

Brian J. Mankin, Esq. [CSB No. 216228]
brian@lmlfirm.com
Peter J. Carlson, Esq. [CSB No. 295611]
peter@lmlfirm.com
LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP
4590 Allstate Drive
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 320-1444
Fax: (951) 320-1445

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Riverside
8/19/2021
J. Hendrickson
Electronically Filed

Attorneys for Plaintiff, on a representative basis and on behalf of all others similarly situated

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

GEOFFREY KINZEL, individually, on a
representative basis, and on behalf of all
others similarly situated;

Plaintiff,

vs.

RLS-CMC, INC., a Delaware Corporation;
and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive;

Defendants.

Case No.: CVRI2101907
*[Assigned to Hon. Judge Sunshine Sykes,
Dept 6, for all purposes]*

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION CLAIMS

- (1) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (2) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (3) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (4) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (5) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (6) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Each Period;
- (7) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (8) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;
- (9) Unfair and Unlawful Competition;

PAGA CLAIMS

- (10) Failure to Pay Minimum Wages;
- (11) Failure to Pay Overtime Wages;
- (12) Failure to Provide Meal Periods;
- (13) Failure to Provide Rest Breaks;
- (14) Failure to Reimburse Bus. Expenses;
- (15) Failure to Timely Pay Wages Each Period;
- (16) Failure to Timely Pay Final Wages;
- (17) Failure to Provide Accurate Itemized Wage Statements;

1 Plaintiff Geoffrey Kinzel (“Plaintiff”) on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and
2 on behalf of others similarly situated, complains and alleges as follows.

3 **I. INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 1. Plaintiff brings this action against his former employer(s), Defendants RLS-CMC,
5 Inc. and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, (collectively, “Defendants”) on behalf of all current and
6 former nonexempt employees employed by Defendants in California (the “Class” or
7 “Represented Employees”), for Labor Code violations stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay
8 all wages owed, including minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide meal
9 periods, failure to provide rest breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely
10 pay wages each period, failure to timely pay wages upon separation of employment, and failure
11 to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

12 2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from approximately January through April
13 2021.

14 3. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Represented Employees were
15 subjected to the same policies, working conditions, and corresponding wage and hour violations
16 to which Plaintiff was subjected during employment.

17 4. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
18 and overtime wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
19 worked.

20 5. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper wages to Plaintiff and the
21 Represented Employees. For example, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented
22 Employees on a “salary” basis and did not pay proper minimum and overtime wages for all hours
23 worked. Despite that Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were non-exempt employees
24 under California law, and entitled to compensation for all hours worked, Defendant’s practice
25 was to only pay a set number of hours for work each day, regardless of the actual length of shift.
26 As a result, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided all minimum, regular,
27 and overtime wages owed.

28 ///

1 6. Also, at all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were entitled
2 to and did receive additional earned compensation in the form of nondiscretionary bonuses.
3 However, during workweeks where the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and
4 earned additional nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to include that compensation in
5 the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5 times the base
6 rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and
7 one-half the regular rate of pay.

8 7. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were also denied 30-minute off-duty
9 meal periods, as mandated by California law. As a result of Defendants’ policies and practices,
10 the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations when they were: (1) unable
11 to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal periods while under
12 Defendants’ control, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal occurred, after the 5th hour
13 of work, (4) not provided a mandated first meal period for shifts in excess of 6 hours, and (5) not
14 provided mandated second or third meal periods for shifts over 10 or 15 hours, respectively.

15 8. Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Represented Employees with
16 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major fraction thereof, as
17 mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the Represented
18 Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due to being
19 overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
20 were not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of California law.
21 Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Represented Employees worked longer shifts,
22 Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

23 9. Plaintiff further alleges that he and the Represented Employees were required by
24 Defendants to incur substantial business-related expenses and costs without reimbursement. For
25 example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Represented Employees to acquire and maintain a
26 smart phone and related monthly data plan to communicate via phone and text message.
27 Additionally, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to provide various tools
28 and equipment to perform duties for the Company, such as power tools, without reimbursement.

1 10. Plaintiff also alleges that he and the Represented Employees were not paid all
2 wages due and owing each pay period (Labor Code § 204) and upon separation of employment
3 within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants
4 engaged in the practice of failing to pay all wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Represented
5 Employees at the time their employment ended with Defendants, including, but not limited to
6 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, wage premiums, among others.

7 11. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants failed to provide accurate itemized wage
8 statements that fully complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a). This claim is
9 detailed below, but one example relates to Defendants’ practice of paying Plaintiff and the
10 Represented Employees on a “salary” basis. Because of this practice, Defendants’ wage
11 statements failed to state the total hours worked in the period, as well as all applicable rates of
12 pay, in direct violation of Labor Code § 226(a).

13 12. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants’ violations of the wage and hour components of
14 the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders enabled them to decrease expenses and to increase their
15 level of productivity and profits, thereby allowing Defendants to gain an unfair advantage over
16 its competitors.

17 13. At all material times, Defendants and DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
18 Represented Employees’ employers or persons acting on behalf of the Represented Employees’
19 employer, within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
20 violated, a section of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California Labor Code or any provision regulating
21 hours and days of work in an IWC Wage Order and, as such, are subject to penalties for each
22 underpaid employee as set forth in Labor Code § 558 and under California law.

23 14. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking declaratory, injunctive, equitable, and
24 monetary relief against Defendants and each of them, on behalf of himself and the Represented
25 Employees to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees,
26 penalties, costs and expenses pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 208,
27 210, 218.6, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 1199, and 2802,
28 among possibly other sections inadvertently omitted. Plaintiff also reserves the right to name

1 additional representatives throughout the State of California.

2 **II. JURISDICTION**

3 15. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims for relief of Plaintiff and the
4 Represented Employees pursuant to the Labor Code and the IWC Wage Orders.

