16 and all persons similarly situated, and all interested persons of rights, benefits, and privileges
17 guaranteed to all employees under law.

18 56. Defendants’ conduct, as alleged herein, constitutes unfair competition in violation of
19 §17200 *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

20 57. Defendants, by engaging in the conduct herein alleged, either knew or in the exercise
21 of reasonable care should have known that the conduct was unlawful. As such, it is a violation of §
22 17200 *et seq.* of the Business & Professions Code.

23 58. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned acts of Defendants, Plaintiff and others
24 similarly situated have been damaged in a sum as may be proven.

25 59. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to engage in the unlawful
26 conduct, as alleged above. Pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*, this Court
27 should make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver, as may be necessary
28 to prevent the use or employment, by Defendants, its agents, or employees, of any unlawful or

1 deceptive practice prohibited by the Business & Professions Code, and/or, including but not limited
2 to, disgorgement of profits which may be necessary to restore Plaintiff and Class Members to the
3 money Defendants have unlawfully failed to pay.

4 **X.**

5 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **PLAINTIFF AND ALL AGGRIEVED EMPLOYEES AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS**
7 **PENALTIES PURSUANT TO LABOR CODE § 2699(f) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR**
8 **CODE §§ 201-202, 226(a), 226.7, 246(d), 510, 512, 1194 AND 2802 AND PURSUANT TO**
9 **LABOR CODE § 2699(a) FOR VIOLATIONS OF LABOR CODE §§ 226.3 AND 558**

10 60. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 59 of this Complaint as though fully set
11 forth herein.

12 61. As a result of the acts alleged above, including the Labor Code violations set forth in
13 paragraph 2 above, Plaintiff seeks civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*

14 62. Plaintiff also seeks civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2698 *et seq.* for
15 Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff and other non-exempt Aggrieved Employees with any paid
16 sick leave, as required by the California Healthy Workplaces/Healthy Families Act of 2014 (the
17 "Act"), codified at Labor Code § 246(d). Pursuant to the Act, at a minimum, employers must provide
18 employees with 24 hours or three days of accrued sick leave for each year of employment. Defendants
19 failed to provide any paid sick leave, in violation of the Act, resulting in a failure to pay all wages
20 due, in violation of Labor Code §§ 246(d), 510, 558, and 1194.

21 63. For each such violation, Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
22 penalties and other relief in an amount to be shown at the time of trial subject to the following formula:

- 23 a. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(f), \$100 for each initial violation and \$200 for
24 each subsequent violation of Labor Code §§ 201-202, 226(a), 226.7, 246(d),
25 510, 512, 1194, and 2802; and
26 b. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), the penalties as authorized by Labor Code
27 §§ 226.3 and 558.
28

64. Civil penalties recovered will be allocated 75% to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and 25% to the affected employees.

65. On April 19, 2021, Plaintiff sent a letter, by online submission to the LWDA and by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Defendants setting forth the facts and theories of the violations alleged against Defendant, as prescribed by Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a)(2)(A), no notice was received by Plaintiff from the LWDA within sixty-five (65) calendar days of April 19, 2021. Plaintiff may therefore commence this action to seek civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*

Wherefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees he seeks to represent request relief as described below.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

1. For compensatory damages in the amount of one hour of wages for each day on which a meal and/or rest period was not properly provided to Plaintiff and Class Members pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512;
2. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 226(e) for Plaintiff and Class Members;
3. For penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 203 for Plaintiff and Class Members;
4. For reimbursement of all expenses incurred by Plaintiff and Class Members pursuant to Labor Code § 2802;
5. For restitution for unfair competition pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* for Plaintiff and Class Members;
6. An award of prejudgment and post-judgment interest;
7. For civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.* for Plaintiff and all other Aggrieved Employees;
8. An award providing for payment of costs of suit pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 2699(g)(1), and other applicable law;
9. An award of attorneys' fees pursuant to Labor Code §§ 226(h), 2699(g)(1), 2802, and other applicable law; and

1 10. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

2 Dated: May 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

3
4 GAINES & GAINES
A Professional Law Corporation

5 By: Daniel F. Gaines
6 DANIEL F. GAINES
7 EVAN S. GAINES
Attorneys for Plaintiff

8
9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of his claims by jury to the extent authorized by law.

11 Dated: May 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

12 GAINES & GAINES
A Professional Law Corporation

13
14 By: Daniel F. Gaines
15 DANIEL F. GAINES
16 EVAN S. GAINES
Attorneys for Plaintiff

- 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

_____ (For messenger) my business address is:

Matthew J. Kraus, Esq.
Nickolaus E. Buchholz, Esq.
LESTER, CANTRELL & KREAUS, LLP
1770 Iowa Avenue, Suite 110
Riverside, CA 92507
mkraus@lc-lawyers.com
nbuchholz@lc-lawyers.com

 X (BY x U.S. MAIL/ BY ☐ CERTIFIED MAIL, RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED) The sealed envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with United States postal service on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more that one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

 X (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) The above-stated document was submitted for service by electronic transmission via email on the counsel of record listed above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and

Katherine Soriano
Katherine Soriano