

1 Kane Moon (SBN 249834)  
kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com  
2 H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834)  
scott.leviant@moonyanglaw.com  
3 Lilit Tunyan (SBN 329351)  
lilit.tunyan@moonyanglaw.com  
4 **MOON & YANG, APC**  
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880  
5 Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 232-3128  
6 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff Daniel De La Cruz

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**  
10

11 DANIEL DE LA CRUZ, individually, and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13  
14 vs.

15 SNIDER MOTORS, INC., a California  
16 corporation dba ELK GROVE TOYOTA; and  
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

17 Defendants  
18

Case No.: 34-2021-00298766

**FIRST AMENDED PAGA  
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION  
COMPLAINT:**

[Amended As of Right Pursuant to Labor  
Code Section 2699.3(2)(C)]

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.  
Code § 2699, et seq.]

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**FILED**  
**Superior Court Of California,**  
**Sacramento**  
**07/15/2021**  
**rsarmiguel**  
**By \_\_\_\_\_, Deputy**  
**Case Number:**  
**34-2021-00298766**

**BY FAX**

1 Plaintiff Daniel De La Cruz (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary  
2 support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further  
3 investigation and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendant Snider Motors, Inc. dba Elk Grove  
6 Toyota, and Does 1 through 10 (Snider Motors, Inc. dba Elk Grove Toyota, and Does 1 through  
7 10 are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys  
8 General Act of 2004, California Labor Code §§ 2698 et seq. (“PAGA”) stemming from  
9 Defendants’ failure to pay minimum and straight time wages, failure to pay overtime wages,  
10 failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, failure to maintain  
11 accurate records of hours worked and meal periods, failure to timely pay all wages to terminated  
12 employees, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

13 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this  
14 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.  
15 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his  
16 or her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so  
17 that employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required  
18 for employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has  
19 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these  
20 underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or  
21 other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the PAGA to permit an  
22 individual to bring an action on behalf of himself and on behalf of others for PAGA penalties  
23 only, which is the precise and sole nature of this action.

24 3. All California employees during the relevant statutes of limitations who are or  
25 were harmed by Defendant’s illegal practices are “Aggrieved Employees.”

26 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties for  
27 himself, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the  
28 State of California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted

1 by California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are  
2 mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages  
3 for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699,  
4 declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for himself and all aggrieved employees as permitted by  
5 the PAGA.

6 5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and  
7 establishment within the State of California, including Sacramento County. As such, and based  
8 upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants  
9 are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare  
10 Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

11 6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants  
12 maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- 13 (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum  
14 wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the  
15 California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- 16 (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in  
17 compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing  
18 to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and  
19 failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period  
20 violation occurred;
- 21 (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest  
22 periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage  
23 Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest  
24 period violation occurred;
- 25 (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- 26 (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, straight time  
27 wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period  
28

premium wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates;

- (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked; and
- (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

7. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

### **THE PARTIES**

#### **A. Plaintiff**

9. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in Sacramento County, California as a driver from February 2019 to October 2020.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

#### **B. Defendants**

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Snider Motors, Inc. is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal places of business in Sacramento, California.

- 1 (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the  
2 State of California, including in Sacramento County;
- 3 (c) The former employer of Plaintiffs, and the current and/or former employer  
4 of the Aggrieved Employees. Snider Motors, Inc. suffered and permitted  
5 Plaintiffs and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their  
6 wages, hours, or working conditions; and
- 7 (d) At all times herein mentioned was and is doing business as Elk Grove  
8 Toyota.

9 12. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or  
10 entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious  
11 names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages  
12 suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this  
13 complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been  
14 ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

15 13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and  
16 each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of,  
17 and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of  
18 California.

19 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times  
20 each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and  
21 the other employees described in the definitions below, and exercised control over their wages,  
22 hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all  
23 relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director,  
24 controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or  
25 predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all  
26 of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some  
27 or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters  
28 alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted

pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

**ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

15. Plaintiff Daniel De La Cruz is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of Sacramento, State of California, as a driver from approximately February 2019 to October 2020. At all times Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's overtime requirements. During the statutory period, Plaintiff typically worked 5 days each workweek, and typically in excess of 8 hours each workday.

16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours worked (including minimum wages, straight time wages, and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendants was typical and illustrative.

17. Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were typically required to work "off the clock". For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo a COVID temperature screening prior to clocking into work each workday, which included waiting in line for that screening. Also during the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses. However, Defendants failed to include those bonuses into their calculation of the regular rate of pay when determining the correct overtime rate of pay. Therefore, Defendants failed to pay all overtime owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants did not correctly calculate the amount of overtime pay owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants wrongfully deducted monies from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees' wages, as reflected in their wage statements as "Mutual Dis". As a result, Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time, some of which should have been paid at the

overtime rate. As a further result, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Further, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to wait in line to wash their hands during their 30-minute meal period, which reduced the actual meal period itself. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendants regularly, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Indeed, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in lieu of taking 10-minute, paid, duty-free rest periods because there was too much work to do. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the

1 Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the  
2 timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify  
3 whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further,  
4 Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore  
5 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods  
6 during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not  
7 authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance  
8 with California law.

9 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the  
10 Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for  
11 Defendants without reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to use  
12 their personal cellular telephones for work-related reasons, without reimbursement. Plaintiff and  
13 the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing  
14 their job duties for Defendants, and Defendants have failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the  
15 Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

16 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely  
17 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages for  
18 all minimum wages, straight time wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest  
19 period premium wages.

20 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the  
21 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly  
22 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned  
23 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not  
24 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not  
25 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).  
26 As a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved  
27 Employees suffered injury because, among other things:  
28

- 1 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid  
2 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest  
3 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were  
4 entitled;
- 5 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,  
6 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even  
7 though they had not been;
- 8 (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid  
9 minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages  
10 at the correct California rate even though they were;
- 11 (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime,  
12 meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct  
13 California rate even though they had not been;
- 14 (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum,  
15 overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- 16 (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in  
17 connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have  
18 to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages  
19 owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage  
20 statements contained the required accurate information;
- 21 (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to  
22 lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security,  
23 disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- 24 (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages  
25 rates to which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and  
26 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and  
27 wage rates to which they were entitled.  
28

Thus, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)**

23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

24. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

25. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section 2699.3.”

26. Plaintiff has exhausted their administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699.3. On April 14, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations (See attached as **Exhibit A**). Plaintiff’s PAGA case number is No. LWDA-CM-829289-21. At the time of this filing, 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’ Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of the Labor Code

described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to, penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

27. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants' violation of California Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

28. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing when employees begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants' knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

29. Based on the conduct described in this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly

1 Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in  
2 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other  
3 remedies permitted by law.

4 30. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs  
5 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in  
6 any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Plaintiff, on behalf of all similarly aggrieved employees, prays for relief and judgment  
9 against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

10 1. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the California  
11 Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, straight time,  
12 and overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to authorize and permit rest  
13 periods, failing to furnish accurate wage statements, and failing to maintain accurate records  
14 of all hours worked and meal periods;

15 2. An award of civil penalties on behalf of himself and all similarly aggrieved  
16 employees pursuant to PAGA;

17 3. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the maximum rate allowed;

18 4. Attorneys' fees and costs reasonably incurred;

19 5. Injunctive and declaratory relief to the extent allowed by PAGA; and

20 6. Such other and further relief that the Court deems proper.

21  
22 Dated: June 25, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

23 MOON & YANG, APC

24  
25 By: 

Kane Moon

H. Scott Leviant

Lilit Tunyan

Attorneys for Plaintiff Daniel De La Cruz

1  
2  
3 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**  
4

5 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all causes of action triable by jury.

6 Dated: June 25, 2021

MOON & YANG, APC

7  
8 By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Kane Moon

H. Scott Leviant

Lilit Tunyan

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT A

# **MOON & YANG, APC**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
WWW.MOONYANGLAW.COM

1055 W. SEVENTH ST., SUITE 1880  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017  
TELEPHONE: (213) 232-3128  
FACSIMILE: (213) 232-3125

Kane Moon, Esq.  
Kane.Moon@moonyanglaw.com

April 14, 2021

## **VIA ONLINE SUBMISSION**

Labor & Workforce Development Agency  
Attn. PAGA Administrator  
1515 Clay Street, Ste. 801  
Oakland, CA 94612

## **VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

Snider Motors, Inc.  
Elk Grove Toyota  
9640 W. Stockton Blvd.  
Elk Grove, CA 95757

## **Notice of Labor Code Violations and PAGA Penalties**

Re: ***Daniel De La Cruz v. Snider Motors, Inc. dba Elk Grove Toyota***

To Whom It May Concern:

Please be advised that my office has been retained by Daniel De La Cruz ("Plaintiff") to pursue a Labor Code Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) representative action (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2699, *et seq.*) against his former employer, Snider Motors, Inc. dba Elk Grove Toyota ("Defendant"). The purpose of this letter is to comply with PAGA and set forth the facts and theories of California Labor Code violations which we allege Defendant engaged in with respect to Plaintiff and all of Defendant's aggrieved employees.