5 **III. VENUE**

6 16. Venue as to each Defendant is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil
7 Procedure § 395(a). Defendants transact business in Riverside County and the unlawful acts
8 alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and the Represented Employees in Riverside
9 County. Furthermore, Defendants employed or employ Plaintiff and Represented Employees in
10 Riverside County.

11 **IV. PARTIES**

12 **Plaintiff**

13 17. Plaintiff and Class Representative Geoffrey Kinzel was employed by Defendants
14 from approximately January through April 2021 and performed work for Defendants in
15 Riverside County.

16 **Defendants**

17 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendant RLS-CMC,
18 Inc. is an Illinois Corporation authorized to and doing business in Riverside County, California.
19 Plaintiff is also informed and believes that Defendant RLS-CMC, Inc. is and/or was the legal
20 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees during the applicable statutory periods.

21 19. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, capacities, relationships, and extent of
22 participation in the conduct herein alleged, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 20,
23 inclusive, but on information and belief alleges that those Defendants are legally responsible for
24 the payment of penalties and damages to Plaintiff and all Represented Employees by virtue of
25 Defendants' unlawful actions and practices and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious
26 names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege the true names and capacities of the DOE
27 Defendants when ascertained.

28 ///

1 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that he and the Represented
2 Employees worked under the joint direction and control of Defendants and that Defendants, and
3 each of them, acted in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other Defendants,
4 carried out a joint scheme, business plan or policy in all respect pertinent hereto, and the acts of
5 each Defendant are legally attributable to the other Defendants. On information and belief, a
6 unity of interest and ownership between each Defendant exists such that all Defendants acted as
7 a single employer of Plaintiff and other Represented Employees.

8 21. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that
9 Defendants, and each of them, are an integrated enterprise and should be treated as a single
10 employer because these entities share an interrelation of operations, with common human
11 resources and personnel policies and shared common offices and facilities. Additionally,
12 Defendants also have a shared website, common management, a centralized control of labor
13 operations, and common ownership or financial control.

14 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, in conducting
15 themselves in the manner described herein, Defendants, and each of them, were acting in active
16 concert with one another such that the acts of each were and are fully attributable to the others in
17 all material respects. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times
18 Defendants and each of them are now, and at all material times herein mentioned were, the
19 agents, servants, employees, partners, affiliates, and/or representatives of each of their remaining
20 co-Defendants, and were, at all times herein mentioned, acting within the course, scope, and
21 purpose of such relationship(s) and with the knowledge, consent and/or ratification of each of
22 their remaining co-Defendants.

23 23. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all relevant times, Defendants
24 have been inadequately capitalized to conduct business, have failed to follow appropriate
25 corporate formalities, and have simply been a shell and instrumentality through which
26 Defendants DOES 11 through 20, inclusive, have conducted their personal affairs. Accordingly,
27 the corporate veil should be pierced, and any liability attached to Defendants should be imposed
28 jointly and severally against Defendants DOES 11 through 20. Adherence to the fiction of the

1 separate existence of these corporate entities would permit abuse of the corporate privilege,
2 thereby sanctioning fraud and promoting injustice.

3 **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

4 24. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
5 as if fully alleged herein.

6 25. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated as
7 a class action, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

8 26. The relevant time period for this class action is defined as the period beginning
9 four years prior to the filing of this action until class certification (the “Relevant Time Period”).

10 27. The Class, also referred to as the “Represented Employees,” that Plaintiff seeks to
11 represent is defined as follows:

12 All current and former nonexempt employees employed by
13 Defendants in California during the Relevant Time Period.

14 28. Plaintiff also seeks to represent the following subclasses:

15 **Meal Break Subclass**

16 All Represented Employees who worked a shift in excess of
17 5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

18 **Rest Break Subclass**

19 All Represented Employees who worked a shift of at least
20 3.5 hours during the Relevant Time Period.

21 **Unreimbursed Expense Subclass**

22 All Represented Employees who were required to incur
23 expenses to discharge their duties for Defendants without
24 reimbursement during the Relevant Time Period.

25 **Waiting Time Penalties Subclass**

26 All Represented Employees who separated from their
27 employment with Defendants during the period three years
28 before the filing of this action and ending when final

judgment is entered.

Wage Statement Penalties Subclass

All Represented Employees during the period one year before the filing of this action and ending when final judgment is entered.

29. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend or modify the class description with greater specificity or further division into subclasses or limitation to particular issues as appropriate.

30. Plaintiff, as Class Representative, is a member of the class and subclasses that he seeks to represent.

31. This action has been brought and may properly be maintained as a class action under Code of Civil Procedure § 382 because there is a well-defined community of interest in the litigation and the proposed class is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

32. **Numerosity:** The potential members of the Class as defined are so numerous that a joinder of all Represented Employees is impracticable. Although the exact number is currently unknown to Plaintiff, this information is easily ascertainable from Defendants' records.

33. **Commonality:** There are questions of law and fact common to the class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the class, including without limitation:

i. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for all hours worked;

ii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for hours above 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week;

iii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant meal periods to Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a compliant

meal period was not provided;

iv. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to provide compliant rest breaks to Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass and whether Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with one additional hour of wages at the regular rate of pay for each instance when a paid rest break was not provided;

v. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Order by failing to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for business expenses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of their employer;

vi. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to timely pay all wages to Plaintiff and the Class within the time required by Labor Code § 204;

vii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to timely pay all wages due upon separation of employment between Defendants and Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass, whether such separation was voluntary or involuntary;

viii. Whether Defendants violated the California Labor Code by failing to provide Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass with complete, accurate, itemized wage statements;

ix. Whether Defendants violated California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.* due to the: failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated paid rest breaks, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to reimburse business expenses, and failure to timely pay final wages; and

x. Whether Plaintiff and Represented Employees are entitled to equitable relief pursuant to California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*

34. **Typicality:** Plaintiff's claims, as the Class Representative, are typical of the claims of The Class. Plaintiff, like other members of The Class, was subjected to Defendants' ongoing Labor Code and Wage Order violations including pertaining to the failure to pay all wages owed, failure to provide mandated meal periods, failure to provide mandated paid rest

breaks, failure to reimburse business expenses, failure to timely pay wages each period and upon separation of employment, and failure to provide accurate itemized wage statements.

