

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

David D. Bibiyan (SBN 287811)

david@tomorrowlaw.com

Diego Aviles (SBN 315533)

diego@tomorrowlaw.com

Sara Ehsani-Nia (SBN 326501)

sara@tomorrowlaw.com

8484 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500

Beverly Hills, California 90211

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, PAULINE MARY HUFF,
as an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other
aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

PAULINE MARY HUFF, as an aggrieved
employee, and on behalf of all other aggrieved
employees under the Labor Code Private
Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTERIOR SPECIALISTS, INC., a California
corporation; INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP,
INC., a Delaware corporation; INTERIOR
LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company;
INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS,
INC., an unknown corporation; INTERIOR
LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS II, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company;
INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS III,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS IV,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
INSTALLATION SERVICES HOLDINGS,
LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
INSTALLATION SERVICES HOLDINGS,
INC., a Delaware corporation; FARADAY
HOLDINGS, LLC, Delaware limited liability
company; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

06/28/2021 at 10:46:56 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Elizabeth Reyes, Deputy Clerk

CASE NO.: 37-2021-00027662-CU-OE-CTL

REPRESENTATIVE ACTION

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1
and 2699**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than
\$25,000.00]

COMES NOW plaintiff PAULINE MARY HUFF (“Plaintiff”), as aggrieved employees, and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys’ General Act of 2004, and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”), against INTERIOR SPECIALISTS, INC., and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ISI”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG INC.”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG HOLDINGS”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS, INC., an unknown corporation and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG HOLDINGS INC.”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS II, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG HOLDINGS II”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS III, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG HOLDINGS III”); INTERIOR LOGIC GROUP HOLDINGS IV, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ILG HOLDINGS VI”); INSTALLATION SERVICES HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ISH”); and INSTALLATION SERVICES HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“ISH INC.”); and FARADAY HOLDINGS, LLC, Delaware limited liability company and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California (“FARADAY” and, collectively with ISI, ILG INC., ILG HOLDINGS, ILG HOLDINGS INC., ILG HOLDINGS II, ILG HOLDINGS III, ILG HOLDINGS IV, ISH, ISH INC., and with and DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below, “Defendants”) as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce

1 Development Agency of the State of California (“LWDA”), on behalf of Plaintiff and all other
2 current and former non-exempt employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period,
3 as further defined herein, and, as it pertains to the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor
4 Code section 2810.5, Labor Code section 203, Labor Code section 226, Labor Code section 227.3,
5 Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*, Labor Code section 2802, restraints on competition, whistleblowing
6 and freedom of speech on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty
7 Period (collectively, “Aggrieved Employees”).

8 2. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code
9 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

10 3. Venue is proper in San Diego County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
11 sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, San Diego County is where the causes of action
12 complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in
13 which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was
14 due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff
15 and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them,
16 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved
17 Employees in San Diego County, and because Defendants employ numerous Aggrieved Employees
18 in San Diego County.

19 4. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by
20 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code
21 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil
22 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code
23 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus
24 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former
25 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

26 5. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative
27 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*
28 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the

1 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

2 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the
3 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),
4 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226,
5 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 246, *et seq.*, 432, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 1194, 1197,
6 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 2699, 2802, and 2810.5, among others.

7 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees
8 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former employees within
9 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures
10 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

11 8. On or around April 12, 2021, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor
12 Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants’
13 violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA,
14 as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

15 9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not
16 provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants’ alleged violations within sixty-five (65)
17 calendar days of the April 12, 2021 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiff
18 to the LWDA and Defendants.

19 **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

20 10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
21 of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in the State of
22 California in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation,
23 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per
24 week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime
25 wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually
26 worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without
27 limitation, by requiring employees: to remain on-call, to suffer under Defendants’ control to
28 complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out (including

1 answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to
2 don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the
3 clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration,
4 including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other forms of
5 remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the
6 additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay;
7 detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show
8 less hours than actually worked, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

9 11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy
10 of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours
11 worked or otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation, failing to
12 accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring employees: to remain on-
13 call; to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift
14 tasks after clocking out (including answering calls from dispatch and others), to clock out for meal
15 periods and continue working, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to
16 attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental
17 rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours
18 than actually worked; failing to pay reporting time pay; paid time off and vacation time owed, to the
19 detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

20 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
21 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted,
22 timely, and complete meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and
23 ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal
24 periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods;
25 not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short
26 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal
27 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal
28 periods, as required by California wage and hour laws

1 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
2 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and
3 complete rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions
4 thereof, or compensation in lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest
5 periods all together; requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting
6 them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods not
7 providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and/or
8 otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods, as required by California wage and hour laws.