Plaintiff wishes to pursue a PAGA representative action on behalf of himself as an aggrieved employee, on behalf of the State of California, and on behalf of all other current and former aggrieved employees who worked for Defendant in California as an hourly paid, non-exempt employee at any time within the applicable statutory period (hereafter, the "Aggrieved Employees").

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of Defendant suffered the Labor Code violations described below.

### **Factual Background Regarding Plaintiff's Employment with Defendant**

Defendant owns and operates an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Sacramento County. As such, Defendant is subject to the California Labor Code and the Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC").

Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a driver from approximately February 2019 to October 2020, primarily in Sacramento County. Defendant classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from overtime. During the time period that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, Plaintiff typically worked 5 days per week, and in excess of 8 hours each workday.

Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendant committed numerous labor code violations under state law. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for Defendant was typical and illustrative.

### **Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked, Including Overtime**

Under California law, an employer must pay for all hours worked by an employee. "Hours worked" is the time during which an employee is subject to the control of an employer, and includes all the time the employee is suffered or permitted to work, whether or not required to do so.

In addition, Labor Code § 510 provides that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight (8) hours in any workday or forty (40) hours in a workweek unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law.

Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1198 also provide that employees in California shall not be employed more than eight hours in any workday unless they receive additional compensation beyond their regular wages in amounts specified by law. Additionally, Labor Code § 1198 states that the employment of an employee for longer hours than those fixed by the Industrial Welfare Commission is unlawful.

Throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were typically required to work "off the clock". For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to undergo a COVID temperature screening prior to clocking into work each workday, which included waiting in line for that screening. Also during the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received non-discretionary bonuses. However, Defendants failed to include those bonuses into their calculation of the regular rate of pay when determining the correct overtime rate of pay. Therefore, Defendants failed to pay all overtime owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants did not correctly calculate the amount of overtime pay owed to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants wrongfully deducted monies from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees's wages, as reflected in their wage

statements as “Mutual Dis”. As a result, Defendants frequently paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees less than all their work time, some of which should have been paid at the overtime rate. As a further result, Defendants failed to maintain accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime.

### **Failure to Provide Meal Periods**

Under California law, employers have an affirmative obligation to relieve employees of all duty in order to take their first 30-minute, duty-free meal periods no later than the start of sixth hour of work in a workday, and to allow employees to take their second 30-minute, duty-free meal period no later than the start of the eleventh hour of work in the workday. Further, employees are entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday they were not provided with all required meal period(s).

Despite these legal requirements, Defendant wrongfully failed to provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of five consecutive hours a day without providing a 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of work or tenth hour of work. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or, for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate written policies or practices providing meal periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of meal periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required meal periods. Accordingly, Defendant’s policy and practice was to not provide meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not provided with all required meal period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for meal periods and that were not provided.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to provide meal periods and pay meal period premium wages.

### **Failure to Authorize and Permit Rest Periods**

Employers are required by California law to authorize and permit breaks of 10 uninterrupted minutes for each four hours of work or major fraction of four hours (i.e. more than two hours). Thus, for example, if an employee's work time is 6 hours and ten minutes, the employee is entitled to two rest breaks. Each failure to authorize rest breaks as so required is itself a violation of California's rest break laws.

Defendant, however, wrongfully failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods. Defendant regularly required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendant authorizing and permitting them to take a 10 minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendant did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendant did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendant have adequate policies or practices regarding the timing of rest periods. Defendant also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further, Defendant did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore Defendant cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendant's policy and practice was for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work through rest periods and to not authorize or permit them to take any rest periods.

Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are thus entitled to be paid one hour of additional wages for each workday he or she was not authorized and permitted to take all required rest period(s). Defendant, however, regularly failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the additional wages to which they were entitled for rest periods and that they were not authorized and permitted to take.