35. **Adequacy of Representation.** Plaintiff, as the Class Representative, will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class. Plaintiff's interests are not in conflict with those of the Class. Class Representative's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating large employment class actions and other complex litigation matters, including cases like this case.

36. **Superiority of Class Action.** Class certification is appropriate because a class action is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Individual joinder of all Represented Employees is not practicable, and questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each Represented Employee has been damaged and is entitled to recovery by reason of Defendants' illegal policies and practices set forth above. Class action treatment will allow those similarly situated persons to litigate their claims in the manner that is most efficient and economical for the parties and the judicial system.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

37. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

38. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not exempt from the requirement to be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each hour worked.

39. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were not provided proper minimum and regular wages due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they

1 were performing.

2 40. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
3 Represented Employees due to its “salary” payroll policy. For example, Defendants paid
4 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees on a “salary” basis and, thus, only paid a set number of
5 hours for work each day, regardless of the actual length of shift. However, Plaintiff and the
6 Represented Employees were non-exempt employees under California law and entitled to
7 compensation for all hours worked. Therefore, Defendant’s “salary” payroll policy violated
8 California law and results in the failure to pay minimum wages to the Represented Employees.

9 41. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
10 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
11 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

12 42. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
13 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Represented
14 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

15 43. Defendants’ conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
16 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid wages throughout the statutory period for each
17 hour worked, including proper minimum and regular wages, yet Defendants chose not to pay
18 them in accordance thereto.

19 44. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
20 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
21 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
22 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
23 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

24 45. During employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
25 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

26 46. As a result of the Defendants’ wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
27 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

28 ///

47. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of all unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees and costs of suit, pursuant to Labor Code §§ 1194 and 1194.2, against Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES

(Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

Plaintiff and the Represented Employees Against All Defendants

48. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint as if fully alleged herein.

49. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were employees of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

50. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12) in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

51. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required by Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the Represented Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

52. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees due to its “salary” payroll policy. For example, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented Employees on a “salary” basis and, thus, only paid a set number of hours for work each day, regardless of the actual length of shift. However, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were non-exempt employees under California law and entitled to proper overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week.

1 Defendant's "salary" payroll policy did not comply with this requirement, resulting in the failure
2 to pay proper overtime wages to the Represented Employees.

3 53. Furthermore, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented
4 Employees on an hourly basis but also paid additional earned nondiscretionary bonuses.
5 However, during workweeks where the Represented Employees worked overtime hours and
6 earned additional nondiscretionary bonuses, Defendants failed to include the bonuses in the
7 calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5 times the base rate
8 of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid at time and one-
9 half the regular rate of pay.

10 54. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
11 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees because
12 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
13 week without proper overtime compensation.

14 55. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
15 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
16 Represented Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

17 56. Defendants' conduct was willful, as Defendants knew that Plaintiff and the
18 Represented Employees were entitled to be paid proper overtime wages throughout the statutory
19 period, yet Defendants chose not to pay them in accordance thereto.

20 57. At all material times, Defendants DOES 1 through 20 were and/or are the
21 employer of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees or were persons acting on behalf of said
22 employer(s), within the meaning of California Labor Code § 558, who violated or caused to be
23 violated Labor Code § 204 and a provision or provisions of Part 2, Chapter 1 of the California
24 Labor Code regulating hours and days of work respectively.

25 58. During the employment of Plaintiff and the Represented Employees, Defendants
26 failed to pay them all wages to which they were entitled, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

27 59. As a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct, Plaintiff and the Represented
28 Employees have been damaged in amounts to be proven at trial.

1 60. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Represented Employees, seeks recovery of
2 all unpaid overtime wages, penalties, interest, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit against
3 Defendants in an amount to be proven at trial.

4 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE MEAL PERIODS**

6 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

7 *Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

8 61. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
9 as if fully alleged herein.

10 62. Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
11 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
12 periods.

13 63. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
14 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

15 64. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
16 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
17 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
18 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
19 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
20 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
21 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

22 65. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
23 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
24 pay for each meal period that is missed.

25 66. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were denied
26 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
27 practices, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were subjected to meal period violations
28 when they were: (1) unable to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal

1 periods while under Defendants' control, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal
2 occurred, after the 5th hour of work, (4) not provided a mandated first meal period for shifts in
3 excess of 6 hours, and (5) not provided mandated second or third meal periods for shifts over 10
4 and 15 hours, respectively.

5 67. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
6 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not provided with all
7 mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass one
8 additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

9 68. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Meal
10 Break Subclass all mandated meal periods and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
11 meal or rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

12 69. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass did not
13 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
14 obtained from Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass were not willfully obtained, were not
15 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
16 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass
17 to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

18 70. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Meal Break Subclass with meal
19 periods as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of
20 each meal period not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and
21 IWC Wage Order § 11. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at
22 the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that a meal period was not
23 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

24 71. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
25 and IWC Wage Order § 11, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Meal
26 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

3 (Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

4 *Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass Against All Defendants*

5 72. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 73. Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass are and/or were employees of Defendants
8 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

9 74. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
10 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

11 75. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
12 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
13 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
14 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
15 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

16 76. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
17 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
18 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

19 77. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
20 Break Subclass with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
21 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
22 Rest Break Subclass were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks due
23 to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Rest Break
24 Subclass were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of California
25 law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass worked lengthy
26 shifts, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit mandated third or fourth rest breaks.

