

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104

KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672

JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626

FAWN F. BEKAM, State Bar No. 307312

fbekam@aegslawfirm.com

9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100

Irvine, California 92618

Telephone: (949) 379-6250

Facsimile: (949) 379-6251

Attorneys for Plaintiff Brian Harvey, individually
and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

08/04/2021 at 03:33:58 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By Melinda McClure, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

BRIAN HARVEY, individually and on
behalf of all other aggrieved employees,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ADVISORS MORTGAGE GROUP, LLC;
and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2021-00033201-CU-0E-CTL

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE
CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT OF 2004
(CAL. LAB. CODE §§ 2698, ET SEQ.)**

1 Plaintiff Brian Harvey, individually, and on behalf of all other aggrieved employees,
2 alleges as follows:

3 **NATURE OF ACTION AND INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

4 1. Plaintiff Brian Harvey (“Plaintiff”) brings this representative action against
5 defendants Advisors Mortgage Group, LLC, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive (collectively,
6 “Defendants”), on behalf of himself and other aggrieved employees who are and were
7 employed by Defendants as non-exempt employees throughout California.

8 2. Defendants are in the business of providing mortgage banking.

9 3. Through this action, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have engaged in a
10 systematic pattern of wage and hour violations under the California Labor Code and Industrial
11 Welfare Commission (“IWC”) Wage Orders.

12 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants have
13 increased their profits by violating state wage and hour laws by, among other things:

- 14 (a) failing to pay all wages (including minimum wages and overtime
15 wages);
16 (b) failing to provide lawful meal periods or compensation in lieu thereof;
17 (c) failing to authorize or permit lawful rest breaks or provide compensation
18 in lieu thereof;
19 (d) failing to provide accurate itemized wage statements;
20 (e) failing to pay all wages due upon separation of employment.

21 5. Plaintiff seeks monetary relief against Defendants on behalf of himself and all
22 others similarly situated in California to recover, among other things, unpaid wages and
23 benefits, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and penalties pursuant to Labor Code §§
24 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 510, 512, 558, 1174, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2,
25 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2698, *et seq.* and Code of California Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. This is a representative action pursuant to Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698, *et seq.*) (“PAGA”). The civil penalties sought by Plaintiff exceeds the minimal jurisdictional limits of the Superior Court and will be established according to proof at trial.

7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution, Article VI, § 10, which grants the Superior Court original jurisdiction in all causes, except those given by statutes to other courts. The statutes under which this action is brought do not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.

8. This Court has jurisdiction over all Defendants because, upon information and belief, they are citizens of California, have sufficient minimum contacts in California, or otherwise intentionally avail themselves of the California market so as to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

9. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, Defendants reside, transact business, or have offices in this county, and the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this county.

THE PARTIES

10. Plaintiff is a citizen of California and worked for Defendants in California during the relevant time periods as alleged herein.

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that at all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants were and are subject to the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders as employers, whose employees were and are engaged throughout this county and the State of California.

12. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names or capacities of the defendants sued herein under the fictitious names DOES 1 through 20, but will seek leave of this Court to amend this Complaint and serve such fictitiously named defendants once their names and capacities become known.

1 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1 through 20
2 are or were the partners, agents, owners, shareholders, managers, or employees of Defendants
3 at all relevant times.

4 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant acted
5 in all respects pertinent to this action as the agent of the other defendant, carried out a joint
6 scheme, business plan, or policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant
7 are legally attributable to the other defendant. Furthermore, defendants in all respects acted as
8 the employer and/or joint employer of Plaintiff and the class members.

9 15. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each and all of the
10 acts and omissions alleged herein were performed by, or are attributable to, Defendants and/or
11 DOES 1 through 20, acting as the agent or alter ego for the other, with legal authority to act on
12 the other's behalf. The acts of any and all Defendants were in accordance with, and represent,
13 the official policy of Defendants.

14 16. At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, acted within the scope of
15 such agency or employment, or ratified each and every act or omission complained of herein.
16 At all relevant times, Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted the acts and omissions of
17 each and all the other Defendants in proximately causing the damages herein alleged.

18 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said
19 Defendants is in some manner intentionally, negligently, or otherwise responsible for the acts,
20 omissions, occurrences, and transactions alleged herein.

21 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

22 18. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants employed Plaintiff and other
23 California citizens as non-exempt employees at Defendants' California business location(s).

24 19. Defendant employed Plaintiff as a non-exempt employee at Defendants'
25 California business location.

26 20. Defendants continue to employ non-exempt employees within California.

27 21. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein
28 mentioned, Defendants were advised by skilled lawyers, employees, and other professionals

1 who were knowledgeable about California's wage and hour laws, employment and personnel
2 practices, and the requirements of California law.

3 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
4 should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive wages for
5 all time worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages) and that they were not
6 receiving all wages earned for work that was required to be performed. In violation of the
7 Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were not paid all wages
8 (including minimum wages and overtime wages) for all hours worked at the correct rate due to
9 rounding of time punches in the employer's favor and Defendants' failure to correctly include
10 other incentive pay in the overtime rate, among other issues.