As a result, Defendant are liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code §§ 210, 558, and 2699(f)(2) for failing to authorize and permit rest periods and pay rest period premium wages.

### **Failure to Maintain Accurate Records of Hours Worked and Meal Periods**

Plaintiff seeks penalties under Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records

showing when the employee begins and ends each work period. Meal periods and total hours worked daily shall also be recorded.

Defendant, however, failed to maintain accurate records of hours worked and all meal periods taken or missed by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees.

Defendant's failure to provide and maintain records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendant's records. Therefore, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendant. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendant to fully perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. As a result of Defendant's knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing, understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

As a result, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 1174.5 for failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods.

#### **Failure to Reimburse and Indemnify Expenses**

California Labor Code § 2802 requires employers to reimburse employees for their necessary expenditures and losses incurred in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties or of their obedience to directions of the employer.

Throughout the statutory period, Defendant wrongfully required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for Defendant without reimbursement, which included the use of their personal cellular telephones for work-related reasons, without reimbursement. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties for Defendant, and Defendant has failed to indemnify Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for these employment-related expenses.

#### **Failure to Timely Pay All Wages at Termination**

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 seventy-two (72) hours thereafter, unless the employee has given seventy-two (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.

Within the applicable statute of limitations, the employment of Plaintiff and many other Aggrieved Employees ended, i.e. was terminated by quitting or discharge, and the employment of others will be. However, during the relevant time period, Defendant failed, and continues to fail to pay Plaintiff and terminated Aggrieved Employees, without abatement, all wages required to be paid by Labor Code sections 201 and 202 either at the time of discharge, or within seventy-two (72) hours of their leaving Defendant's employ. These unpaid wages include wages for unpaid work time (including minimum and straight time wages), missed meal periods, and missed rest periods.

Defendant's conduct violates Labor Code §§ 201 and 202. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay wages owed, in accordance with sections 201 and 202, then the wages of the employee shall continue as a penalty wage 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.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant their additionally accruing wages for each day they were not paid, at their regular hourly rate of pay, up to 30 days maximum pursuant to Labor Code § 203.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 2699(f)(2) for failing to timely pay all wages at termination.

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

Labor Code § 226(a) provides that every employer shall furnish each of his or her employees an accurate itemized wage statement in writing showing nine pieces of information, including: (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 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. An employee is presumed to suffer an injury if this information is missing. (Lab. Code § 226(e)(2)(B)(iii).)

The statute further provides: “An employee suffering injury as a result of a knowing and intentional failure by an employer to comply with subdivision (a) is entitled to recover the greater of all actual damages or fifty dollars (\$50) for the initial pay period in which a violation occurs and one hundred dollars (\$100) per employee for each violation in a subsequent pay period, not to exceed an aggregate penalty of four thousand dollars (\$4,000), and is entitled to an award of costs and reasonable attorney’s fees.” (Lab. Code § 226(e)(1).)

Defendant intentionally and willfully failed to provide employees with complete and accurate wage statements. The deficiencies include, among other things, the failure to correctly identify hourly rates, the failure to correctly list gross wages earned, and the failure to list the true net wages earned, including wages for meal periods that were not provided in accordance with California law, wages for rest periods that were not authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and correct wages earned for all hours worked.

As a result of Defendant violating Labor Code § 226, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees suffered injury and damage to their statutorily protected rights.

Accordingly, Plaintiff and similarly Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover from Defendant the greater of their actual damages caused by Defendant’s failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a), or an aggregate penalty not exceeding \$4,000 dollars per employee.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 226.3 for failing to furnish accurate itemized wage statements.

### **Failure to Pay All Earned Wages Twice Per Month**

Based on its failure to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all wages as discussed above, Defendant also violated Labor Code § 204.

Labor Code § 204 requires employers to pay employees all earned wages two times per month. Throughout the statute of limitations period applicable to this cause of action, employees were entitled to be paid twice a month at their regular rates, including all meal period premium wages owed, rest period premium wages owed, and wages owed for hours worked. However, during all such times, Defendant systematically failed and refused to pay the employees all wages due, and failed to pay those wages twice a month, in that employees were not paid all wages for all meal periods not provided by Defendant, all wages for all rest periods not authorized and permitted by Defendant, and all wages for all hours worked. As a result, Defendant owes employees the legally required wages for unpaid wages, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees suffered damages in those amounts.