27 78. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
28 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass were not provided with all

1 mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees
2 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

3 79. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and the Rest
4 Break Subclass all mandated rest breaks and failed to pay wage premiums in lieu of mandated
5 rest periods, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

6 80. By their failure to provide Plaintiff and the Rest Break Subclass with rest breaks
7 as required by California law, and failing to pay one hour of additional wages in lieu of each rest
8 break not provided, Defendants willfully violated Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512, and IWC Wage
9 Order § 12. Accordingly, Defendants are liable for one hour of additional wages at the
10 employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that a paid rest break was not
11 lawfully provided in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

12 81. Also, as a direct result of Defendants' violations of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512,
13 and IWC Wage Order § 12, Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Rest
14 Break Subclass for unpaid wage premiums, penalties, costs, and interest.

15 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

17 (Labor Code § 2802)

18 *Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Class against All Defendants*

19 82. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 83. Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass are and/or were employees of
22 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing
23 reimbursement of business expenses.

24 84. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
25 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
26 their employer.

27 85. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
28 required Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass to incur necessary business-related

1 expenses and costs without reimbursement, including, but not limited to, acquiring and
2 maintaining a smart phone and related monthly data plan to communicate with Defendants via
3 phone and text message. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Represented Employees were required to
4 provide various tools and equipment to perform duties for the Company, such as power tools,
5 without reimbursement.

6 86. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
7 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass for expenses incurred as a
8 direct consequence of employment with Defendants and/or under the direction of Defendants.

9 87. At all relevant times herein, Defendants failed to reimburse the Unreimbursed
10 Expense Subclass, including Plaintiff, for expenses incurred while discharging duties to
11 Defendants, thereby receiving an economic benefit.

12 88. As a direct result of Defendants' violation of Labor Code § 2802 and IWC Wage
13 Order § 9(B), Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass have suffered, and continue to
14 suffer, substantial losses related to such incurred expenses, expenses, and attorney's fees in
15 seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform their obligations under the law, all in an amount
16 to be proved at time of trial.

17 89. Labor Code § 2802(b) states that "[a]ll awards made by a Court for
18 reimbursement of necessary expenditures" shall carry interest, at the same rate as judgments in
19 civil actions, and said interest will accrue from the date on which the employee incurred the
20 necessary expenditure or loss including, but not limited to, reasonable costs and attorney's fees
21 incurred by the employee enforcing the rights granted pursuant to Labor Code § 2802. The exact
22 amount of the necessary expenditures or losses is in an amount to be proven at time of trial.

23 90. Furthermore, Labor Code § 2802(c) states that "[f]or the purposes of this section,
24 the term 'necessary expenditures or losses' shall include all reasonable costs, including, but not
25 limited to, attorney's fees incurred by the employee in enforcing the rights granted by this
26 section." Therefore, Plaintiff and the Unreimbursed Expense Subclass seek to recover the
27 unreimbursed expenses, interest on the unreimbursed expenses, and the costs and attorney's fees
28 necessarily incurred in pursuing same. The exact amount of reimbursements, interest, costs, and

1 attorney's fees will be in an amount to be proved at the time of trial.

2 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

4 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 210)

5 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

6 91. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
7 as if fully alleged herein.

8 92. Plaintiff and the Represented Employees are and/or were employees of
9 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the timing
10 of payment of wages each period.

11 93. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
12 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
13 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
14 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
15 the following month.

16 94. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states "[t]he requirements of this section shall
17 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
18 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period."

19 95. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
20 Represented Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
21 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Represented
22 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
23 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
24 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

25 96. Labor Code § 210 establishes that, for each violation of Labor Code § 204,
26 Defendants are "subject to a penalty as follows: (1) for any initial violation, one hundred dollars
27 (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee. (2) for each subsequent violation, or any willful or
28 intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for each failure to pay each employee, plus 25

1 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.

2 97. Furthermore, Labor Code § 210 was recently amended to create a private right of
3 action for Plaintiff and the Represented Employees to seek these as a “statutory penalty”. See
4 Labor Code § 210(b).

5 98. As a result of Defendant’s violations of Labor Code § 204, Defendants, and each
6 of them, are liable to Plaintiff and the Represented Employees for the statutory penalties under
7 Labor Code § 210.

8 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

10 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203)

11 *Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

12 99. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
13 as if fully alleged herein.

14 100. Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
15 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the timing
16 and payment of wages.

17 101. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
18 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

19 102. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
20 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
21 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

22 103. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
23 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
24 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

25 104. At all relevant times, Defendants employed a policy and practice whereby
26 Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass were not paid all wages due and owing upon
27 separation of employment within the time required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

28 ///

1 105. Also, at all relevant times, Defendants engaged in the practice of failing to pay all
2 wages due and owing to Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass upon separation of
3 employment, including, but not limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as
4 meal and rest period premiums.

5 106. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
6 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and the Waiting Time Penalties Subclass all
7 wages due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and
8 202. Consequently, pursuant to Labor Code § 203, Defendants owe Plaintiff and the Waiting
9 Time Penalties Subclass the above-described waiting time penalty, all in an amount to be shown
10 according to proof at trial and within the jurisdiction of this Court.

11 **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

13 (Labor Code § 226)

14 *Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass against All Defendants*

15 107. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

17 108. Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass are and/or were employees of
18 Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
19 provision of accurate itemized wage statements.

20 109. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
21 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
22 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
23 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
24 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
25 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

26 110. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
27 and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a wage
28 statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the

1 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

2 111. For example, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Represented
3 Employees on a “salary” basis. And, as part of this policy, Defendants did not accurately record
4 the hours worked by the Represented Employees. Therefore, Defendants’ wage statements failed
5 to accurately state total hours worked in the pay period. Also, the wage statements failed to state
6 all applicable rates of pay and corresponding hours worked at each rate.

7 112. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants’ wage statements failed to
8 accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions, and net wages earned.

9 113. Additionally, Defendants’ wage statements frequently failed to state the accurate
10 overtime rate of pay.