9 14. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
10 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
11 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross
12 wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable
13 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each
14 hourly rate by the employee; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
15 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
16 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

17 15. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
18 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish
19 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment
20 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records
21 under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to
22 calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other
23 Aggrieved Employees.

24 16. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
25 of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages
26 owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime
27 wages, minimum wages, premium wages, paid time off and vacation time owed as required by Labor
28 Code sections 201, 202, and 203.

1 17. At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing
2 to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon
3 separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3
4 and applicable Wage Orders.

5 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
6 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without
7 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal
8 vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, providing uniform and other deposits,
9 separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools and safety equipment (including
10 work boots to handle oil), for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone
11 plans, office equipment to work from home, in direct consequence of the discharge of their duties,
12 or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants, as required by Labor Code 2802.

13 19. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
14 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft
15 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved
16 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;
17 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the
18 name, address, and telephone number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier; information
19 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants
20 under Labor Code section 2810.5.

21 20. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and
22 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to
23 California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 246, *et seq.*), and also did not
24 permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and
25 all other Aggrieved Employees.

26 21. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of
27 failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code
28 Section 204, which requires that: "[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of

1 any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the
2 labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any
3 calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

4 22. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice
5 of preventing Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge
6 and experience they obtained at Defendants for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,
7 without limitation, preventing Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a new job with
8 a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under what
9 circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is informed
10 and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code sections 17200,
11 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code, including Labor
12 Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

13 23. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
14 Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants
15 to their managers or outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation
16 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section
17 1102.5. In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants’ herein-described policies
18 and/or practices prevent Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information
19 about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation
20 of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

21 24. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other
22 Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state
23 statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including,
24 without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5,
25 subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of
26 Plaintiff’s and/or other Aggrieved Employee’s constitutional rights of freedom of speech and
27 economic liberty.

25. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees pursuant to PAGA.

PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

26. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, providing online customer support. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately November of 2020 through at least January of 2021

B. Defendants

27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ISI is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG INC. is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG HOLDINGS is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

30. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG HOLDINGS INC. is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

///

1 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG
2 HOLDINGS II is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under
3 and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego,
4 State of California.

5 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG
6 HOLDINGS III is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under
7 and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego,
8 State of California.

9 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ILG
10 HOLDINGS IV is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under
11 and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego,
12 State of California.

13 34. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ISH is,
14 and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and existing under and
15 by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State
16 of California.

17 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant ISH
18 INC. is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by
19 virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of
20 California.

21 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that defendant
22 FARADAY is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a limited liability company organized and
23 existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the County
24 of San Diego, State of California.

25 37. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,
26 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,
27 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.
28 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated

1 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.
2 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of
3 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is
4 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent
5 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or
6 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the
7 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to "Defendants," it shall
8 include ISI, ILG INC., ILG HOLDINGS, ILG HOLDINGS INC., ILG HOLDINGS II, ILG
9 HOLDINGS III, ILG HOLDINGS IV, ISH, ISH INC., FARADAY, and any of their parent,
10 subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100
11 identified herein.

12 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

13 38. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times
14 mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,
15 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or
16 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,
17 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

18 39. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant
19 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate
20 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In
21 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of
22 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the
23 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant
24 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,
25 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the
26 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

27 40. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based
28 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 210 – Against All Defendants)**

3 41. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
4 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

5 42. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 204, requires and required that:
6 “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of any calendar month shall be paid for
7 between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the labor was performed, and labor
8 performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive, of any calendar month, shall be paid for
9 between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

10 43. At all relevant times herein, Labor Code section 210, subdivision (a) states and stated
11 that “[i]n addition to, and entirely independent and apart from, any other penalty provided in this
12 article, every person who fails to pay the wages of each employee as provided in Sections 201.3,
13 204, 204b, 204.1, 205, 205.5, and 1197.5, shall be subject to a civil penalty as follows: (1) For any
14 initial violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each failure to pay each employee” and “(2) For
15 each subsequent violation, or any willful or intentional violation, two hundred dollars (\$200) for
16 each failure to pay each employee, plus 25 percent of the amount unlawfully withheld.”