Moreover, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for the civil penalties provided for in Labor Code § 210 for failing to pay all earned wages twice per month.

**Action for Civil Penalties Under PAGA**

In light of the above, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the following provisions of the Labor Code with respect to the Aggrieved Employees:

1. Labor Code § 204, 510, 1194, 1197, and 1198 by failing to pay for all hours worked, including minimum wages, straight time wages and overtime wages;
2. Labor Code § 226.7, 512 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to provide meal periods;
3. Labor Code § 226.7 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to authorize and permit rest periods;
4. Labor Code § 1174.5 and applicable Wage Orders by failing to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods taken or missed;
5. Labor Code § 2802 by failing to reimburse and indemnify employees for expenses and losses in the direct consequence and discharge of their duties;
6. Labor Code §§ 201 to 203 by willfully failing to pay all wages owed at termination;
7. Labor Code § 226 by failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements; and
8. Labor Code § 204 by failing to pay all earned wages two times per month.


Therefore, on behalf of all Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff seeks applicable penalties related to the violations alleged above pursuant to the PAGA. These include, but are not limited to, penalties under Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, 2802, and 2699(f)(2).

Plaintiff has placed Defendant on notice by mailing a certified copy of this correspondence to its corporate address, as indicated on the first page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

MOON & YANG, APC



Kane Moon  
*Attorney at Law*



MOON & YANG, APC


ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1055 W. SEVENTH STREET, SUITE 1880, LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

Snider Motors, Inc.  
Elk Grove Toyota  
9640 W. Stockton Blvd.  
Elk Grove, CA 95757

PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT  
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS. FOLD AT DOTTED LINE

CERTIFIED MAIL®



7019 2970 0001 5131 8437

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Snider Motors, Inc.  
Elk Grove Toyota  
9640 W. Stockton Blvd.  
Elk Grove, CA 95757



9590 9402 5711 9346 4755 43

2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7019 2970 0001 5131 8437

PS Form 3811, July 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

- A. Signature ☒ Agent ☐ Addressee
- B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery
- D. Is delivery address different from item 1? ☐ Yes ☐ No  
If YES, enter delivery address below:

3. Service Type
- ☐ Adult Signature
  - ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
  - ☐ Certified Mail®
  - ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
  - ☐ Collect on Delivery
  - ☐ Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
  - ☐ Insured Mail
  - ☐ Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)
- ☐ Priority Mail Express®
- ☐ Registered Mail™
- ☐ Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
- ☐ Return Receipt for Merchandise
- ☐ Signature Confirmation™
- ☐ Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

Domestic Return Receipt

U.S. Postal Service™  
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT  
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at [www.usps.com](http://www.usps.com)®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

|                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (hardcopy)           | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (electronic)         | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery  | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Required            | \$ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery | \$ |

Postage

\$

Total Postage and Fees

\$

Sent To

Snider Motors, Inc. Elk Grove Toyota  
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.  
9640 W. Stockton Blvd.  
City, State, ZIP+4®  
Elk Grove, CA 95757

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions

7019 2970 0001 5131 8437

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
3 ) ss  
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18  
6 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1055 West Seventh Street, Suite 1880,  
Los Angeles, California 90017. On July 14, 2021, I served the foregoing document described as:

7 **FIRST AMENDED PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT:**

8 X by E-mailing \_\_\_\_ the original X a true copy to the following:

9  
10 John P. Boggs  
David J. Reese  
Daniel J. Padova  
11 **FINE, BOGGS & PERKINS, LLP**  
12 111 West Ocean Blvd., Ste. 2400  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
13 jboggs@employerlawyers.com  
dreese@employerlawyers.com  
14 dpadova@employerlawyers.com

15 Attorneys for Defendants  
**SNIDER MOTORS, INC. dba ELK GROVE TOYOTA**

16 [✓] **BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order, Rule of Court, or an agreement of the  
17 parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the  
electronic service addresses listed above via electronic mail. I did not receive an error message.

18 [✓] **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The  
19 envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily familiar" with  
the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that  
20 practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage  
thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am  
21 aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal  
cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for  
mailing in affidavit.

22 X (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of  
23 California that the above is true and correct.

24 Executed on July 14, 2021, at Los Angeles, California.

25  
26 Jessica Reyes Flores  
27 Name

28  
  
Signature