11 114. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
12 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass because Defendants failed to provide a
13 wage statement to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the
14 requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

15 115. Defendants’ failure to provide the required writing deprived Plaintiff and the
16 Wage Statement Penalties Subclass of the ability to know, understand, and question the
17 calculation and rate of pay and hours used to calculate the wages paid by Defendants. Therefore,
18 Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass had no way to dispute the resulting
19 miscalculation of wages, all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to said
20 Defendants. As a direct result, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered
21 and continue to suffer, substantial losses related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost
22 interest on such wages and expenses and attorney’s fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully
23 perform its obligation under state law, all to their respective damages in amounts according to
24 proof at trial.

25 116. As a result of Defendants’ knowing and intentional failure to comply with Labor
26 Code § 226(a), Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have suffered an injury in
27 that each was prevented from knowing, understanding and disputing the wage payments paid to
28 them. Furthermore, Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass have each suffered an

1 injury in that the failure to show all wages earned on the itemized wage statements resulted in
2 Plaintiff and the Represented Employees being denied all necessary deductions, payments, and
3 withholdings owed by the employer, including, but not limited to, the failure to make all
4 necessary contributions for unemployment benefits, social security benefits, proper payment of
5 taxes and withholdings, and other mandated state and federal benefits.

6 117. Plaintiff has also been injured as a result of having to bring this action to attempt
7 to obtain correct wage information following Defendants' refusal to comply with many of the
8 mandates of California's Labor Code and related laws and regulations.

9 118. Labor Code § 226(e) requires Defendants to pay the greater of all actual damages
10 or fifty dollars (\$50.00) per employee for the initial pay period in which a violation occurred, and
11 one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per employee for each violation in subsequent pay periods, plus
12 attorney's fees and costs, to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass who were
13 injured by Defendants' failure to comply with Labor Code § 226(a). The exact amount of the
14 applicable penalty is all in an amount to be shown according to proof at trial.

15 **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

16 **UNFAIR AND UNLAWFUL COMPETITION**

17 (Business and Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*)

18 *Plaintiff and the Represented Employees against All Defendants*

19 119. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
20 as if fully alleged herein.

21 120. California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*, prohibits acts of unfair
22 competition, which includes any "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice." The
23 Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, have suffered and continue to suffer injuries in fact,
24 due to the unfair and unlawful business practices of Defendants as alleged herein.

25 121. Defendants, and each of them, are "persons" as defined under Business &
26 Professions Code § 17021.

27 122. As alleged herein, Defendants engaged in conduct that violated California's wage
28 and hour laws, including failure to pay minimum, regular, and overtime wages, failure to provide

1 mandated meal periods and rest breaks, and failure to timely pay wages each period and upon
2 separation of employment, all to decrease their costs and increase their profits.

3 123. At all times relevant herein, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Represented
4 Employees wages and monies and other financial obligations to which they were entitled.

5 124. As a result of Defendants' failure to comply with the Labor Code and IWC
6 Orders, Represented Employees, including Plaintiff, suffered a loss of wages and monies, all in
7 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. Defendants' ongoing violations of the
8 foregoing statutes and laws constitute a violation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, *et seq.*

9 125. Defendants' violations of the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders and
10 its scheme to lower its payroll costs as alleged herein, constitute unlawful and unfair business
11 practices because it was done in a systematic manner over a period of time to the detriment of the
12 Plaintiff and all others similarly-situated.

13 126. Defendants' conduct, as alleged herein, has been, and continues to be, unfair,
14 unlawful, and harmful to Plaintiff, other Represented Employees, and to the general public.
15 Plaintiff seek to enforce important rights affecting the public interest within the meaning of Code
16 of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

17 127. A violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.* may be
18 predicated on the violation of any state or federal law. All of the acts described herein as
19 violations of, among other things, the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, are
20 unlawful and in violation of public policy, and in addition are immoral, unethical, oppressive,
21 fraudulent and unscrupulous, and thereby constitute unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business
22 practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*

23 128. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has no plain,
24 speedy, and/or adequate remedy at law to redress the injuries which they have suffered as a
25 consequence of Defendants' unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. As a result of
26 the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices described above, Plaintiff, individually,
27 and on behalf of the Represented Employees, has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
28 harm unless Defendants, and each of them, are restrained from continuing to engage in said

1 unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices.

2 129. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is entitled to,
3 and does, seek such relief as may be necessary to disgorge the profits which Defendants have
4 acquired, or of which Plaintiff and Represented Employees have been deprived, by means of the
5 above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices. Plaintiff and the
6 Represented Employees are not obligated to establish individual knowledge of the unfair
7 practices of Defendants in order to recover restitution.

8 130. Plaintiff, individually, and on behalf of the Represented Employees, is further
9 entitled to and do seek a declaration that the above described business practices are unfair,
10 unlawful and/or fraudulent, and injunctive relief restraining Defendants, and each of them, from
11 engaging in any of the above-described unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices in
12 the future.

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

19 **VI. LABOR CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT CAUSES OF ACTION**
20 **(Cal. Lab. Code. §§ 2698 – 2699.5)**

21 132. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under the PAGA as he was employed by
22 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
23 violations alleged herein. As such, Plaintiff may recover the remedies described herein in a civil
24 action filed on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former aggrieved
25 employees in California against whom one or more of the alleged violations was committed
26 (hereinafter the “Aggrieved Employees”).

27 133. Plaintiff seeks to recover all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to
28 Labor Code § 2699, as well as attorneys' fees, costs, and/or other damages as permitted by

1 PAGA through a representative action pursuant to the PAGA and the California Supreme Court
2 in *Arias v. Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969. Therefore, Plaintiff is not required to, nor
3 does she, seek class certification of the PAGA claims under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.

4 134. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699.3(a), Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing
5 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and by certified mail to
6 Defendants of the specific provisions of the Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including
7 the facts and theories to support the alleged violations. More than sixty-five (65) days have
8 elapsed since the date Plaintiff provided the written notice of the claims alleged herein without
9 the LWDA assuming jurisdiction over the claims alleged. Accordingly, Plaintiff has fully
10 satisfied the administrative prerequisites to suit under the PAGA.