17 44. At all relevant times herein, Defendants have had a consistent policy or practice of
18 failing to pay Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees during their employment on a timely basis as
19 per Labor Code section 204. Thus, pursuant to Labor Code section 210, Plaintiff and other
20 Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants’ violations of Labor
21 Code section 204, in the amount of one hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee for
22 each initial violation per employee, and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each Aggrieved Employee
23 for each subsequent violation in connection with each payment that was made in violation of Labor
24 Code section 204.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 226.3 – Against All Defendants)**

27 45. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
28 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

1 46. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to comply with Labor Code
2 section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees
3 with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net
4 wages earned; the name and address of each employer with whom they have been placed to work;
5 all applicable hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours
6 worked at each hourly rate; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal
7 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such
8 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

9 47. Labor Code section 226.3 states that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)
10 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)
11 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for
12 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage
13 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

14 48. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in
15 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law."

16 49. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had
17 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish non-exempt employees, including, without
18 limitation, Plaintiff, with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total
19 hours worked; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the
20 corresponding number of hours worked at each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal
21 name of the employer and/or the name and address of the legal entity securing the employer's services
22 if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such information as required by Labor Code
23 section 226, subdivision (a).

24 50. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are
25 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision
26 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period
27 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay
28 period for each subsequent violation.

1 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Violation of Labor Code § 558 – Against All Defendants)**

3 51. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
4 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

5 52. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person
6 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating
7 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission” shall be subject to a civil
8 penalty as follows:

9 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each
10 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient
11 to recover underpaid wages;

12 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid
13 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to
14 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

15 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

16 53. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that Defendants, and
17 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including
18 causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid overtime wages and minimum
19 wages; receive meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; be paid timely wages during
20 their employment and after their employment separation; receive accurate, itemized wage
21 statements; be provided with the opportunity to inspect employment records; be provided with
22 notice as required under Labor Code section 2810.5; be provided with the proper accrual and use of
23 paid sick leave; and/or be paid out all paid time off and/or vacation wages owed at the proper rate
24 of pay.

25 54. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
26 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover
27 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars
28 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars

1 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

2 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

3 **(Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5 – Against All Defendants)**

4 55. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
5 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

6 56. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required
7 every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the
8 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or
9 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are
10 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,
11 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,
12 or papers of the person.”

13 57. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required
14 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of
15 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

16 58. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required
17 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the
18 plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours
19 worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable
20 piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records
21 shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any
22 case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee
23 from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units
24 earned.”

25 59. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully
26 fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate
27 and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any
28 member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision

1 (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

2 60. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have
3 willfully failed to maintain the records required by Labor Code subdivision (c), failed to maintain
4 accurate and complete records required by Labor Code subdivision (d), and/or failed to allow
5 inspection of records as required by Labor Code subdivision (b).

6 61. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
7 pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
8 recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five
9 hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

10 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1 – Against All Defendants)**

12 62. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
13 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

14 63. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other
15 person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays
16 or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or
17 local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,
18 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
19 Section 203 as follows:

20 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars
21 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
22 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount
23 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
24 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

25 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty
26 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the
27 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is
28 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount

1 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section
2 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

3 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to
4 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected
5 employee.”

6 64. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused
7 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without
8 limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees’ wages for all hours
9 worked or otherwise under Defendants’ control due to, without limitation, routinely failing to
10 accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimental rounding or manipulation of
11 time entries; paying straight pay instead of overtime or otherwise failing to pay overtime hours at
12 the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock.

13 65. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,
14 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to
15 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one
16 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and
17 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each
18 subsequent violation.

19 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **(Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699 – Against All Defendants)**

21 66. Plaintiff re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs
22 and incorporates each by reference as though fully set forth hereat.

23 67. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other
24 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed
25 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or
26 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil
27 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former
28 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

68. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

69. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for the failure to: pay overtime wages and minimum wages; provide meal and rest periods or compensation in lieu thereof; provide accurate, itemized wage statements; pay timely wages during employment and after employment separation; provide employees the opportunity to inspect employment records; reimburse Aggrieved Employees for costs incurred in furtherance of their work duties; provide notice as required under Labor Code section 2810.5; provide the proper accrual and use of paid sick leave; paying employees all owed paid time off and vacation time owed by separation at the proper rate of pay; and placing restraints on competition, whistleblowing and freedom of speech, entitling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to civil penalties for each of these Labor Code violations in the amounts set forth in Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f).

70. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

REQUEST FOR JURY TRIAL

71. Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, on behalf of Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

A. An award of civil penalties pursuant to Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;

/ / /

- 1 B. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Labor Code sections
2 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699;
3 C. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
4 D. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
5 E. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

6
7 Dated: June 28, 2021

BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.

8
9 BY: /s/ Jeffrey D. Klein

10 JEFFREY D. KLEIN

DAVID D. BIBIYAN

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff PAULINE MARY
12 HUFF, as an aggrieved employee, and on
13 behalf of all other aggrieved employees under
the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General
Act of 2004,
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28