11 23. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
12 should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all required
13 meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and aggrieved
14 employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted meal period.
15 In violation of the Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did
16 not receive all meal periods or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and
17 aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when they did not receive a timely, uninterrupted
18 meal period.

19 24. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
20 should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive all rest
21 breaks or payment of one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and aggrieved employees'
22 regular rate of pay when a rest break was missed. In violation of the Labor Code and IWC
23 Wage Orders, Plaintiff and aggrieved employees did not receive all rest breaks or payment of
24 one (1) additional hour of pay at Plaintiff's and aggrieved employees' regular rate of pay when
25 a rest break was missed.

26 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
27 should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to receive itemized
28 wage statements that accurately showed the following information pursuant to the Labor Code:

1 (1) gross wages earned; (2) total hours worked by the employee; (3) the number of piece-rate
2 units earned and any applicable piece rate if the employee is paid on a piece-rate basis; (4) all
3 deductions, provided that all deductions made on written orders of the employee may be
4 aggregated and shown as one item; (5) net wages earned; (6) the inclusive dates of the period
5 for which the employee is paid; (7) the name of the employee and only the last four digits of his
6 or her social security number or an employee identification number other than a social security
7 number; (8) the name and address of the legal entity that is the employer; and (9) all applicable
8 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at
9 each hourly rate by the employee. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and aggrieved
10 employees were not provided with accurate itemized wage statements.

11 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
12 should have known that Plaintiff and aggrieved employees were entitled to timely payment of
13 wages due upon separation of employment. In violation of the Labor Code, Plaintiff and
14 aggrieved employees did not receive payment of all wages within permissible time periods.

15 27. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants knew or
16 should have known they had a duty to compensate Plaintiff and aggrieved employees, and
17 Defendants had the financial ability to pay such compensation but willfully, knowingly, and
18 intentionally failed to do so in order to increase Defendants' profits.

19 28. Therefore, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit seeking monetary and injunctive relief
20 against Defendants on behalf of himself and all Class Members to recover, among other things,
21 unpaid wages (including minimum wages and overtime wages), unpaid meal period premium
22 payments, unpaid rest period premium payments, interest, attorneys' fees, penalties, costs, and
23 expenses.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 29. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the previous paragraphs as
26 though fully set forth herein.

27 30. Pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(a), any provision of the Labor Code that provides
28 for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by the Labor and Workforce Development Agency

1 (“LWDA”) or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies, or employees for
2 violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil action brought by
3 an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former employees
4 pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code § 2699.3.

5 31. For all provisions of the Labor Code except those for which a civil penalty is
6 specifically provided, Labor Code § 2699(f) imposes upon Defendants a civil penalty of one
7 hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for the initial violation and
8 two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved employee per pay period for each subsequent pay
9 period in which Defendants violated these provisions of the Labor Code.

10 32. Defendants’ conduct violates numerous Labor Code sections, including, but not
11 limited to, the following:

12 (a) violation of Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 210, 227.3, 510, 1182.12, 1194,
13 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1 and 1198 for failure to timely pay all earned wages (including
14 minimum and overtime wages) owed to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees during
15 employment and upon separation of employment as herein alleged;

16 (b) violation of Labor Code §§ 226.7 and 512 for failure to provide meal periods to
17 Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed
18 meal periods as herein alleged;

19 (c) violation of Labor Code § 226.7 for failure to permit rest breaks to Plaintiff and
20 other aggrieved employees and failure to pay premium wages for missed rest periods as
21 herein alleged;

22 (d) violation of Labor Code §§ 226 and 226.3 for failure to provide accurate
23 itemized wage statements to Plaintiff and other aggrieved employees as herein alleged;
24 and

25 (e) violation of Labor Code §§ 1174 and 1174.5 for failure to maintain accurate and
26 complete records showing, among other things, the hours worked daily and the wages
27 paid to aggrieved employees as herein alleged; and
28

1 (f) violation of Labor Code §§ 2800 and 2802 for failure to reimburse Plaintiff and
2 other aggrieved employees for necessary business expenses as herein alleged.

3 33. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” because he was employed by the alleged
4 violator and had one or more of the violations committed against him, and therefore is properly
5 suited to represent the interests of all other aggrieved employees.

6 34. Plaintiff has exhausted the procedural requirements under Labor Code § 2699.3
7 as to Defendants and is therefore able to pursue a claim for penalties on behalf of himself and
8 all other aggrieved employees under PAGA.

9 35. Pursuant to Labor Code §§ 2699(a), 2699.3 and 2699.5, Plaintiff is entitled to
10 recover civil penalties in addition to other remedies, for violation of the Labor Code sections
11 cited above.

12 36. For bringing this action, Plaintiff is entitled to attorneys’ fees and costs incurred
13 herein.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 On Plaintiff’s own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff prays for
16 relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

17 1. For civil penalties against Defendants on behalf of all aggrieved employees and
18 the LWDA pursuant to Labor Code § 2698, *et seq.*;

19 2. For reasonable attorneys’ fees, costs of suit, and interest to the extent permitted by
20 law, including, but not limited to, Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5 and Labor Code § 2698 *et*
21 *seq.*; and;

22 3. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
23

24 Dated: August 4, 2021

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC

25
26 By: 
27 Fawn F. Bekam
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff Brian Harvey