11 **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY MINIMUM WAGES**

13 (Labor Code §§ 200, 1194, 1194.2, 1197; IWC Wage Order § 4)

14 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

15 135. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
16 as if fully alleged herein.

17 136. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not exempt from the requirement to
18 be paid at least the applicable California minimum wage throughout the statutory period for each
19 hour worked.

20 137. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided proper minimum and
21 regular wages due to Defendants’ failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours
22 worked. As a result of this policy and practice, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
23 required to perform off-the-clock work that Defendants either knew or should have known they
24 were performing.

25 138. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper minimum wages to Plaintiff and the
26 Aggrieved Employees due to its “salary” payroll policy. For example, Defendants paid Plaintiff
27 and the Aggrieved Employees on a “salary” basis and, thus, only paid a set number of hours for
28 work each day, regardless of the actual length of shift. However, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved

1 Employees were non-exempt employees under California law and entitled to compensation for
2 all hours worked. Therefore, Defendant's "salary" payroll policy violated California law and
3 results in the failure to pay minimum wages to the Represented Employees.

4 139. Consequently, Defendants violated California Labor Code laws and minimum
5 wage laws, *inter alia*, Labor Code §§ 200, 221, 222, 223, 1197, IWC Wage Order 9, § 4, and
6 Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, section 11090, subds. 1 and 4(B).

7 140. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
8 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay wages to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
9 Employees for each hour worked in violation of Labor Code §§ 221-223, 1194 and 1197.

10 141. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
11 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
12 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

13 **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

14 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME WAGES**

15 (Labor Code §§ 204 and 510; IWC Wage Order § 3(A))

16 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

17 142. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
18 as if fully alleged herein.

19 143. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were employees of Defendants who did
20 not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing payment of overtime wages.

21 144. Labor Code § 204 requires that the employer timely pay all overtime wages to its
22 employees. Labor Code § 510(a) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 3(A) provide that any
23 work performed in excess of eight (8) hours in one workday or in excess of forty (40) hours in
24 any one workweek shall be compensated at the rate of no less than one and one-half times the
25 regular rate of pay for an employee. Furthermore, any work performed in excess of twelve (12)
26 in one workday shall be compensated at twice the regular rate of pay for an employee.

27 145. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required by
28 Defendants to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week. However, due to

1 Defendants' failure to accurately record and compensate for all hours worked Plaintiff and the
2 Aggrieved Employees did not receive proper overtime compensation.

3 146. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
4 Aggrieved Employees due to its "salary" payroll policy. For example, Defendants paid Plaintiff
5 and the Aggrieved Employees on a "salary" basis and, thus, only paid a set number of hours for
6 work each day, regardless of the actual length of shift. However, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
7 Employees were non-exempt employees under California law and entitled to proper overtime
8 compensation for all hours worked in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per week.
9 Defendant's "salary" payroll policy did not comply with this requirement, resulting in the failure
10 to pay proper overtime wages to the Aggrieved Employees.

11 147. Furthermore, Defendants failed to pay proper overtime to Plaintiff and the
12 Aggrieved Employees due to the failure to include all earned and nondiscretionary compensation
13 in the calculation for the regular rate of pay and overtime rate.

14 148. At all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees on
15 an hourly basis but also paid additional earned nondiscretionary compensation and/or bonuses.
16 However, during workweeks where the Aggrieved Employees worked overtime hours and
17 earned additional nondiscretionary compensation and/or bonuses, Defendants failed to include
18 the bonuses in the calculations for the regular rate of pay and instead paid overtime at only 1.5
19 times the base rate of pay – violating the well-established rule that overtime must always be paid
20 at time and one-half the regular rate of pay.

21 149. Defendants violate Labor Code §§ 204 and 510 and the applicable IWC Wage
22 Order § 3(A) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because
23 Defendants required its employees to work hours in excess of 8 and/or 12 per day and/or 40 per
24 week without proper overtime compensation.

25 150. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
26 intentionally, willfully, and improperly failed to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff and the
27 Aggrieved Employees in violation of Labor Code §§ 204, 221-223, 510, 1194 and 1197.

28 ///

1 151. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
2 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
3 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

4 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLIANT MEAL PERIODS**

6 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 11, 12)

7 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

8 152. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
9 as if fully alleged herein.

10 153. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
11 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory meal
12 periods.

13 154. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide
14 employees with meal periods as mandated by the Industrial Welfare Commission.

15 155. Labor Code § 512(a), in part, provides that employers, including Defendants, may
16 not employ an employee for a work period of more than five hours per day without providing an
17 employee the opportunity to take an uninterrupted meal period of not less than 30 minutes,
18 except that if the total work period per day of the employee is no more than six hours, the meal
19 period may be waived by mutual consent of both the employer and the employee. Employers
20 may not employ an employee for a work period more than 10 hours per day without providing
21 the employee with a second meal period of not less than 30 minutes.

22 156. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and the applicable IWC Wage Order § 11(B),
23 Defendants shall pay an employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of
24 pay for each meal period that is missed.

25 157. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were denied
26 the 30-minute meal periods to which they were entitled. As a result of Defendants' policies and
27 practices, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were subjected to meal period violations when
28 they were: (1) unable to take meal periods due to workload, (2) forced to take on-duty meal

1 periods while under Defendants' control, (3) forced to take meal periods, if such a meal
2 occurred, after the 5th hour of work, (4) not provided a mandated first meal period for shifts in
3 excess of 6 hours, and (5) not provided mandated second meal periods for shifts over 10 hours.

4 158. Furthermore, on the occasions that Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
5 Employees a meal premium under Labor Code § 226.7 for a missed/denied meal period,
6 Defendants paid this premium at the base rate of pay instead of at the "regular rate" which
7 incorporates additional nondiscretionary compensation (such as shift differentials and bonuses).

8 159. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
9 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
10 all mandatory meal periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
11 one additional hour of compensation at the regular rate of pay in lieu thereof.

12 160. On information and belief, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
13 voluntarily or willfully waive the mandated meal periods. Any expressed or implied waivers
14 obtained from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not willfully obtained, were not
15 voluntarily agreed to, were a condition of employment, or were a part of a contract of an
16 unlawful adhesion. Defendants did not permit or authorize Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
17 Employees to take meal periods in accordance with California law.

18 161. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
19 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
20 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

21 **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST BREAKS**

23 (Labor Code § 226.7 and 512; IWC Wage Order § 12)

24 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

25 162. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
26 as if fully alleged herein.

27 163. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
28 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing mandatory rest breaks.

1 164. Labor Code § 226.7 requires employers, including Defendants, to provide rest
2 breaks to its employees as mandated by Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission.

3 165. The IWC Wage Order § 12 states, in part, that every employer shall authorize and
4 permit all employees to take rest periods, which insofar as practicable shall be in the middle of
5 each work period. Employees shall receive a 10-minute rest period every four hours or major
6 fraction thereof that they are required to work. Authorized rest period time shall be counted, as
7 hours worked, for which there shall be no deduction from wages.

8 166. Pursuant to Labor Code § 226.7(b) and Section 12(B) of the applicable Wage
9 Order, Defendants shall pay Plaintiff and the Represented Employees one additional hour of pay
10 at his regular rate of compensation for each day that the rest period is not provided.

11 167. At all relevant times, Defendants also failed to provide Plaintiff and the
12 Aggrieved Employees with 10 minutes of net rest break time for every 4 hours worked, or major
13 fraction thereof, as mandated by California law. Defendants did not schedule rest breaks and the
14 Aggrieved Employees were often not authorized and/or permitted to take mandated rest breaks
15 due to being overwhelmed by their hectic workload. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
16 Employees were often not permitted to leave the premises for rest breaks, in violation of
17 California law. Furthermore, on occasions when Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked
18 in excess of 10 hours in a shift, Defendants failed to authorize and/or permit a third mandated
19 rest break.

20 168. Defendants violated Labor Code §§ 226.7, 512, and the applicable IWC Wage
21 Order every pay period because Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were not provided with
22 all mandatory rest periods and Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
23 one additional hour of compensation in lieu thereof.

24 169. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
25 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
26 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO REIMBURSE BUSINESS EXPENSES**

3 (Labor Code § 2802)

4 170. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
5 as if fully alleged herein.

6 171. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
7 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing reimbursement of
8 business expenses.

9 172. Labor Code § 2802(a) requires that the employer indemnify its employees for
10 expenses and losses incurred while discharging their duties or in obedience to the directions of
11 their employer.

12 173. At all relevant times herein mentioned, as a condition of employment, Defendants
13 required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to incur substantial business-related expenses
14 and costs without reimbursement. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
15 Employees to use personal cell phones to carry out their duties for Defendants without
16 reimbursement. Additionally, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were required to provide
17 various tools and equipment to perform duties for the Company, such as power tools, without
18 reimbursement.

19 174. At all relevant times herein, Defendants violated Labor Code § 2802(a) when they
20 failed to reimburse Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for expenses incurred as a direct
21 consequence of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant and/or under the direction of Defendants.

22 175. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
23 the assessment of all applicable and available remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699, and
24 seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under the PAGA.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **FIFTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY WAGES EACH PERIOD**

3 (Labor Code § 204)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 176. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 177. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “nonexempt” employees
8 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws regarding the
9 timing of payment of wages each period.

10 178. Labor Code § 204(a) states that all wages earned by a person are due and payable
11 twice during each calendar month, and further states that wages earned during the first through
12 fifteenth days of the month must be paid no later than the twenty-sixth day of the month, and that
13 wages earned between the sixteenth and last day of the month must be paid by the tenth day of
14 the following month.

15 179. Furthermore, Labor Code § 204(d) states “[t]he requirements of this section shall
16 be deemed satisfied by the payment of wages for weekly, biweekly, or semimonthly payroll if
17 the wages are paid not more than seven calendar days following the close of the payroll period.”

18 180. At all relevant times herein, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the
19 Aggrieved Employees with all wages due and owing each period within the time required by
20 Labor Code § 204. Moreover, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees with all wages due and owing each pay period, including, but not limited to,
22 minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums, within the
23 time specified by Labor Code § 204.

24 181. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
25 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
26 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

27 ///

28 ///

1 **SIXTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR FAILURE TO TIMELY PAY FINAL WAGES**

3 (Labor Code §§ 201 – 203 and 256)

4 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

5 182. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
6 as if fully alleged herein.

7 183. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were “non-exempt” employees
8 of Defendants who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the
9 timing and payment of final wages.

10 184. Labor Code § 201 requires that the employer immediately pay any wages, without
11 abatement or reduction, to any employee who is discharged.

12 185. Labor Code § 202 requires that the employer pay all wages earned and unpaid,
13 without abatement or reduction, no later than 72 hours of receiving an employee's notice of
14 intent to quit or immediately at the time of quitting if at least a 72-hour notice was provided.

15 186. Labor Code §§ 201-203 cause the unpaid wages of the employee to continue as a
16 penalty from the due date thereof at the same rate until paid or until an action therefore is
17 commenced, but the wages shall not continue for more than thirty (30) days.

18 187. At all relevant times here, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
19 Employees with all wages due and owing upon separation of employment, including, but not
20 limited to, minimum, regular, and overtime wages, as well as meal and rest period premiums,
21 within the time specified by Labor Code §§ 201 – 203.

22 188. Plaintiff alleges that, at all times material to this action, Defendants had a planned
23 pattern and practice of failing to timely pay to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees all wages
24 due and owing upon separation of employment as required by Labor Code §§ 201 and 202.

25 189. As a result of the unlawful employment practices alleged herein, Plaintiff seeks
26 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
27 and seeks to recover all attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.

28 ///

1 **SEVENTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **PAGA ASSESSMENT FOR**

3 **FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS**

4 (Labor Code § 226)

5 *Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees against All Defendants*

6 190. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint
7 as if fully alleged herein.

8 191. Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are and/or were employees of Defendants
9 who did not receive proper protections and benefits of the laws governing the provision of
10 accurate itemized wage statements.

11 192. Labor Code § 226(a) requires an employer to provide its employees with itemized
12 wage statements accurately stating gross wages earned, all deductions, net wages earned, the
13 inclusive dates of the pay period, the employee's name and the last four digits of his or her
14 Social Security number (or employee identification number), the name and address of the legal
15 entity that is the employer, and all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the
16 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate by the employee.

17 193. Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect to Plaintiff
18 and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement to Plaintiff
19 and the Aggrieved Employees that complied with the requirements of Labor Code § 226(a).

20 194. For example, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
21 Employees on a "salary" basis. And, as part of this policy, Defendants did not accurately record
22 the hours worked by the Aggrieved Employees. Therefore, Defendants' wage statements failed
23 to accurately state total hours worked in the pay period. Also, the wage statements failed to state
24 all applicable rates of pay and corresponding hours worked at each rate.

25 195. Also, due to violations discussed herein, Defendants' wage statements failed to
26 accurately state gross wages earned, all deductions, and net wages earned.

27 196. Additionally, Defendants' wage statements frequently failed to state the accurate
28 overtime rate of pay.

1 197. Therefore, Defendants violate Labor Code § 226(a) every pay period with respect
2 to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees because Defendants failed to provide a wage statement
3 to Plaintiff and the Wage Statement Penalties Subclass that complied with the requirements of
4 Labor Code § 226(a).

5 198. As a result of the Defendants' violations of Labor Code §226(a)(9), Plaintiff seeks
6 the assessment of all applicable and available PAGA remedies pursuant to Labor Code § 2699,
7 and seeks to recover all attorneys' fees, costs, and/or any other damages permitted under PAGA.
8 See *Raines v. Coastal Pacific Food Distributors, Inc.* (2018) 23 Cal.App.5th 667, 675 ("Section
9 226.3 provides the civil penalty for failure to comply" with Labor Code § 226).

10 **VII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on a representative basis, and all others
12 similarly situated, prays for judgment and relief against Defendants, jointly and severally, as
13 follows:

- 14 1. As to the Tenth through Seventeenth Causes of Action, the assessment of all
15 applicable and available remedies under the PAGA;
- 16 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as permitted under the PAGA;
- 17 3. That the First through Ninth Causes of Action be certified as a class action;
- 18 4. That Plaintiff be appointed as Class Representative;
- 19 5. That counsel for Plaintiff be appointed Class Counsel;
- 20 6. For all applicable statutory penalties recoverable under the First through Ninth
21 Causes of Action to the extent permitted by law, including those pursuant to Labor Code and
22 Orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission;
- 23 7. For reasonable attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
24 law, including those pursuant to the Labor Code;
- 25 8. For injunctive relief and/or restitution as provided by the Labor Code and
26 Business and Professions Code § 17200, *et seq.*;

27 ///

28 ///

1 9. For a declaratory judgment that Defendants have violated Labor Code §§ 200,
2 201, 202, 203, 204, 208, 210, 218.6, 221, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 558, 1194, 1197, 1198,
3 1199, 2802, among other sections inadvertently omitted;

4 10. For an award of damages in the amount of unpaid compensation including, but
5 not limited to, unpaid wages, benefits, and penalties according to proof, including interest
6 thereon;

7 11. For pre- and post-judgment interest; and

8 12. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

10 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, hereby
11 demands a jury trial as to the First through Seventeenth Causes of Action pled herein.

12
13 Dated: June 23, 2021

LAUBY, MANKIN & LAUBY LLP

14
15 BY:



Brian J. Mankin, Esq.
Peter J. Carlson, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

OF SERVICE
(Pursuant to CCP §§ 1013(a)(1) and 2015.5)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)

I am employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 4590 Allstate Drive, Riverside, California 92501.

On August 19, 2021, I caused to be served the foregoing document(s) described as follows:

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

I declare that I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. It is deposited with the U.S. 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 than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

☐ **By Mail** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Riverside, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

☐ **By Facsimile** I sent this document via fax to all parties as listed on attached service list, on

☐ **By Overnight Service** I deposited such envelope in a facility regularly maintained by the United Parcel Service for receipt of items for overnight delivery, with overnight delivery expenses prepaid, addressed to the person to be served.

☒ **By Email or Electronic Transmission:** Pursuant to CCP § 1010.6 or an agreement of the parties to accept service by email or electronic transmission, I caused the document(s) to be sent from email address tracie@lmlfirm.com to the persons at the electronic notification address listed in the service list. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was not successful.

☐ **By Certified Mail-Return Receipt Requested** I caused such envelope with postage fully prepaid thereon, to be placed in the United States mail at Riverside, California.

☐ **By Personal Service** I caused said document(s) to be personally served by hand on the parties listed on the attached service list.

☒ **State** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on August 19, 2021, Riverside, California.

☐ **Federal** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.



Tracie Chiarito, Declarant

SERVICE LIST

John W. Fagerholm, Esq.

jfagerhorn@jwflawltd.com

M. Danton Richardson, Esq.

drichardson@jwflawltd.com

Stephanie Greenberg, Esq.

sgreenberg@jwflawltd.com

LAW OFFICES OF JOHN W. FAGERHOLM, LTD

725 S. Figueroa Street, #3065

Los Angeles, CA 90017

323-289-2260

323-642-5441-fax

Attorneys for Defendant RLS-CMC, INC.
